

# A Dictionary of Scientific Communism



Progress Publishers  
Moscow

Translated from the Russian  
Designed by *Alexander Geintse*

НАУЧНЫЙ КОММУНИЗМ. СЛОВАРЬ

Под редакцией Румянцева А. М.

*На английском языке*

© Политиздат, 1980

English translation © Progress Publishers 1984

*Printed in the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics*

Н  $\frac{0302030000-633}{014(01)-84}$  18-84

## PUBLISHERS' NOTE

For ease of reference a uniform system of references has been adopted in the dictionary. The entries are arranged in alphabetical order and are in essay form. The word or words contained in the subject-headings are not repeated but are referred to by the initial letter or letters. Cross-references (shown by "q. v.") are inserted only where they would help clarify the topic under consideration, not on every occasion when a person, place or event has an entry of its own elsewhere. Additional information is given in subject-headings (it is enclosed in brackets and preceded by the words "see also"). References to books, foreign words and expressions are given in italics as commonly used in Britain. References to works by classics of Marxism-Leninism are made to *Collected Works* of K. Marx and F. Engels and to *Collected Works* by V. I. Lenin and their individual works put out by Progress Publishers in English.

# A

**Abolition of the Exploiting Classes**, the principal social task the proletariat fulfils in the course of the socialist revolution (q. v.) and during the transition period from capitalism to socialism (q. v); it is a major component of the total eradication of all classes and the building of a classless communist society. It involves expropriation, i. e. confiscation of the means of production from the exploiting classes and their transfer to public ownership. Engels wrote: "As soon as our Party is in possession of political power it has simply to expropriate the big landed proprietors just like the manufacturers in industry" (K. Marx, F. Engels, *Selected Works* in three volumes, Vol. 3, p. 474). Hence A. E. C. is a socio-economic measure rather than the physical extermination of property-owners. To terminate the exploiters' existence as a class, they should be deprived not only of the means of economic domination, but also of political power and command positions in politics, ideology, culture, education and intellectual life.

The socialist revolution faces the problem of abolishing two exploiting classes: capitalists (kulaks included), and landowners, feudal lords, and latifundists. The numerical strength and influence of these exploiting classes are determined by the country's socio-economic development on the eve of the revolution. The lower the development level of capitalism, the greater the power, influence and the numerical proportion of the class of landowners. In pre-revolutionary Russia, the landowners comprised a special class, while in countries with more developed capitalism the class of feudal lords is bourgeoisified and, being closely allied with the bourgeoisie, in many respects intermingles and merges with it.

The stages in the abolition of various sections of the exploiting classes depend

primarily on which means of production and in what quantities are at their disposal. As a rule, the first to be confiscated is the large-scale property of landowners, latifundists, and capitalist monopolies (in the USSR, the Decree on Land abolished the landowners' ownership of the land the day after the Revolution had triumphed, on 8 November 1917); at the same time, or very soon, big private capitalist property is also expropriated. The property of medium- and small-scale capitalists in town and countryside (kulaks) is expropriated subsequently. The methods used to take private property away from the exploiters and turn it into public property vary, too: either confiscation (expropriation without compensation to former owners), or by redemption (with a certain compensation of its value). "Whether this expropriation is to be compensated for or not," Engels wrote, "will to a great extent depend not upon us but the circumstances under which we obtain power, and particularly upon the attitude adopted by these gentry, the big landowners, themselves. We by no means consider compensation as impermissible in any event; Marx told me (and how many times!) that in his opinion we would get off cheapest if we could buy out the whole lot of them" (K. Marx, F. Engels, *Selected Works* in three volumes, Vol. 3, p. 474). Confiscation was practised in the USSR, primarily because of the resistance put up by the bourgeoisie; in Bulgaria, Hungary, the GDR, the Socialist Republic of Vietnam, Czechoslovakia, and several other socialist countries a certain amount of compensation was paid to former owners for expropriated property.

A. E. C. is carried out in the course of the working people's class struggle against the exploiters, in accordance with the principle of "Who beats whom". The



acuteness and fierceness of this struggle is largely determined by the strength of the resistance on the part of the overthrown classes, who sometimes hope to restore the old exploiting system. Because savage resistance was put up by the exploiters, in the USSR the class struggle launched against them was violent (see *Violence*). It was less vicious in the other socialist countries, so violence was resorted to on a smaller scale there to abolish the kulaks as a class. That was also in a large measure due to the fact that, by that time, the total might of socialism had grown noticeably and some experience had been gained in this sphere. Once the exploiting classes cease to exist, their representatives are free to join the ranks of the working people. The most zealous opponents of the new system emigrate to the capitalist countries (as they did from the USSR and several other countries) in order to continue their class struggle against the socialist countries; but many of those who stay behind are re-educated by the working class and become involved in socially useful activities. Lenin noted on this score: "As far as individual capitalists, or even most of the capitalists, are concerned, the proletariat has no intention of 'taking their last shirt from them'... has no intention of taking 'everything' from them. On the contrary, it intends to put them on useful and honourable jobs — under the control of the workers" (V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 24, p. 429). Socialism provides a fine opportunity to engage in creative work for the benefit of society for those property-owners who show patriotism and loyalty to worker-peasant power, not to speak of sympathisers and progressive-minded elements from among the bourgeoisie (see also *Class Struggle in the Transition Period from Capitalism to Socialism; State Capitalism*).

**Aesthetic Education** is the creation and development of man's ability to perceive works of art and the aesthetic side of existence, that is, his ability to evaluate those phenomena as beautiful or ugly, lofty or mean, tragic or comical.

The actual content of the objectives, principles and tasks of the A. E. of people has varied in different historical epochs, but it has always functioned as the cultiva-

tion in man of the ability to proceed from certain aesthetic, and eventually social, ideals in the evaluation of realities.

In socialist society, A. E. is part of the overall process of communist education (q.v.), exerting a purposeful influence on different sides of people's intellectual life, intended to implant in them diversified aesthetic tastes, interests, attractions, needs, as well as an imaginative attitude towards reality, a genuinely humane attitude towards one another. People's labour is an important sphere of application for A. E. The task here is to stimulate each individual's desire to improve his labour activity, develop his ability to feel the greatness and beauty of labour and its accomplishments. In this sphere A. E. cannot be abstracted or separated from the progressive development of society and labour processes. Hence, it is also important to instill a negative aesthetic attitude to whatever is repugnant in labour, to whatever interferes with man's creative development. Yet another aspect of A. E. is the fostering of aesthetic views, feelings, and tastes related to man's attitude to other people, to the evaluation of the human personality, to other people's ways of life and behaviour.

People's aesthetic feelings, tastes, interests, attractions, and requirements exert a strong influence on their behaviour, are projected into their actions, into their work carried out in keeping with their notions of what is beautiful, into their striving for perfection. Without this active, creative, and transformative feature, A. E. would be lopsided and abstract. More still, A. E. embraces people's attitude towards nature. It is one of its major goals to help each individual associate with nature as with an aesthetic value, teach him to enjoy nature, treat it sparingly, enhance its beauty and grandeur.

One part of A. E. is artistic education. It fosters a love of art, an ability to appreciate the beauty of artistic values, a high standard of artistic requirement, aspirations and interests; it cultivates participation at least in one form of creative art, it awakens the artist in each individual. Without A. E. it would be impossible to develop artistic talents; moreover, it would be impossible for millions of readers, listeners, and

spectators to assimilate the riches created by art. Artistic education creates a favourable intellectual atmosphere for the efflorescence of art, as it refines human feelings, and improves man's creative abilities.

A.E. does not intend to achieve a uniformity of aesthetic perceptions, feelings, requirements and preferences in all individuals. Human individuality will, by all possible means, inject a great variety of attitudes within a genuinely aesthetic (not perverted) attitude towards reality and art. For example, the degree of aesthetic elation, its forms of expression, preferred interest in objects of aesthetic perception and elation, in some or other varieties of genres or stylistic patterns in art may differ.

A.E. contributes to refinement of the personality (see Harmonious Development of the Individual). The level of man's aesthetic culture is closely linked to his intellectual, moral, and physical standards; it solidifies his views, enriches his feelings and emotions, and affects his overall behaviour, his attitudes to other people; it plays a constructive role in the formation of a communist attitude to labour, in the refinement of behavioural culture and of lifestyles. The greater the progress towards communism, the greater is the role of A.E., commensurate with the growing role of a set of aesthetic appraisals, views, feelings and preferences as factors determining people's behaviour and actions.

Social conditions, association with nature, all types and forms of practical activity, educational and other institutions, and the like, are all factors in the process of A.E. Labour is the foundation of A.E., not just because all the material and intellectual values are created by labour, but also because its process shapes aesthetic abilities, which are indispensable for the development of man's intellectual aesthetic culture. School is important for the A.E. of the younger generation. The basic instrument of A.E. is art, which helps form multifaceted aesthetic attitudes towards various spheres of activity and evaluate that activity in terms of certain ideals. Art refines people's tastes and views, their aesthetic feelings and needs. Important for A.E. is Marxist-Leninist

aesthetics, the science that studies the entire realm of aesthetic relations to the world, thereby contributing to the formation of the tasks and aims of A.E. and to determining the ways to accomplish them.

**Agricultural Co-operation**, association of peasant economies for joint crediting, the marketing of output, purchase of machinery and other implements, and for the collective use of land and agricultural production. The content of co-operation is determined by the dominant social system in the country. Under capitalism, A.C. is an element of the system of market, private-property relations; under the dictatorship of the proletariat (q.v.), when the means of production, sometimes including the land, are owned by society as a whole, the class nature of co-operation changes drastically. It helps the peasants go over to socialism, "by means that are the *simplest, easiest and most acceptable to the peasant*" (V.I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 33, p. 468).

In the developed capitalist countries, A.C. emerged early in the 19th century, reflecting progressive trends in social development. Being subject to the general laws of the capitalist economy, however, it only emphasised the superiority of large-scale production over small, and promoted differentiation among the peasants.

The major factors currently determining the development of peasant-and-farmer co-operation are the following: the formation of an agrarian-industrial complex during the industrialisation of agricultural production, in which co-operation is striving to occupy firm positions; a constant increase in state assistance through the direct and mediated financing of capital investment, and the organisation of professional training, scientific consultations and technical aid; and more vigorous penetration of agriculture by monopoly capital.

The merger of different forms of co-operation, the setting up of regional and national co-operative centres and associations, and the emphasis on capitalist principles in co-operative activities are the trends most typical of the contemporary co-operative movement in the developed capitalist countries.

As the growing monopoly pressure makes opposition from the peasant masses more vigorous, A. C. may develop along a democratic road. Communist parties in developed capitalist countries put forward the slogan of a united front with all co-operators (except for capitalists) engaged in the struggle against monopoly rule.

In the economically backward countries, A. C. appeared in the late 19th-early 20th centuries. Here co-operatives were largely implanted by the relevant colonial powers, as a means to promote their own interests. At the same time, national co-operatives also began to emerge spontaneously.

At the stage of winning political independence, agrarian reforms carried out in the countryside played an important role in the implementation of co-operative forms of economy. Their nature and content exerted a definitive influence on A. C. In countries where land reform was held back because the big national bourgeoisie formed an alliance with imperialism and the landowner-feudalist upper crust, co-operation promoted capitalist relations in the countryside. In countries that have embarked on the non-capitalist path of development (q.v.), agrarian transformations are carried out in the interests of agricultural labourers, and co-operation becomes an important means of rallying together the rural working people and tackling political and socio-economic tasks.

The theoretical principles behind socialist co-operation were elaborated by Marx and Engels, who treated A. C. as a transitional form from the capitalist to the socialised mode of production. They advised that big capitalist farms be turned over for collective use and that small peasant holdings be united into co-operatives. Lenin, in turn, pointed out and substantiated concrete ways and means, as well as the conditions, for changing from individual peasant holdings to a large-scale collective production.

According to Lenin's co-operative plan, major conditions for socialist co-operation are a state of a proletarian dictatorship, public ownership of the means of production, and an alliance between the proletariat and millions of small farmers. The

co-operation of the peasant masses requires prolonged and painstaking efforts aimed at gradually attracting the peasants to the collective way of farming. Co-operation must be voluntary, the advantages of collective labour should be thoroughly explained, and the socialist state should provide financial and other assistance. Lenin said that the political significance of A. C. was that it made it possible "to learn to build socialism in practice in such a way that every small peasant could take part in it" (V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 33, p. 468).

State ownership of the land on a country-wide scale created favourable conditions for A. C. in the USSR. In the first few years of Soviet power, simple forms of A. C. were the most widespread: crediting, supply and marketing. Later, simple production associations emerged (for the joint use of machines, land reclamation, seed-growing and stock-breeding), in which the land and the principal means of production remained in the hands of individual peasants, but elements of public ownership of the means of production had already appeared.

At the stage of large-scale collectivisation, the most widespread forms of production co-operation were associations for the joint tilling of the land, agricultural arts and communes. The most acceptable form proved to be the agricultural artel, in which the main means of production were socialised, but personal plots, productive cattle and homes remained in individual use. Since 1933, this has become the dominant form of collective-farm production. The CPSU Central Committee resolution "On Further Development of Specialisation and Concentration of Agricultural Production Based on Inter-Economy Co-operation and Agro-Industrial Integration" (1976) ushered in a new stage in agricultural co-operation.

In the European People's Democracies, agricultural co-operation had certain specific features, one of the most important being retention of private ownership of the land. This engendered another peculiarity: a great number of transitional forms of co-operation. There have been three major types of agricultural co-operation in these

countries. In co-operatives of the first type, peasants only work together: they till the land jointly, but each of them reaps his own harvest from his own plot, or the harvest is distributed according to the size of the plot of land owned by each member of the association. In co-operatives of the second type, the main means of production are socialised, but the land is not, i.e. agricultural machines and implements, draught animals, etc. are common property; the larger part of the income is distributed among the co-operative members according to the quantity and quality of labour expended, and the remaining part, according to the amount of land contributed to the co-operative. In the third type of co-operative, all means of production are socialised, the land included, while the income is distributed according to labour inputs only. The latter type is widespread, for example, in Bulgaria.

As co-operative forms of production organisation develop and become consolidated, more and more co-operatives pass from lower to the higher forms, in which all means of production are socialised. The state creates the conditions necessary for a socialist transformation of the countryside by rendering tremendous financial and technical assistance to co-operatives. Socialist co-operation makes it possible to transfer the peasantry, which comprises a considerable part of the population, onto a socialist road, change their age-old individualistic consciousness, abolish the kulak class and raise the level of agricultural production.

**Alliance of the Working Class and the Peasantry** is a special form of class co-operation between two labouring classes in the struggle to overthrow capitalism and build a communist society. Its emergence and strengthening are determined by the fundamental interests of these classes and represent an objective historical pattern.

Marx and Engels believed that the coming revolutions would be successful provided the proletariat's action was supported by the peasantry (q.v.). Only then would *"the proletarian revolution ... obtain that chorus without which its solo becomes a swan song in all peasant countries"*

(K. Marx, F. Engels, *Collected Works*, Vol. 11, p. 193).

The alliance of the "peasant war" with the revolutionary working-class movement, referred to by Marx as a possibility, began to take shape during the 1905-07 revolution in Russia and came fully into its own in the course of the Great October Socialist Revolution of 1917. Lenin considered the emergence and strengthening of this alliance as a dialectical process that changes its content during the transition from one stage of the working people's struggle for communism to the next. At the stage of the bourgeois-democratic revolution, the working class (q.v.) comes out together with the whole peasantry. At the stage of the socialist revolution (see Revolution, Socialist), its ally is "the broad mass of the semi-proletarian and partly also of the small-peasant population, who number scores of millions and constitute the overwhelming majority of the population" (V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 23, p. 307). Lenin emphasised that the alliance of the working class with the toiling peasants determines the fate of the revolution and following the revolution becomes the supreme principle of the dictatorship of the proletariat (q.v.).

The existence of an unbreakable alliance of these classes ensured the radical social transformations that led to the victory of socialism and determined the entire development of the USSR. The alliance of the working class and collective-farm peasantry stood the severe test of the Great Patriotic War waged by the Soviet people against nazi Germany. It made possible the major successes in the development of the national economy and culture and improvement of the people's living standards.

The foundation of the strengthening of the ties between workers and peasants and the economic basis of their alliance is the single social socialist property (q.v.). The closer cohesion of the working class and the collective-farm peasantry is determined by the gradual convergence of the forms of socialist property, in particular, a further concentration of collective-farm production and the higher level of socialisation of collective-farm and co-operative property through expansion of inter-

collective-farm ties, creation of agrarian-industrial associations, etc. (see *Convergence and Fusion of the Forms of Socialist Property*). In turn, the further development of socialist production and the building of the material and technical base of communism, the improvement of relations between town and country (see *Overcoming Differences Between Town and Country*), industry and agriculture, the state and collective-farm and co-operative sectors of production are only possible through an alliance of the working class and the co-operated peasantry.

This alliance was further developed and strengthened in developed socialist society and continues to provide the socio-political foundation of the Soviet state. Art. 19 of the 1977 Constitution of the USSR proclaims: "The social basis of the USSR is the unbreakable alliance of the workers, peasants and intelligentsia." This alliance is an important means for strengthening and developing socialist democracy (see *Democracy, Socialist*). Relying on the alliance of the working class, collective-farm peasantry and intelligentsia, with the working class playing the leading role, the CPSU tackles political, economic, social, ideological and cultural-educative tasks at the present stage. They involve raising the efficiency of production and quality of everyday life in the countryside, the material well-being of rural workers, fostering in them a communist world outlook and a communist attitude to work. The alliance of the working class, collective-farm peasantry and people's intelligentsia, given the leading role of the working class, has become a stable foundation for the new historical community that has taken shape in the USSR — the Soviet people (q.v.). Under the conditions of developed socialism, the alliance of the working class, collective-farm peasantry and intelligentsia serves as the basis for the social-political and ideological unity of society (q.v.), the friendship of the peoples of the USSR (see *Friendship among Peoples*) and is the fountainhead of Soviet patriotism. The principles of the alliance of the working class and the peasantry that have stood the test of history undergo further development and have be-

come the foundation for the building of a new society in other socialist countries. This alliance constitutes the core of a broader alliance of the working class with all non-proletarian working sections of society (see *Middle Sections*). The experience of the Soviet Union and other socialist countries has confirmed the Marxist-Leninist thesis that the alliance with the peasantry is indispensable if the working class is to fulfil its historic mission: "the alliance of the workers and peasants is effected with difficulty, but ... at any rate it is the only invincible alliance against the capitalists" (V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 30, p. 134). The vital interests of each socialist country thus require the utmost consolidation of this alliance, a closer cohesion of the peasants and the intelligentsia around the working class and its militant vanguard, the Communist Party. The Communist Party is the leading and guiding force of political co-operation between workers and peasants aimed at building a classless, communist society.

**Anarchism**, a petty-bourgeois socio-political trend, its main principle being rejection of the state, of all political power in general, which is regarded exclusively as an organ of coercion (see *Violence*). Characteristic features of modern A. are rejection of political struggle within the framework of bourgeois democracy (q.v.) and denial of the need for dictatorship of the proletariat (q.v.). "Anarchism," wrote Lenin, "denies the need for a state and state power in the period of transition from the rule of the bourgeoisie to the rule of the proletariat..." (V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 24, p. 49).

A. emerged as a peculiar reflection — from the viewpoint of petty-bourgeois strata and like-minded intelligentsia (q.v.) — of the rise, especially after the 17th-18th century bourgeois revolutions, of the role of the state in the life of society, the rise in the various means of political, judicial, moral and other kinds of oppression of the working people by the economically dominating and ruling bourgeois class, and as a protest against this strengthening of the machinery of political coercion. By exposing the formal character of equality (q.v.) under capitalism, by criticising bourgeois

democracy and the bourgeois state mainly for its tendency towards authoritarianism, which led to subjugation of the individual, A. came close to utopian socialism (q.v.). Being a form of social utopianism, however, it took the idea of a stateless way of life to absurd extremes by denying any transitional stages from the society of bourgeois oppression to a society of genuine human freedom.

The difference in principle between Marxists and anarchists was seen by Lenin first of all in that "the former, while aiming at the complete abolition of the state, recognise that this aim can only be achieved after classes have been abolished by the socialist revolution, as the result of the establishment of socialism, which leads to the withering away of the state. The latter want to abolish the state completely overnight, not understanding the conditions under which the state can be abolished" (V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 25, p. 489). While insisting on the destruction of the state machinery, therefore, anarchists have no clear idea of what the proletariat will replace it with and how the latter will use its revolutionary power; they even deny that the revolutionary proletariat should exercise state power and the necessity of preparing the proletariat for revolution through use of the bourgeois state (see *ibid.*).

In terms of theory, A. is eclectic. Its various proponents have tried to rest their theoretical constructions on certain Hegel's ideas, on diverse positivist theories and even on Marxism. Some ideologists of A. have been disrespectful or even nihilistic towards theory.

A quite outright exposition of A. is presented in the book *Der Einziger und sein Eigentum* by Max Stirner, a German petty-bourgeois radical of the 1840s. He held that a social order of freedom could only be achieved as an order of free individuals, for society and the individual are locked in an irreconcilable contradiction. Proceeding from individualism, Stirner denied both the state and the struggle for a socialist transformation of society.

At about the same time, the ideas of A. were being propounded by Pierre J. Proudhon, a French petty-bourgeois socialist

who was responsible for the very term A. being introduced. (*What Is Property?*, *The General Idea of the 19th Century Revolution*, and others). Like Stirner, Proudhon came out against not only any state as an instrument of class oppression, but also against those socialist teachings that recognised the importance of centralism for building a new society. At the same time, and in contrast to Stirner, Proudhon viewed the future society as being based on an exchange of services, on agreement between small proprietors. Hence, a peculiar form of Proudhon's petty-bourgeois utopianism — "mutualism", i. e. a system of mutual benefits. This "synthesis of community and property" was nothing but an idealised petty-bourgeois conception of equal property and fair exchange of products produced by private owners.

In the 1860s, the ideas of A. were further elaborated by M. A. Bakunin, a Russian revolutionary who was active mostly in West-European politics. Marx and Engels were strongly critical of Bakuninism and A. in general. "Bakunin," wrote Engels, "has a peculiar theory of his own, a medley of Proudhonism and communism. The chief point concerning the former is that it does not regard capital, i. e., the class antagonism between capitalists and wage workers which has arisen through social development, but the state as the main evil to be abolished" (Marx, Engels, *Selected Correspondence*, p. 257). The activities of Bakunin and his followers showed clearly the inconsistency of A. as an ideology for a social movement. In a word, they preached full anarchy, insisted on the free play of popular spontaneity, and denied the need for revolutionaries to organise a political party; but in fact, they set up a party of their own directed from a certain centre, and veered towards dictatorship. Thus, A. was turning into anti-democratic authoritarianism and even into "a beautiful model of barrack-room communism" (Marx, Engels, Lenin, *Anarchism and Anarcho-Syndicalism*, p. 119).

At the beginning of the 20th century, Western Europe was swept by anarcho-syndicalism, which denies the guiding role of a political party in the working-class movement and regards not political strug-

gle, but trade-union activity as sufficient in itself for organising and emancipating the proletariat.

In the Russian liberation movement, the ideas of A. did not gain much ground, though they did cause it some harm; on the whole, Narodism (see Populist Socialism), as Lenin said, could never dissociate itself from A. There was some revival of A. during the October Revolution in 1917 and the Civil War in 1918-20, in the course of which A. in Russia degenerated into a counter-revolutionary trend.

The struggle against A. remains a necessary aspect of the Communist and Workers' Parties' activities at the present time, as well. The experience of the modern class struggle shows that the activities of anarchist groups, relying on neo-Trotskyite adventurist precepts (see *Trotskyism*), can cause much damage to the organised working-class and democratic movement. Leftist demands and actions by modern anarchists, who are not averse to slandering Communist Parties, objectively play a provocative role, for they allow the ruling regimes to charge the whole mass movement for social progress with extremism and to use repressive means against it.

**Anti-communism**, the militant ideology of imperialism, which expresses the interests of monopoly capital in its struggle against the forces of socialism, democracy and progress, against the international working-class and communist movement, against the peoples fighting for their national liberation.

A., as a reaction by the bourgeoisie and feudal aristocracy to the proletariat's creation of its own class ideology, had appeared even before the scientific theory of socialism and communism came into being. In the mid-19th century, when Marx and Engels were working on the *Manifesto of the Communist Party*, communism was already hounded by "Pope and Czar, Metternich and Guizot, French Radicals and German police-spies" (Marx, Engels, *Collected Works*, Vol. 6, p. 481). Later on, with the growth of the working-class movement and spread of the theory of scientific socialism, A. gained prominence in bourgeois ideology. Lastly, with the emergence of the world socialist system (q.v.),

with the rise of the authority and influence of the socialist countries and socialist ideas across the world, A. has become the ideological basis of the policy of imperialist reaction. In the context of struggle between the two world systems, A. has become the official ideology of imperialist states. Today A. is seen in the political actions of imperialist reaction, its economic efforts and broad engagement in the ideological struggle. A. is used to fuel jingoism, justify militarisation of the economy and the arms race, "prove" the need for military alliances and bases on foreign territories, and finally, interfere in the internal affairs of economically weaker countries on the pretext of "defence against communism".

A salient feature of A. is the striving to discredit the scientific theory of social development, that is Marxism-Leninism (q.v.). Proponents of A. are quite unprincipled in gathering together anything they can use to fight communism. They try to prove that Marxism-Leninism "is out of date" and its conclusions regarding the prospects for capitalism are divorced from reality because capitalism "has been transformed" into some kind of new society. They bandy about such phrases as "democratically renewed capitalism" and the "welfare state", they come up with theories of the "middle class", "managerial revolution", etc., the purpose being to camouflage the social antagonisms of modern capitalism.

The changed balance of power between the two social systems in the international arena has told both on the theory and strategies of A. Frontal attacks have increasingly been replaced by large-scale ideological subversion aimed at disarming the forces of socialism and undermining their capacity to fight bourgeois ideology. Accordingly, the theories of "convergence", of "industrial and post-industrial society" are being propounded, alleging that socialism and capitalism are merely two different ways to the same type of society, where these ways will converge.

Being the ideology of extreme reaction, A. is wholly alien to the interests of the working people. Yet it still weighs heavily on the public, especially in the imperialist

countries, where it is trumpeted by all the might of the mass media.

The spreading of A. amongst the masses is based not on theory, but on propaganda clichés called on to discredit the tenets of Marxist teaching and socialist practice. Accordingly, these anti-communist clichés are fabricated to suit the "consumers": intellectuals, workers, petty-bourgeois, clericals, etc. But with all the diversity of trends and approaches, all anti-communist precepts are based, first, on the lie that "communist imperialism" aims to "conquer the world" (the objective and inevitable change of socio-economic formations is thus presented as the result of the "evil will" and "intrigues" of Communists); second, slanderous assertions that Communists are proponents of violence, that they are "sworn enemies of democracy", that they do not want nor are able to stand by human dignity and freedom of the individual in the countries where they come to power; third, all sorts of inventions about communist atheism and "persecution" of believers in socialist countries, aimed at setting religious working people against Communists.

Modern A. can be overt and covert. The first stakes on the backwardness and prejudices of the masses, plays on ignorance, racism, chauvinism and religious fanaticism. The second masks its reactionary essence in the guise of science, and concentrates its efforts not only on "refuting" Marxism, but also on revising and emasculating its revolutionary content. It tries to speculate on such sentiments and aspirations of peoples as strivings for national independence, democracy, freedom of conscience, etc.

The chief method of A. is falsification of Marxist-Leninist theory, of the policy and goals of Communist Parties, and slander of socialism. In their propaganda the ideologists of A. attempt to use the objective difficulties encountered in the development of the new society, the unsolved problems of the theory and practice of building socialism and communism, as well as certain mistakes made by the Communist Parties in some countries.

A variant of A., that bourgeois ideologists are now resorting to with increasing

frequency, is anti-Sovietism, an attempt to distort the peace-loving foreign policy of the USSR (i. e. myth-making about the Soviet "military threat"), to distort and belittle Soviet achievements in the economic and cultural spheres. Anti-Sovietism is also a tactical ploy designed to drive a wedge between the USSR and the other socialist countries, to foment discord within the international communist movement and weaken the influence of the world socialist system on the developing countries (q.v.).

The struggle against A. demands of Communists clearly defined tactics, distinguishing between organised A., which serves imperialism, and the prejudices of misled people. Regarding the latter, Communists engage in extensive explanatory work, seeking popular unity in the struggle for peace (q. v.) and against the power of the monopolies. This unity is necessary and possible because the struggle against A. concerns not only Communists. It is joined by all those who come out honestly and consistently in defence of democracy, national independence and peace. To counter A. means not only exposure of bourgeois conceptions but also creative development of Marxist-Leninist theory, profound elaboration of the problems encountered in the building socialism and communism, and in modern social development as a whole (see also "Deideologisation", Theory of; Quality of Life Concepts; Convergence Theory; "Post-Industrial Society", the Theory of; "Human Relations", the Doctrine of).

**Armed Insurrection**, a form of the class struggle, an open armed action taken by certain classes or social forces against the existing political power. It is mostly a component part of a revolution; it starts when the ruling classes apply violent repressions in an attempt to retain power.

After studying the experience gained by the working class in its armed struggle against the bourgeoisie, Marx and Engels emphasised that the bourgeois state power with its political bodies, relying on the army, police and gendarmerie, is an instrument of violence applied by the bourgeoisie against the working people, a mighty material force that can only be crushed by the



organisation and revolutionary onslaught of the working class, including by arms, against the bourgeoisie. "The weapon of criticism cannot, of course, replace criticism by weapons, material force must be overthrown by material force" (K. Marx, F. Engels, *Collected Works*, Vol. 3, p. 182).

Marx and Engels saw A. I. as an art governed by the following rules: it should not be started before the situation is objectively ripe for it; even if it is so, the insurrection should be thoroughly prepared; once it has started, determined action should be taken and an offensive launched, for "the defensive is the death of every armed rising"; it is necessary to score a success, even if a very small one, every day, and to "keep up the moral ascendant" (K. Marx, F. Engels, *Collected Works*, Vol. 11, p. 86).

In the new historical situation, Lenin firmly opposed the opportunists of the Second International (q. v.), who maintained that an A. I. staged by the people could not win given the present level of military technology and organisation in bourgeois armies; they thus disarmed the working class facing an armed bourgeoisie. Lenin also sharply criticised putschists and all kind of gamblers who thought that an A. I. could be started at any moment, irrespective of whether there were objective conditions for it and whether the masses had been prepared for it (see Revolutionary Adventurism). Lenin stressed that, for a popular A. I. to take place, a revolutionary situation (q. v.) should exist. "To be successful, insurrection must rely not upon conspiracy and not upon a party, but upon the advanced class. That is the first point. Insurrection must rely upon a *revolutionary upsurge of the people*. That is the second point. Insurrection must rely upon that *turning-point* in the history of the growing revolution when the activity of the advanced ranks of the people is at its height, and when the *vacillations* in the ranks of the enemy and in the ranks of the weak, half-hearted and irresolute friends of the revolution are strongest. That is the third point. And these three conditions for raising the question of insurrection distinguish *Marxism from Blanquism*." (V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 26, pp. 22-23.) An A. I. also requires a revolutionary army

to be formed by the armed working people and led by their organised vanguard contingents. The formation of such an army is a difficult, complicated and prolonged process. Lenin also focused serious attention on preparing the masses for an A. I. and the A. I. itself. The task had three aspects: political, military-technical and tactical, and organisational. The first involved a painstaking explanation to the workers and peasants, both by legal and illegal means, of the government's anti-popular policies; slogans were to be put forward that would lead the masses to an A. I.— about the confiscation of the landowners' land and its distribution among the peasants through peasants' committees, about the introduction of an eight-hour working day, etc.; extensive explanatory work was to be conducted in the army and the navy to win them over to the side of the people. The military-technical and tactical preparation consisted in acquiring arms, training the people to use them, etc. And finally, organisational preparation implied the formation of armed detachments, the setting up of district and city headquarters for leading the insurrection, and the elaboration of a plan for preparing and carrying it out.

The A. I. of 1917 in Russia was led by the Soviets of Workers', Peasants' and Soldiers' Deputies, with Bolsheviks at the head, both in the centre and locally; the proletarian victory over the bourgeoisie and the establishment of a dictatorship of the proletariat (q. v.) were ensured by implementing Lenin's plan for an A. I.

Following World War II old reactionary governments were overthrown (by armed forces at home or with the assistance of the Soviet Army), and democratic governments of the united anti-fascist, anti-imperialist national or patriotic fronts were set up, which made it possible for the popular-democratic revolutions in several countries of Europe and Asia to develop peacefully as they passed from a democratic to a socialist stage. Speaking about the importance of A. I. for the working-class struggle for power, Lenin emphasised that the working class's initiative is displayed to the full during it: it completely disregards all bourgeois laws; moreover, it violates and renounces them, and imposes its own

will upon the bourgeoisie by force of arms. Revolutionary transformations are therefore effected quickly and in a radical way during an A. I.

Marx, Engels and Lenin regarded A. I. as a means for the proletariat and its allies to take power; they did not, however, exclude the possibility of the proletariat winning power peacefully. This is of special importance in the contemporary situation, when the balance of power between the two world systems has changed (see *Peaceful and Non-Peaceful Forms of the Transition to Socialism*).

**Atheist Education**, a special kind of public education designed to instill a scientific and materialist world outlook and help overcome religious prejudices. As an integral part of the communist education (q. v.) of the masses, A. E. plays an important role in the education of the new man, the bearer of progressive Marxist-Leninist ideology, free from the negative vestiges of the past and a firm atheist.

Under socialism, religion loses its deepest roots, which grew within the class-antagonistic society in the course of social and national oppression. Thus, the objective conditions emerge for overcoming religion. Yet, this does not mean that religious prejudices disappear by themselves. Helped by tradition, the church and sectarian organisations, as well as by the low cultural level of a certain part of the population, religious beliefs show great vitality. That is why, along with socio-economic transformations, goal-oriented educational work is needed to overcome religion.

A. E. started in the very first years of Soviet power with separation of the church from the state and the school from the church, and grew in scope with the rising cultural level of the working people. Guided by Lenin's instructions on the ways to overcome religious prejudices, on the contents and forms of scientific and atheist instruction under socialism, the CPSU put forward a concrete programme of ideological struggle against religion. Adoption of important party decisions on scientific and atheist instruction, development of a mass atheist movement, broad dissemination of atheism conducted by publishers, magazines, newspapers and other mass media

have contributed to religion being abandoned by the overwhelming majority of the country's population. Today, the fostering of a scientific and materialist world outlook in Soviet people is at the core of the Communist Party's educational work. The extensive system of A. E. that has been set up in the USSR is an important integral part of ideological work as a whole. It is intended for all groups of the population, taking account of their varied cultural and demographic characteristics. An important goal of A. E. is the drawing of believers and "waverers" into active production, political, social and cultural activities. Daily participation in the life of a work collective helps a person to realise his role in society, strengthen the principles of collectivism and norms of communist morality. A. E. is carried on not only within work collectives, but also in residential areas, where it is directed primarily at those not engaged in production (pensioners, housewives). A. E. includes mass forms for spreading atheist information (lectures, talks, question-and-answer sessions, topical gatherings), and individual work with believers, as well as the use of the mass media and cultural and educational facilities (palaces of culture, clubs, libraries, etc.). Lenin emphasised that the masses should be given "the most varied atheist propaganda material, they [the masses] should be made familiar with facts from the most diverse spheres of life, they should be approached in every possible way, so as to interest them, rouse them from their religious torpor, stir them from the most varied angles and by the most varied methods, and so forth" (V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 33, P. 230). Along with criticism of religious ideology and propagation of scientific and materialist views, A. E. also employs various emotional and psychological ways of disseminating atheism. These include, above all, the creation and introduction of new civil rites intended to satisfy the moral and aesthetic needs of the population, strengthen communist ideals and help replace religious ceremonies and rites. The effectiveness of A. E. largely depends on a differentiated approach to the different groups of the population and a combination of A. E. with other forms of education. Since the aim

of A.E. is not only to criticise religious ideology and beliefs, but also instill scientific and materialist views and norms of communist morality, it is necessary to rely in A.E. on the achievements of modern science and the realities of communist construction (see also Collectivism; Communist Morality).

**Authority**, the influence of a person or social institution based on recognition of their functions of control or special knowledge, experience or moral virtue. The emergence of A. as a distinct form of public relations is connected with the development of social practice, with the need to organise and guide people's collective activities. "Whoever mentions combined action," wrote Engels, "speaks of organisation; now, is it possible to have organisation without authority? ... On the one hand, a certain authority, no matter how delegated, and, on the other hand, a certain subordination, are things which, independently of all social organisation, are imposed upon us together with the material conditions under which we produce and make products circulate." (Marx, Engels, Lenin, *Anarchism and Anarcho-Syndicalism*, pp. 101, 102-03.)

In the course of history A. changes its forms and spheres of action. In primitive society, with no classes or state, A. was mainly of a moral nature and based on the real abilities and know-how of the commune's members and their real appraisal. With the division of society into classes and emergence of the state, A. becomes a political category that no longer expresses trust in the knowledge and abilities of certain people, but the relations of domination and subordination connected with the economic and political privileges of certain classes. The subject of A. is no longer a person with his or her personal merits, but wealth and political power. In the Middle Ages, A. was sanctified by religion and the idea that power comes from God. Under capitalism, A. is an expression of the power of capital and is not averse to demagoguery, myth-making and deception of the masses.

The working-class movement comes up with a new idea of A., which acquires a developed form in socialist society. Under socialism, A. is the consequence of a per-

son's or social institution's conscientious attitude to work and real merits. In socialist society, real A. is enjoyed by a leader whose official power (formal A.) is supplemented by a high personal standing in the collective (personal A.). Not only a leader, but also a rank-and-file member of a collective can be vested with A., the one who expresses most fully the collective's norms, standards and values. Since, under socialism, strict control is still necessary over the amount of labour and the amount of consumption, the political functions of A. are retained. Petty-bourgeois individualism, which comes out against any A., against any state, under the banner of freedom of the individual, has always been hostile to Marxism. Marx, Engels and Lenin resolutely opposed anarchism (q. v.) with its rejection of state power and exposed its harmful effect on the working-class movement. They stressed that it is the Communist Party, the workers' state, its authoritative leaders and institutions that must head the revolutionary movement, the struggle for socialism and communism.

During the gradual development of socialist into communist society, A. will undergo certain changes that are connected, first of all, with a change in the nature of production and the content of labour. When classes disappear and labour becomes man's first necessity, the state will wither away and, consequently, the political function of A., too. But since combined action demanding organisation is bound to persist, no individual will ever be able to master the whole sphere of human knowledge, so there will always be specialists in certain fields, which means human relations will include relations of A. in a particular field of human activity.

**Automation**, application in the mechanised production of equipment, devices and instruments that free man from the control of machines and provide for production processes without direct human participation and solely under the worker's supervision. Of automatic machinery Marx wrote as follows: "As soon as a machine executes, without man's help, all the movements requisite to elaborate the raw material, needing only attendance from him, we have

an automatic system of machinery, and one that is susceptible of constant improvement in its details." (K. Marx, *Capital*, Vol. I, p. 360.)

A. is an integral part and result of the scientific and technological revolution (q. v.) and leads to profound changes in the productive forces and, through them, in the relations of production and the intellectual life of society. A. allows a sizeable increase in the technical and economic effectiveness of production: a manyfold reduction in the number of workers, savings of raw materials, enhancement of labour productivity, and improvement of the quality of manufactured products. A. paves the way for introducing science and scientific organisation of labour in production. A. began on a mass scale back in the 1930s, when ordinary machines began to be equipped with programmed control devices (copying machines, electric devices with perforated cards, photo-cells, etc.), and has attained great scope since the 1950s with the construction and use of computers. The main prerequisites for A. are as follows: (1) a high level of electrification, which permits the use of complex electronic control devices; (2) mechanisation of all operations in a production cycle; (3) scientific elaboration of a production process, including a mathematical description of it; (4) the mass and batch nature of production. A. is developing alongside mechanisation. A higher stage of A. is achieved in cybernetic machines which, in principle, can work according to an unlimited number of programmes. Automatic machinery in the true sense is an intermediary stage between ordinary machines and cybernetic machinery.

A., a potent contributor to further socialisation of production, calls for better relations of production. It leads to changes in the economic structure (a higher ratio of new industries), in the social division of labour (greater specialisation of production), and in the structure of the working class (a higher number of skilled workers). In socialist countries, A. consolidates public property and makes for improved socialist relations of production. Under capitalism, A. promotes the growth of monopoly, makes for an unbalanced economy, and aggravates

social conflicts and contradictions. The main consequence of A. — savings on labour — leads, under capitalism, to a marked rise in unemployment. In socialist countries, A. calls for systematic programmes for retraining workers, and brings about considerable changes in the cultural and technical education of workers. A. helps improve the education system and raise the nation's cultural level.

Bourgeois and reformist ideologists often go to extremes in considering the social problems of A. Some paint frightening pictures of the future in the belief that mankind is nearing an age of robot rule. Extrapolating the vices of A. in capitalist countries, they call it a "road to disaster". Others preach apologetic and technocratic views, predicting a "better deal" for all in an "automated" capitalist society. Right-wing socialists in a number of countries interpret bourgeois theories on the "general usefulness" of A. as meaning that A. makes it possible for capitalism to be "transformed" into socialism of its own accord, without a social revolution. In reality, A. in capitalist society strengthens the material prerequisites for its revolutionary transformation into a socialist society. Under socialist conditions, A. is an important means for accomplishing the gradual transition of developed socialism into full communism. It provides the material basis for overcoming the substantial differences between intellectual and physical labour and for bringing about communist labour.

## B

**Basic Principle of Communism**, the principle "From each according to his abilities, to each according to his needs"—expresses the complete social equality inherent in communist society, the demands made by that society on its members and the nature of the distribution of material and intellectual wealth.

The B.P.C. requires that each member of society works to the best of his abilities and takes an active part in running the life of society, continuously educates himself culturally and theoretically and voluntarily

observes the rules of communist community life. These requirements become feasible because work under communism ceases to be a duty or a means for earning a living, and becomes a primary vital requirement (see Labour, Communist).

Communist society will ensure the social equality of all its members and thereby will create equal opportunities not only for the formation, but also for the most expedient, both for society and the individual, application of their capabilities. Engels wrote that communism "... allows *all* members of society to develop, maintain and exercise their capacities with maximum universality" (F. Engels, *Anti-Dühring*, p. 239). The capabilities themselves will also profoundly change, diversify and improve. Above all, man's work skills will develop. Completely automated work will become creative, interesting, and not taxing physically. Narrow specialisation will cease to exist; the free change of vital activity will become possible. The capabilities of the individual as a citizen or public figure will be more sophisticated. Communist social self-government (q.v.) which will take over from the state, will provide the basis for developing people's organising abilities. They will be relieved from the mundane job of earning a living or seeking personal material gain, of the load of the mentality of the past, and this will result in an unprecedented flourishing of their intellectual abilities and potential. Relieved from everyday, often tedious, time- and effort-consuming material anxieties, each individual will have free time (q.v.) for sharing actively in social life, for researching into science and technology, literature and art, for improving himself morally and physically; his dignity will grow immeasurably as the creator of unprecedented material and intellectual values, of new social relations. While requiring that each member of society work to the best of his abilities, the B.P.C. (and this is its qualitative difference from the basic principle of socialism, q.v.) presumes complete satisfaction of reasonable material and intellectual needs in the context of a high level of development of social production (see Material and Technical Base of Communism).

The communist principle of distribution

has nothing to do with asceticism or leveling out human needs and interests, as the opponents of scientific communism would have people believe. It establishes equality of opportunity and the potential for their materialisation rather than equality of needs. Differences in age and sex, activities and localities, biological and psychological specifics, abilities, inclinations, and interests will remain under communism; human needs cannot be identical.

Man's needs become more sophisticated as communism is being built; so do the means for satisfying them. Communist society, as Engels wrote, will "...create new needs and at the same time the means to satisfy them" (K. Marx, F. Engels, *Collected Works*, Vol. 6, p. 352). The needs of a member of communist society will become very sophisticated and multi-faceted, but they will not be excessive or whimsical; they will be the reasonable needs of a healthy, in all senses, and harmonically developed man. The needs whose satisfaction improves the individual's physical and intellectual qualities are defined as reasonable. In his *State and Revolution*, Lenin derided the idea of communism as a society where everyone obtains everything without working at all. He noted that, together with high productivity of labour, communism needs a new consumer, different from the philistines who "are capable of damaging the stocks of public wealth 'just for fun', and of demanding the impossible" (V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 25, p. 474). The fostering of reasonable, healthy needs is a necessary condition for the B.P.C. to materialise. It is important to manufacture those things and to involve people in those forms of activity that would develop needs and interests compatible with the high communist ideals. It is important to teach everyone not only how to make reasonable use of the public wealth, but also how to create this wealth, or how to contribute to the best of one's abilities to socially useful work (see also Harmonious Development of the Individual).

**Basic Principle of Socialism**, the principle "From each according to his abilities, to each according to his work"—characterises the nature of socialism, the social

relations under it, and the specifics of the distribution of material and spiritual wealth in socialist society.

According to this principle, all members of society have an equal duty to work and increase the public wealth, and enjoy the same right to receive from society means of livelihood, according to the quantity and quality of their labour. While declaring labour compulsory for all able-bodied people, socialist society guarantees work for everyone of them under the law. "Citizens of the USSR have the right to work (that is, to guaranteed employment and pay in accordance with the quantity and quality of their work, and not below the state-established minimum), including the right to choose their trade or profession, type of job and work in accordance with their inclinations, abilities, training and education, with due account of the needs of society" (*Constitution of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics*, Art. 40). This constitutes a major difference between socialism and capitalism, which is constantly cursed by unemployment.

The objective of socialist production is the ever fuller satisfaction of material and cultural needs of the working people. Socialist production cannot provide abundance of the means of livelihood or satisfy the needs of all society members completely. Hence the need to take stringent stock of labour and consumption. The quantity and quality of labour is the measure of the satisfaction of needs under socialism. The satisfaction of the needs of each working person is in proportion to the extent of his labour activity and contribution to the public wealth. He who works more and better receives more. This order of things creates a personal material interest to improve one's skills, enhance one's abilities, actively contribute to production, increase the quantity and upgrade the quality of output. Since everyone works in a collective rather than alone (in an industrial or agricultural enterprise, an agricultural producer co-operative, etc.) the measure of one's contribution and, consequently, the measure of the satisfaction of one's needs are largely dependent on the contribution made by the collective. Therefore, the B.P.S. provides collective as well as

personal material incentives. In creating the basis for unity of interests of the individual, collective, and all society, the B.P.S. also gives rise to non-material labour incentives, such as a sense of duty to society, collective or public recognition of labour, etc. (see *Material and Moral Incentives*).

The B.P.S. not only stimulates labour and social activity, it also fosters a communist attitude towards labour, consolidates socialist discipline (q. v.) and organisation, and serves as an important tool in combating parasitism.

Under socialism every working person receives from society what he gives to it, minus the fraction that is channelled for the needs of society as a whole (expansion of socialist reproduction, defence, etc.). In the distribution of the fraction received by the members of society, however, there is still inequality, because the principle of equal pay for equal work means application of the same yardstick to different people. Since people differ in skills, family size, and attitude towards work they receive different incomes.

The B.P.S. is incompatible with the petty-bourgeois principle of egalitarian distribution (q. v.), which undermines material incentives and hinders development and improvement of man's abilities, improvement of his professional skills and general education, and facilitates dependent mentality. The working class rejects crude egalitarian communism (q. v.), which denies human personality and the entire world of culture and civilisation. The B.P.S. embodies the tremendous achievements of socialist society, such as the domination of public property and the absence of exploitation, the equal opportunity and duty of all members of society to work and receive equal pay for equal work, etc. On the other hand, the principle reflects a certain historical immaturity of socialism, associated with the level of production development and the ensuing actual inequality in distribution. This leads to certain constraints on meeting the needs of all society's members and on the enhancement and manifestation of their abilities. Thus, a well-to-do person stands a better chance of receiving an education and general development. Townspeople have certain advantages

over villagers, this being traceable to the differences in the nature of their work and in cultural and everyday conditions. Women who, as a rule, spend much more time and effort caring for the welfare and education of children have fewer opportunities than men for forming and enhancing their abilities. Not all society's members have opportunities for systematic scientific or artistic creative activities. In addition, the choice of work is often still dictated by material considerations (wages, accommodation, etc.), rather than vocation.

As the communist society is built, qualitative changes in industrial processes and in social relations, and the development of the individual make the conditions ripe for the B.P.C. to give way for the basic principle of communism (q. v.).

**Bourgeoisie**, the dominating, exploiting, ruling class of capitalist society. "By bourgeoisie is meant the class of modern Capitalists, owners of the means of social production and employers of wage-labour" (K. Marx, F. Engels, *Manifesto of the Communist Party, Collected Works*, Vol. 6, p. 482). Having arisen deep within feudal society as the exponent of a more progressive capitalist mode of production, the bourgeoisie came to power through revolutions from the 16th to the first half of the 19th centuries in most countries of Western Europe and in the USA; in some other countries (Austria-Hungary, Russia, Japan) it came to power in the second half of the 19th and the beginning of the 20th centuries. With the transition of capitalism to imperialism (end of the 19th century) and then to state-monopoly capitalism (approximately since the First World War) and with the appearance of the proletariat on the historical stage, the role of B. in society has changed radically (see also Imperialism; State-Monopoly Capitalism). "From a rising and progressive class the bourgeoisie has turned into a declining, decadent, and reactionary class. It is quite another class that is now on the upgrade on a broad historical scale" (V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 21, p. 149). The struggle of a progressive class (the proletariat) against a reactionary one (the bourgeoisie) constitutes the substance of the modern epoch (q. v.), which is mankind's transition

from capitalism to socialism.

In this struggle, the proletariat and its Marxist-Leninist parties take account of the changes and shifts that are taking place within B. at the present time. The concentration and centralisation of production have ruined a lot of small, middle and some big capitalists, thus reducing the proportion of B. in the gainfully employed population and the entire population in the capitalist countries. B. makes up approximately from 1 to 3 per cent of the employed population in the developed capitalist countries. Having turned from an erstwhile rather numerous class into a superconcentrated, scanty, ruling elite, B. has strengthened its economic and political positions in society. As different forms of state-monopoly capitalism developed and the scientific and technological revolution advanced, B. became stratified. Small capitalists constitute a stratum — the biggest in number and the smallest in power — of owners of small industrial and commercial firms and service enterprises, as well as the agricultural bourgeoisie, exploiting a small number of wage-labourers (from 4 to 50). Some ruined small capitalists join the petty-bourgeoisie, who live by their own labour, or become employees. The middle B. includes owners of bigger enterprises (employing from 50 to 500 workers). The big B. employs thousands of wage workers, while the scanty monopoly B. — the tycoons of trusts, corporations and banks — in fact exploit the toiling people not only of their countries, but of other countries too. The leading position within the state-monopoly B. is held by the financial oligarchy — the proprietors of major industrial, bank, insurance, transport and commercial monopolies. This part of the B. holds the key positions in the economic and political life of the capitalist countries. In fact, it determines the domestic and foreign policy of the capitalist states in its own interests and is mainly to blame for the social hardships of the working people. Many small, middle and some big capitalists have virtually become subcontractors of monopolies and have lost their independence. All this, coupled with the unequal distribution of profits, increases the gap between the interests of the monop-

oly B. and those of the non-monopoly B. The financial oligarchy and the monopolistic top layer, which on many issues loses the support of small and middle capitalists, join ranks with, or often even include in their ranks, big landowners, latifundistas, managers, bourgeois politicians, party and trade-union bosses, high government officials, representatives of the army, police and the secret service (the military clique). A number of countries are witnessing the growth of the military-industrial complex, i. e. the alliance between military-industrial monopolies, reactionary top brass circles and the state bureaucracy. The present-day monopoly B. makes increasingly broad use of the state in its own class interests along with the methods of programming and forecasting production, the state funding of scientific and technological progress, military production, and imperialist integration (see *Integration, Capitalist*). Yet all of this does not make it possible for B. to control the forces of anarchy on the capitalist market, or to keep the deepening contradictions at bay (see *General Crisis of Capitalism*). The decay of B. is manifest in the growth of parasitism, corruption, moral degradation, and political adventurism, bordering on criminality within its ranks. The social gulf between the monopoly B. and the mass of the toiling people is becoming ever wider and deeper.

The working class (q. v.), fighting against the ruling monopoly B., rallies all the toilers and many small and middle capitalist proprietors. The proletariat takes into account the national sentiments of different groups of B., the character and contradictions of its general political line. It is important to consider the formation of B. under the specific historical conditions and see what character it acquired as a result: liberal, republican, conservative or reactionary. For all that, the working class does not overestimate these differences, especially at a time of a mounting class struggle, realising that, under certain conditions, the whole of B. comes out in unison against the proletariat.

In the colonial and dependent countries, two types of B. take shape: comprador and national, the first expressing the reactionary and the second the progressive

tendency in the social development of these countries. With the winning of independence and implementation of progressive transformations in the developing countries (q. v.), especially those following a socialist orientation (see *Non-capitalist Path of Development*), the upper strata of the national B. usually begin to oppose social progress and the anti-imperialist course. The ensuing struggle between the popular masses and B. results either in a further decrease in the latter's influence, or in the restoration of its dominance. The overthrow of the dominance of B. is dictated by historically objective need. But the proletariat is by no means after the physical liquidation of its antagonist. It is fighting for the transfer of all means of production to public property, and the choice of ways to achieve such a socialisation depends a great deal on the position of B. itself, on the actions of its different strata (see *Abolition of the Exploiting Classes*).

**Bureaucracy.** In a socio-political sense, B. means administration of power by privileged persons chosen by the ruling class. Collateral is the concept of B. as a method of administration through officials or a machinery of functionaries that are cut off from the people and dominate it. B. develops with the division of society into classes and the emergence of the state, when the exploiting class, having acquired political power, presents its own interests as those of the entire society. A bureaucratic machinery of power is marked by a closed, caste character of management, which suppresses initiative from below and is noted for a high level of formalisation and standardisation of duties. Marx wrote that B. "turns its 'formal' objectives into its content, it comes into conflict everywhere with 'real' objectives. ... State objectives are transformed into objectives of the department, and department objectives into objectives of the state" (K. Marx, F. Engels, *Collected Works*, Vol. 3, p. 46).

The forms of B. have changed along with changes in socio-economic formations. A complex hierarchy of bureaucratic organs and duties existed even in the slave-owning society. A large officialdom was at the disposal of feudal states in which a prominent part was played by the church



B. But the most developed B. appears in capitalist society, where, in addition to a wide network of administrative and military-police organs, political parties (see Party, Political) and other non-state bourgeois organisations emerge that have an extensive administration. In precapitalist formations, B. was manifest primarily in political life, whereas under capitalism it penetrates economic life as well. That is why Lenin stressed that bureaucracy "by ... its contemporary source, and its purpose, is purely and exclusively a bourgeois institution..." (V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 1, p. 420). B. becomes rife in the era of imperialism, when the state machinery merges with monopolies and, accordingly, the state B. unites with the upper layer of monopolies, which concentrate political and economic power in their hands. An important link in this system is provided by the institution of "management", i. e. a corporate administration representing a new stratum of B. Extreme forms of B. under imperialism are represented by autocratic systems of a fascist type (see Fascism). In an attempt to justify the ascendancy of B. under contemporary capitalism, bourgeois sociologists usually cite the growing complexity of management, the ensuing need for it to be hierarchical as well as for rationalisation and regulation. In other words, they identify B. with the very principle of organisation and management. Yet the need to organise the administration of various aspects of social life has existed at all stages in human history and will always exist, whereas its distortion — the sway of B. — arose in the class society and is liquidated when class-antagonistic distinctions are removed. Some bourgeois sociologists propose certain measures against the bureaucratisation of society, such as enhancing "democratic" control, linking officials with technocrats; they put forward a programme for improving personal relationships among people, the moral and psychological climate of an organisation, all of this based on the well-known concept of "human relations" (see "Human Relations", the Doctrine of). But these sociologists overlook the fact that capitalist public relations are, by their very nature, inseparably linked with undemocratic manage-

ment. The crisis of bourgeois democracy (q. v.) in the imperialist countries cannot, therefore, but entail a further growth of B., the police and bureaucratic state machinery, the privileged officialdom standing above the masses. In these circumstances, the working masses intensify their struggle against the capitalist military-bureaucratic system, trying to overthrow B. and establish real democracy.

Real democracy, alien to B., is only possible with the coming of a socialist revolution, the transition to socialism and the building of communism. The establishment of public property and abolition of exploitation form the basis for the unity of public and personal interests, for bridging the gap between the authorities and the working people. The smashing of the bourgeois state machine means liquidation of the bourgeois system of administration; the machinery of the new state is placed at the service of the people. "The abolition of the bureaucracy", wrote Marx, "is only possible by the general interest, *actually...* becoming the particular interest ... the *particular* actually becoming the *general* interest" (K. Marx, F. Engels, *Collected Works*, Vol. 3, p. 48). Yet vestiges of bureaucratic management do not disappear of their own accord with the liquidation of B.; the process demands systematic work.

Socialism provides every opportunity for overcoming B. and furthering the system of democratic management. The main lines of this process have been drawn in the CPSU programme documents and the new Constitution of the USSR. They pay special attention to expanding the rights and authority of the representative bodies of power, enhancing the role of public organisations, observing socialist legality, safeguarding the rights of citizens, etc. (see Democracy, Socialist). A major goal in this respect is constant improvement of the state machinery and its infrastructure, and a clearer delineation of the functions of its different parts. This makes it possible to bring the bodies of management abreast with the new goals confronting society, to do away with redundancy, increase the responsibility of officials, etc. In accordance with the decisions of the 24th, 25th and 26th CPSU congresses, a comprehensive programme

is being implemented for introducing modern means and methods of management (including computers, automated systems, etc), which provide for more rational organisation of the administrative apparatus. All this taken together, along with the fostering of a Leninist party style in the work of state organs, is of great significance in countering manifestations of B., such as formalism, red tape, etc. Improvement of the principles of management in socialist society is conducive to the emergence of the conditions for a transition to communist social self-government (q. v.).

## C

**Capitalism**, a social system based on the exploitation (q. v.) of wage labour by capitalists, in whose hands the means of production are concentrated as their property.

Historically, capitalism replaces the feudal system. As small production is destroyed in the course of the primitive accumulation of capital, capitalist private property emerges, making it possible to concentrate the means of production and go over to large-scale production and, at a certain stage, create favourable conditions for developing the productive forces. This process is characterised by the forcible ruin of millions of peasants and craftsmen (e. g. enclosures in England), state coercion of labourers who have been deprived of the means of production to hire themselves out to capitalists, and plunder of the peoples of colonies and other countries. As a result, there emerges, at one pole, the class of capitalists, in whose hands money and the means of production are concentrated, and at the other, the class of wage workers, the masses who are legally free but are deprived of the means of production and are therefore forced to sell their labour power to capitalists. One typical feature of C. is the domination of commodity production. While under pre-capitalist systems natural (subsistence) economy prevailed and, as a rule, only the surplus product, i. e. that which was left after the producer's own

needs had been satisfied, assumed the form of a commodity, capitalist production is the production of commodities. Human labour power also assumes the form of a special type of commodity under C.

The initial form of capitalist production is simple co-operation, in which the simultaneous efforts of many labourers are joined, under a capitalist's control, for the purpose of producing a single type of commodity. Joint work enables the workers to carry out operations that would be beyond the power of the individual worker, while social contacts in the process of labour trigger competition, which increases the labour productivity. Further development of co-operation caused by a greater division of labour among the workers leads to the emergence of capitalist manufactory. The production process is here divided into isolated production operations carried out by individual workers, who thus become partial labourers. The manufactory increases the worker's dependence on the capitalist, promotes the growth of the productive forces and prepares the conditions for the application of machines. The creation of large-scale machine industry in the course of the Industrial Revolution, which began in England in the latter half of the 18th century and lasted up to the mid-19th century, signified the establishment of the material base corresponding to capitalist production relations. C. becomes the prevailing mode of production.

The principal social relation under C. is the exploitation of wage labour by capital. The capitalist hires a worker and pays him the value of his labour power, this assuming the form of the wages the worker receives for his work. It appears as if the worker is paid for all the work he has done but, in actual fact, only part of his work goes to reproduce the value of his labour power (necessary labour), while the remaining part is surplus labour, which is not paid for and which creates the surplus value appropriated by the capitalist. To obtain surplus value is the aim of capitalist production, and the law of surplus value is its basic law, the main factor behind the movement and functioning of the entire capitalist economic complex.

Capitalist production results not only in the creation of commodities and surplus value; it also reproduces capitalist relations. The worker emerges from the process of production deprived of the means of production, while the product created by his labour is appropriated by the capitalist. With its boundless urge for surplus value (profit), C. is characterised by production on an enlarged scale, i. e. extended reproduction, which assumes a capitalist form, that of the capitalist accumulation of capital (part of the profit goes for expanding capital). As the structure of capital changes, in particular, as the part of it used to pay for labour power decreases in relative terms, relative overpopulation emerges, i. e. unemployment, which spells privations for the working class and is a means of increasing its exploitation. The accumulation of capital involves its concentration and centralisation. The large number of relatively small capitalists is replaced by a small number of big capitalists, who have huge capitals at their disposal. Capitalist accumulation exacerbates the main contradiction of C., that between the social nature of production and the private capitalist form of appropriation. Though enterprises and branches of production are interrelated, the existence of private capitalist property interferes with the social regulation of the economy, leads to anarchy and competition and makes economic development spontaneous in character. The capitalist economy is spontaneously regulated by the law of value. The contradictions inherent in the capitalist economy find their most graphic expression in regular economic crises, which destroy the productive forces, retard the evolution of production, sharply reduce the working people's living standards, and greatly increase unemployment.

C. tries to accommodate itself to the needs of the development of the productive forces, which assume an increasingly social character. The forms of capitalist property develop: apart from individual capitalist property, associated capitalist property appears as a result of the emergence of joint-stock companies, which make it possible to concentrate enormous capital and invest it in the construction of railways, canals and large industrial enterprises.

Subsequently, state capitalist property appears, which is the joint property of the class of capitalists. At a certain stage, the concentration and centralisation of capital brings about the accumulation of such big capital that it monopolises production and distribution. Free-competition C. is replaced by monopoly C., imperialism (q. v.). The transition to imperialism makes the capitalist economy more international.

Capitalist social relations first emerged in the Netherlands and England, and somewhat later in Italy, France, Germany, and Russia. The rest of the world was dominated by pre-capitalist relations (feudal, slave-owning, and primitive-communal). At the stage of imperialism, capitalism expands, drawing more and more countries into the orbit of capitalist relations, which coexist in backward colonial countries with pre-capitalist forms of exploitation. By the early 20th century, C. had become a world system as a result of the export of capital, the formation of international monopolies and the emergence of the colonial system of capitalism. The exploitation of the peoples of colonial and dependent countries increased and contradictions between imperialist powers were exacerbated, breeding wars for carving the world.

The political system of C. was initially influenced by the class struggle of the bourgeoisie against the feudal lords and feudal privileges, and later, by the struggle between the two major classes of bourgeois society, the proletariat and the bourgeoisie. The state system in capitalist society assumes the form of republic or constitutional monarchy (see Democracy, Bourgeois). At the stage of imperialism, when reactionary tendencies in politics become more pronounced, fascism (q. v.), the terrorist dictatorship of big capital, emerges. The interests of different groups and trends of the bourgeoisie are expressed by bourgeois parties, though some of them try to disguise themselves as being of the working people.

As C. develops, the working class takes shape, a force that is called on to do away with it. The working class grows in numbers, and its mass organisations led by Communist parties emerge, raising it to the struggle against the exploiters.

As it passes into its imperialist stage, C. as a whole becomes ripe for being replaced by a new social system. With the break-up of the capitalist system, at first in its weakest link, the age of the downfall of C. sets in (see *General Crisis of Capitalism*). Further aggravation of the general crisis of C. was caused by victorious socialist revolutions in a number of countries in Europe and Asia, as well as in Latin America (Cuba), and the formation of the world socialist system, the collapse of the colonial system and the change in the balance of power in favour of socialism.

**Civil War**, the most acute form of class struggle, largely typical of crucial historical periods (a transition from one socio-economic formation to another, or the transfer of power from one class or socio-political group to another). C. W. is characterised by cruelty and a mass armed struggle; it differs from spontaneous popular revolts in that both belligerents have elements of the state-political machine at their disposal, and in its country-wide scope.

The civil wars of the 2nd and 1st centuries B. C. in Italy left a noticeable mark on the history of ancient society; they were a continuation of the mass democratic movement for agrarian reform and for civic rights to be granted to all Italians. The movement was started by the Gracchi brothers and resulted in the substitution of imperial power for republican forms, which was initially masked but later came out into the open. The establishment of Tudor absolutism in England in the 15th century was preceded by a fierce civil war (the Wars of the Roses). Civil wars also accompanied the emergence of the bourgeois system in Europe. The English Revolution of the 17th century, and the French Revolution of the 18th century were classical examples of C. W.: in England the kings and feudal lords of the backward North-West fought against Parliament, the South-Eastern bourgeoisie and the new gentry supporting it; in France the Royalists allied with the monarchist reactionaries of Europe in opposition to the "third estate", the bourgeoisie and the common people. The popular and bourgeois political trends in the republican camp became particularly evident in the concluding stages of these

revolutions (the French Revolution in particular). Once this trend had been suppressed, for some time the military became the executor of bourgeois revolutions (e. g. Cromwell's Protectorate, and Napoleon's Consulate and later Empire).

The birth of a new, socialist society under the specific conditions that obtained in Russia took the form of a bloody C. W. unleashed by the overthrown exploiting classes right after the Great October Socialist Revolution and proclamation of the Republic of Soviets. "Throughout Russia," Lenin wrote, "civil war began in the form of resistance by the exploiters, the landowners and bourgeoisie, supported by part of the imperialist bourgeoisie" (V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 27, p. 174). As the Russian bourgeois-monarchist reactionaries did not, in fact, find any support among the masses, international imperialism organised large-scale armed intervention "to extinguish", as Lenin put it, "the fire of socialist revolution which has broken out in our country and which is threatening to spread across the world" (V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 28, p. 53). The interventionists and Russian counter-revolutionaries joined forces. The workers and toiling peasants of Russia, called on and led by the Communist Party, rose in defence of Soviet power; a regular Red Army was formed and the economy was put on a military footing. The Soviet government's economic policy was entirely subordinated to the country's defence. By November 1920 the C. W. had been won. Only in the Far East did it linger on: the last Japanese interventionists were finally banished from Soviet territory in 1922. The main tribute for the victory gained in the C. W. should be paid to the military-political alliance of the working class and toiling peasantry; the fact that the middle peasant, who became the central figure in the village as a result of the agrarian revolution, sided with the Soviets, was of great help, too. The working class rallied the toiling peasants and Cossacks around itself, and won the support of the working mass of the country's formerly oppressed peoples. The creation of the military alliance of Soviet Republics was vitally important. The victory was also scored because Soviet

Russia enjoyed sympathy and support among working people all over the world. Socialism's victory over the combined forces of internal counter-revolution (q. v.) and interventionists in the C. W. was a major military and political defeat for world imperialism, and testimony to the great vitality and invincibility of the worker-peasant state. The Soviet Union's victory over nazi Germany in World War II ensured less painful forms of transition from the bourgeois or bourgeois-monarchist system to a revolutionary-democratic, and later to a socialist system in several East-European and Asian countries.

Now that the forces of socialism and democracy have been consolidated the world over, the Communist Parties in the developed capitalist countries are looking for peaceful ways to take power, while not excluding the possibility that they may be forced to defend democratic freedoms with arms in hand if the reactionary minority defeated in elections attempts to stage a counter-revolutionary coup-d'état (see Peaceful and Non-peaceful Forms of the Transition to Socialism). Determining their attitude towards C. W., the Communists must take account of the fact that the system being established in a given country will bear an imprint of the way the socialist revolution was carried out. Additional difficulties in further creative activities arise in those countries where there have been prolonged civil wars, for, as a rule, C. W. involves a great loss of life, economic dislocation and an inevitable militarisation of the country.

Marxism actively opposes a dogmatic absolutisation of the military means of struggle and allegations to the effect that C. W. is a universal means for destroying an old society. It would be even more wrong to see military, violent methods as the key to fulfilling the tasks raised by socialist revolution. The Communist Party is bound to modify the methods of struggle and its organisational forms if circumstances change.

**Class Structure of Bourgeois Society,** the system of classes making up this society, generated by the capitalist nature of production relations. Its main "axis" is formed by antagonistic relations between

the principal classes in this society: the bourgeoisie (q. v.), i. e. the class of capitalists, and the proletariat, or the working class (q. v.).

The bourgeoisie includes different sections and groups of private property owners, who possess the bulk of the means of production and use it to exploit workers and other wage labour. It falls into certain groups, such as the industrial, merchant and agricultural bourgeoisie (the latter group consists of rich farmers who hire wage labour — agricultural workers or farm hands), owners of banking capital, insurance and other agencies, of enterprises and agencies providing services, and others. Some of these groups have their own interests which are not shared by other groups and are even, to a certain extent, opposed to them (e. g. the industrial and merchant bourgeoisies are interested in reducing the prices of farm produce, while the agricultural bourgeoisie is interested in the opposite). Another boundary within the capitalist class is based on the difference in the amount of capital owned: there are big, middle and petty bourgeoisies. The petty and to a certain extent the middle bourgeoisie are themselves oppressed by the big bourgeoisie, particularly as capitalism enters its imperialist stage and mammoth monopolies emerge as a result of the merging of industrial and banking capital; they step up the exploitation of the proletariat and also crush the petty and middle sections of the bourgeoisie. The existence of widely differing groups and sections, as well as of various competing groupings within the capitalist class is an objective base for the existence of several bourgeois parties, various socio-political organisations, and ideological and political trends in bourgeois countries.

Petty-bourgeois elements engaged in municipal industries, trade and services comprise a relatively independent section, for they are both small property-owners and labourers: here belong craftsmen, owners of small shops and workshops, etc. On the one hand, they are naturally attracted to the bourgeoisie and do all they can to "get to the top"; on the other, they are themselves badly oppressed and exploited by big capital; they may, therefore,

become an ally of the working class in its struggle.

The working class, or proletariat, is made up of all wage workers who are exploited by capitalists and are immediate producers of material boons (objects and services of a material nature) with the help of various types of implement and technical appliance. The working class is the class adversary of the bourgeoisie, waging a struggle against it. The working class is also heterogeneous, a fact that must be taken into account by the Communist Parties of capitalist countries as they work out and implement their policies. Lenin pointed out that proletarian consciousness and revolutionary spirit are most of all inherent in the workers of large-scale industry, who constitute the core of the entire working class. There are substantial intraclass differences among sections of the workers, generated by differences in qualifications, i. e. between workers with high, medium and low qualifications, and unskilled workers. These differences breed ones in the cultural and living standards of the workers, making them take different paths and choose different orientations in the class struggle. This does not, of course, occur automatically, according to their affiliation with a particular section, but owing to the influence exerted upon them by certain ideological trends that in turn have to reckon with these sections' peculiarities. In the course of political work carried out among the working class's different groups and sections, their specifics must be considered in order to consolidate the working-class unity of action and make the working-class movement really revolutionary, i. e. ensure that the working class completes its world-historical mission.

Other classes may also exist in bourgeois society, alongside the two main ones, e. g. landlords and peasants, "inherited" from the preceding formation by capitalist countries with strong vestiges of feudalism. As capitalism develops, however, they draw closer to the main classes, shedding the features that, under feudalism, characterised them as special classes. If they are not ruined, the landlords change to capitalist methods of managing their economies and virtually fuse with the bour-

geoisie. The peasantry is stratified, one part forming various sections of the middle and petty bourgeoisie, while the other part, those who are ruined, makes up the agricultural proletariat (farm hands, agricultural labourers). Each of these social groups finds its own place in C. S. B. S. and in the class struggle under way within it. The importance of the social development and stratification of the peasantry is that, while its poorest sections join the ranks of the working class, the broad mass of toiling peasants becomes an ally of the working class in its struggle (provided the appropriate political work is carried out among them); as property-owners, they are affiliated to the petty-bourgeois section, but at the same time they are labourers and are, like the proletariat, oppressed by big capital.

Various sections of mental workers, the intelligentsia (q.v) and office workers (q.v.), have a major role to play in the life of capitalist society and in its class relationships. The upper echelons of mental workers (in their mass) are close to the bourgeoisie as regards their social position, and, consequently, their income, life style, socio-political orientation and psychological make-up, though their social function is to cater for the needs of the bourgeoisie. The lower echelons are wage labourers, not unlike proletarians, and are likewise oppressed (though to a lesser extent), have low living standards, etc.; they are aptly called "white-collar workers", and are the working class's natural ally.

As capitalist society develops under the impact of shifts in its economy and the scientific and technological revolution, certain changes of a rather substantial nature take place in the qualitative and quantitative characteristics of its classes and social strata. By no means do they signify, however, that bourgeois society is being transformed into some qualitatively different social system, into a society consisting of the "middle class" only, as certain bourgeois ideologists and revisionists assert.

Their allegations to the effect that the proletariat has disappeared or is disappearing, turning into part of the "middle class",

because its living standards have been raised, are utterly groundless. No matter how many improvements the working class gains as a result of its consistent struggle (in fact this does not concern all of its sections by far, and then only in a few rich capitalist countries), the main thing, determining its social position, remains intact: still it is deprived of the means of production and therefore remains an exploited class. Similarly devoid of any grounds are the bourgeois sociologists' statements that the working class "is leaving the stage" since under the scientific and technological revolution the wide-spread automation of production processes means that the army of industrial workers does not grow as quickly as before, while the number of intellectuals and those engaged in the services escalates. First, the tendency towards numerical growth persists in the working class (including of those engaged in the services sphere), irrespective of changes in the rate of this growth, and second, its social role is determined by its qualitative characteristics, and not by its size or share in the entire population.

Thus, changes occurring in C. S. B. S. are making its antagonistic nature more and more manifest; the irreconcilable contradictions inherent in it are exacerbated, and the basis of the class struggle and the prerequisites needed to enhance the revolutionary role of the working class are strengthened.

**Class Structure of Socialist Society,** see Social Structure of Socialist Society.

**Class Struggle in the Transition Period from Capitalism to Socialism,** the struggle between the working class, which has come to power in alliance with the non-proletarian mass of the working people it leads, on the one hand, and the overthrown reactionary exploiting classes and the international bourgeoisie, which supports them, on the other. In this struggle, the working class comes out for the abolition of the exploiting classes, the revolutionary transformation of society and guarantees of the victory of socialism.

C. S. is the general law governing the transition by different countries to socialism. It is inevitable, inasmuch as the fact that the proletariat has gained power does

not signify the immediate disappearance of classes with contradictory and often antagonistic, incompatible interests. The overthrown exploiting classes continue to exist for a more or less considerable length of time during the transition from capitalism to socialism and put up fierce resistance to the new power, which has done away with their political supremacy and infringes on private property, the holy of holies of these classes (see Period of Transition from Capitalism to Socialism; Abolition of the Exploiting Classes).

Experience has shown that the exploiting classes retain certain socio-economic positions even after they have lost political power. They have at their disposal considerable material means, knowledge and experience of organising production and administration, as well as extensive ties with experts in the old economic, civic and military machine, and with international capital. Within the country, the overthrown bourgeoisie finds support in petty-commodity production, which constantly generates capitalism; it also uses the vacillations of the peasantry (q. v.) and various intermediary sections of the population to its own advantage. All this nurtures its hopes of the restoration of the old system, which are transformed into actual attempts to restore it. The establishment of the proletariat's power does not, therefore, signify the end of C. S., but its continuation under new conditions, in new forms, and by new means (see Dictatorship of the Proletariat).

Under the dictatorship of the proletariat, the proletarian state with all its bodies of coercion, administration and education, is the principal weapon of the working class in its struggle against the forces and traditions of the old world. The forms of the proletarian C. S. are subordinated to the tasks of consolidating, safeguarding and developing the new social system, and include not only means of coercion, but also such methods as "enlisting" the services of the bourgeoisie, i.e. employing its representatives in the national economy and other spheres of social life in the interest of the building of socialism (see V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 30, pp. 95-98).

No country has ever managed to make the transition to socialism without meeting resistance on the part of the exploiters or been able to dispense with suppressing them. But the nature of the overthrown classes' resistance varies greatly under different conditions and depends on the balance of power between revolution and counter-revolution, primarily within the country, but also internationally. If this balance provides an opportunity for internal and external counter-revolutionaries to resort to violent, military means of resistance to the victorious revolution, they use this opportunity by staging a counter-revolutionary putsch, unleashing a civil war (q. v.), organising foreign intervention, etc.

The working class engaged in building socialism is not interested in exacerbating C. S. to the extreme, to its armed forms. Experience has shown that, as the social base of the socialist revolution expands, the most reactionary forces within the country become more and more isolated, and the balance of power in the world tips in favour of socialism, ever new sections of the bourgeoisie begin to assess the situation realistically and see the hopelessness and futility of open and especially armed forms of resistance to working-class power. Such is the general tendency, which does not, however, exclude manifestations of the most acute forms of the proletarian C. S. today.

While employing flexible and diversified approaches to different sections and groups of the overthrown bourgeoisie, the working class must, in accord with Lenin's teaching, "ruthlessly suppress the uncultured capitalists", but it also "must use the *method of compromise*, or of buying off the cultured capitalists" who are capable of coming over "to socialism in a cultured and organised fashion, provided they were paid" (V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 27, pp. 344, 345). Under the specific historical conditions in the USSR, none, or virtually none, of the bourgeoisie showed any desire to compromise with the new power; they opposed it stubbornly and fiercely, making it difficult "to enlist" its members. At the same time, the proletarian power badly needed the services of the bourgeois intelligentsia, so that the problem of its re-education demanded urgent solution.

In the People's Democracies, the opportunities for "enlisting" the services of the bourgeoisie were much greater, and wider use was made of the multifarious forms of state capitalism (q. v.) and methods for attracting and re-educating representatives of the bourgeoisie and bourgeois intelligentsia for a relatively peaceful socialist transformation of capitalist industry and trade. Such opportunities can be even greater if the proletariat comes to power at the head of a broad anti-monopoly front.

In the transition period from capitalism to socialism, the proletariat wages C. S. not only directly against the exploiting classes in order to decide who will come out on top in favour of socialism, but also against the ideological and political influence the bourgeoisie exerts over the intermediate, non-proletarian mass of the working people, in order to isolate the overthrown reactionary forces as much as possible and facilitate the guiding role of the working class and its Marxist-Leninist Party. Lenin saw the proletariat's systematic guiding influence over all working people as a particular form of C. S. waged by the proletariat, as "the overcoming of a known, though quite different, resistance, and the overcoming of a quite different kind" (V. I. Lenin, *Complete Works*, Vol. 39, pp. 454-55, in Russian). This aspect of the proletarian C. S. is directed at preventing the subjugation of the non-proletarian masses of the working people by the reactionary bourgeoisie, while strengthening the firm alliance of the working class with these masses.

In the transition period, the proletarian C. S. is also aimed at re-educating people in a socialist spirit and rooting out the survivals of the past in their minds and behaviour, including those of representatives of the working class itself. The principal task consists in introducing a new discipline (q. v.), organisation and communist attitude to work.

The general development trend of the proletarian C. S. during the successful building of socialism leads to a strengthening of the positions of socialist forces and a lessening of the resistance put up by the remnants of the hostile classes.



**Class Struggle Under Capitalism**, the struggle of the working class (q.v.) and working masses led by it against the economic and political domination of the bourgeoisie (q.v.). Marx and Engels revealed its essence and aims, the reasons for its emergence, conditions and development prospects, on the basis of a profound study of the laws of the capitalist mode of production and summary of the first lessons of the working class's struggle against the bourgeoisie. They showed that the inevitability of this struggle stems from the fundamentally opposite economic and political positions of the two major classes in bourgeois society, the bourgeoisie and the proletariat, hinging on capitalist production relations. Capitalism (q.v.) is the last antagonistic formation, so the irreconcilable struggle of the working people against the domination of the bourgeoisie leads not only to the abolition of the capitalist form of production, but also to the creation of the conditions required for finally eliminating classes and the class struggle (see *Obliteration of Socio-Class Distinctions*). Marx and Engels saw the struggle of the proletariat against the bourgeoisie as the highest form of the working people's liberation movement, and the proletariat itself as the natural leader of all the oppressed and exploited. Only by actively participating in this struggle does the working class acquire class awareness; as a result, its organisational level and cohesion improve, and its alliance with the broad non-proletarian mass is consolidated. The Marxist-Leninist Party has a major role to play in waging C.S. The consistent struggle of the working people against the sway of capital inevitably brings about a socialist revolution and the dictatorship of the proletariat (q.v.). Lenin said that the class struggle was a major issue of Marxism, and that "outside the class struggle, socialism is either a hollow phrase or a naive dream" (V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 9, p. 443).

The struggle of classes permeates all aspects of life in bourgeois society: the economy, politics and ideology, and is a law and a motive force of its evolution. It exerts a powerful influence on the development of the productive forces. "Almost

all the new inventions," Marx wrote, "were the result of collisions between the worker and the employer... After each new strike of any importance, there appeared a new machine" (K. Marx, F. Engels, *Collected Works*, Vol. 6, p. 188). Democratic freedoms and broader civic and social rights are won by the working people largely as a result of the proletarian C.S. Under the general crisis of capitalism and the unfolding scientific and technological revolution, the contradictions between the boundless opportunities created by progress in science and technology and the obstacles raised by capitalism to society making use of them, between the social nature of modern production and the state-monopoly character of its regulation become especially acute (see *Scientific and Technological Revolution; General Crisis of Capitalism*). As a result, the gap between the interests of the overwhelming majority of the population and the financial oligarchy widens. A sharp curtailment of production, growing unemployment and inflation testify to the increased pressure of capital on the living standards, democratic rights and freedoms of the working people. The working class's struggle intensifies greatly, assuming a massive, organised and purposeful character, its social base broadens and its forms become more diversified. Due to differences in the internal and external situations, the depth of social contradictions, organisational level and political cohesion of the working class, C.S. develops unevenly from one country to another. Yet it goes on in all capitalist countries without exception. The strike movement, involving various sections of the working people, has assumed its highest pitch in recent decades. In 1977, about 50 million people took part in strikes and other mass economic and political actions in the industrial capitalist countries alone. The upsurge of C.S. in the capitalist countries is greatly facilitated by the world socialist system. As a result of its stubborn struggle, the working class of the developed capitalist countries has secured certain wage increases, a shorter working week, paid leave, improvement in the social security system, etc.; in the political sphere, it has won representation on local self-government

bodies and in Parliament. One characteristic feature of C.S. at the present stage is the constant rise of the strike movement and the closely intertwined economic (see Economic Struggle of the Working Class) and political struggle (see Political Struggle of the Working Class), which is reflected in the growing list of socio-economic demands, including that for democratic nationalisation of leading industries, the introduction of trade union control over enterprise activities, etc. Under today's conditions, the proletarian C.S., in the alliance with all democratic forces, is directed at limiting the economic omnipotence of the monopolies and implementing political and economic changes that would create the most favourable conditions for the struggle to achieve socialism. The working people come out in defence of democratic rights and freedoms, against the arms race and militarisation, for peace and against the establishment of dictatorial regimes, in support of the national liberation movement and against imperialist aggression. The international ties and solidarity of the working people are gaining in strength as they fight against the international monopolies. Strikes at enterprises owned by multinational concerns, where people of different nationalities are employed, have become an important form of the fight against monopoly capitalism. A great role is played in exposing the anti-democratic essence of monopoly power by the Communists' activities in Parliament, coupled with organised mass actions staged by the working people to defend democratic rights and freedoms (see Parliamentary Activity of Communists).

The unity of action of the working class, its trade unions and political parties, gains strength in the course of C.S. (see Unity of Action of the Working Class). In the struggle against monopoly oppression, the power and authority of the working class increase, together with its vanguard role in defending the interests of the working people and the genuine interests of the nation. A wide anti-monopoly front is taking shape. The hightening of C.S. today gives the lie to bourgeois, reformist and revisionist allegations to the effect that social contradictions are being obliterated under

capitalism and that it is turning into a society of "class peace" and "general affluence". Capitalism is becoming less and less stable and promises to "improve" it and build a "general welfare society" within its framework have not amounted to anything. The developments of recent years forcefully confirm that capitalism is a society without a future.

**Collective Leadership**, the method of guiding based on joint consideration of problems and joint decision-making. Collective leadership makes it possible to arrive at most correct decisions and effectively combine shared and personal responsibility.

The principle of collectivism underlies the leadership by the Communist Party, the activities of elected state bodies, trade unions, the Komsomol, and other public organisations in socialist society (see Democratic Centralism). The management of production, transport, communications, command of the armed forces and guidance of a number of other spheres of state activity is based, owing to their specific nature, on the principle of one-man leadership, relying on various forms of broad participation by the public.

The collective nature of leadership in socialist society stems from the very essence of the socialist system, the economic base of which is public ownership of the means of production, and the political base of which is the power of the working people, i. e. of the whole people.

The utilisation of collective experience and knowledge accumulated by the leaders of the Communist Party, state and public organisations, the consideration of the opinions of millions of Communists and non-Party working people, and the need for a well-grounded and comprehensive approach are engendered by the gigantic scale and complexity of the tasks facing the builders of communism and by the great responsibility of the leading bodies to the people in socialist society. As the socialist community has shown, a science-based policy and effective leadership are only possible as a result of a comprehensive study of the knowledge and practical experience gained by broad circles of Communists and non-Party masses. Collective leadership

makes it possible to tackle any task, even the most sophisticated one, in the right way. The exchange of opinion and discovery of the will of the majority are necessary prerequisites for achieving unity of action, and a conscientious Party and state discipline (q.v.). To make C.L. really effective, the collective body must actually function, rather than just exist in a formal way, and all of its members must take an active part in its work. The nature of the relations between the members of this body, on the one hand, and its leader, on the other, is of fundamental importance. Recognition of the leader's great role, responsibility and authority (q.v.) has nothing to do with him wielding personal power; he must have immense tact and take an interest in ensuring a free exchange of opinion and an atmosphere of collective creativity. He is vested with high responsibility but enjoys the same rights as any other member of the collective body when decisions are being taken. Each member must contribute to decision-making and show vigour, independent thinking and firm principles. Joint consideration of problems and the taking of relevant decisions are closely connected with discipline and responsibility for their fulfilment, and are indispensable in C.L., which presupposes both the shared and responsibility of each person for the fulfilment of the task he is charged with and for the implementation of collective decisions. Lenin stressed: "At any rate, and under all circumstances without exception, collegiate management must be accompanied by the precisest definition of the personal responsibility of every individual for a *precisely* defined job" (V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 29, p. 437). A businesslike approach in the work of collective bodies and the elimination of rackets, pomposity, empty speech-making and fuss are of radical importance for ensuring the effectiveness of C.L.

The Communist Party and its leading bodies are vested with special responsibility for ensuring C.L. The Party, which is a voluntary political alliance of Communists sharing common views, bases all its work on the principles of collective co-operation rather than administration. "All the affairs of the Party are conducted,

either directly, or through representatives, by all the members of the Party, all of whom without exception have equal rights" (V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 11, p. 434).

The collectivist method to be applied when considering and taking decisions on all important problems in the life and activities of the Party and its organisations is written down in the Party Rules as a necessary condition for the normal functioning of Party organisations, correct education of cadres, and development of activeness and a capacity for independent action in Communists. "The personality cult and violations of inner-Party democracy connected with it," the Rules stipulate, "must not be tolerated in the Party, being incompatible with the Leninist principles of Party life." In every Party organisation, the exclusive right to regard and take a decision on all the most important matters of Party life and activities is vested in a collective body: in the primary Party organisation — in the general meeting of Communists; in district, city, regional and territory organisations — in the corresponding Party conference, and in a Republican Party organisation and the Party as a whole — in the Congress. The executive bodies of the Party and its organisations, Party committees and bureaux at all levels, are also collective. The strictly specified terms fixed for convening congresses, Party conferences and meetings, as well as plenary sessions of Party committees are an important guarantee of observance of the principles of C.L. Another such guarantee is the strict order of electiveness and accountability of Party committees and bureaux from top to bottom. In recent years, the principle of collective leadership in the CPSU has been strengthened and developed by vesting more power in plenary sessions of the CPSU Central Committee as well as in plenary sessions of local Party bodies and in Communists' meetings, and by improving information within Party ranks. In the USSR, trade unions and the Komsomol are also guided by collective bodies. The most important questions are considered in the Soviets of People's Deputies at all levels, at their sessions, and in the intervals between sessions — at the sit-

tings of the Presidia and the Executive Committees of the Soviets. The CPSU is working indefatigably to improve the activities of these tested concentrators of collective thought. The Party's endeavour to educate Communists, leading cadres and all the working people in a spirit of utter commitment to the ideology and principles, and make them better informed is directed at raising the level of C.L.

C.L. is an important political gain of the Communist Party and socialist society, vitally important for making use of the advantages provided by developed socialism in the interests of the people, and for the successful building of communism.

The expansion and improvement of C.L. helps develop socialist democracy (see Democracy, Socialist) and is a prerequisite for a gradual transition to communist self-government (see Communist Social Self-Government).

**Collectivism**, a feature typical of socialist and communist social relations, which are free from social antagonism and are based on the conversion of the means of production into the common property of the working people; it is also a principle of the ideology and morality corresponding to these relations. C. is the opposite of individualism, which is generated by private ownership of the means of production and the division of mankind into hostile classes. In socialist society C. helps greatly in developing the individual and his personal endowments.

The first historical form of collectivist relations was the "natural community" inherent in the relations between the members of the commune in pre-class society. The "natural community" was, in the final analysis, limited by group property, which united people within one commune but divided one commune from another. Later on, primitive communal property was replaced by private property, which extended ties among the people, but at the same time destroyed the "natural community" and substituted individualist relations for it; the individual interests of society's members collided, and society was divided into hostile classes with opposing interests. Marx and Engels called associations of people based on such re-

lationships "substitutes for the community". "The illusory community in which individuals have up till now combined always took on an independent existence in relation to them, and since it was the combination of one class against another, it was at the same time for the oppressed class not only a completely illusory community, but a new fetter as well" (K. Marx, F. Engels, *Collected Works*, Vol. 5, p. 78). Marx and Engels saw genuine community as an association of the working people based on the establishment of public ownership of the means of production corresponding to their common fundamental interests. They pointed out that, as distinct from capitalism, a socialist, "co-operative society" would be "based on common ownership of the means of production", on the principles of collectivism (See K. Marx, F. Engels, *Selected Works* in three volumes, Vol. 3, p. 17).

Collectivism emerges at the stage of capitalism among the industrial proletariat. Being deprived of private property and free from devotion to the law and order that are called on to preserve it, they become increasingly aware of their common interests; joint work in industrial enterprises enhances this process. Lenin wrote in this connection: "The joint work of hundreds and thousands of workers in itself accustoms the workers to discuss their needs jointly, to take joint action, and clearly shows them the identity of the position and interests of the entire mass of workers" (V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 2, p. 103). The process is a contradictory one, because the proletarians come out in the system of capitalist production as individual sellers of their labour power and are influenced by relations of competition. Experience gradually convinces them, however, that the struggle for more favourable conditions for selling their labour power, for economic concessions on the part of entrepreneurs, does not deliver them from oppression. As they are drawn, little by little, into the revolutionary struggle for their basic interests and against the foundations of the capitalist system, the impact of tendencies born of joint work "under the same roof" and of the social nature

of production increases, and lends relationships formed among the workers a collectivist character. The activity of the Communist Party, the vanguard of the working class, is a powerful factor in developing collectivism and class proletarian solidarity.

As a result of the socialist socialisation of the means of production, the relationships the proletariat has formed in the course of its class struggle are established in all spheres of society's life. Relations of exploitation, socio-economic estrangement and competition are eliminated and replaced by those of equality among labourers freed from exploitation, by comradely co-operation, mutual assistance and mutual exactingness in the struggle to achieve communism (see Socialist Collective). As these relations take firm root, the grounds for the individual being opposed to society disappear.

The combination of the interests of the individual and society becomes more and more harmonious under developed socialism — the stage of maturity reached by the new society when the entire set of social relations has been restructured on the collectivist principles inherent in socialism. Ideological and educational work and the application of such methods for organising collective activities as emulation (see Socialist Emulation) promote the development, on this objective basis, of the socialist way of life (q. v) of the working people and the establishment in their consciousness and behaviour of the principles of collectivist ideology and morality. The purpose of education in the spirit of socialist C. is to ensure the assimilation of communist morality standards by society's members in order to make these standards the inner motivation of their behaviour (see Communist Education; Communist Morality).

**Commune**, among the different social forms that have existed in history under this name, two basic types can be identified:

1) Administrative-territorial units, characterised by a certain form of self-government: (a) city communes — cities in mediaeval Western Europe, mainly in Italy, France and Flanders, which won

a certain measure of independence from their seigneurs, had their own courts of justice, people's volunteer detachments and finances, fixed their own taxes and elected a town council and officials from among their own ranks; (b) the Paris Commune of 1789-94, the organ of Paris city self-government, which was formed on the eve of the storming of the Bastille and became an efficient body of revolutionary power in the period of Jacobin dictatorship; (c) the lowest administrative-territorial unit in several countries today, with the municipal council, largely responsible for municipal affairs, at the head; (d) administrative-territorial units in several of the RSFSR regions in the first few years of Soviet rule (for example, in 1918 the Petrograd Labour C. was organised on the territorial principle; it was a member of the Union of Communes of the Northern Region, or the Northern Commune); (e) administrative-territorial units in the People's Republic of China (people's communes), which emerged in 1958 and regulated the entire economic, political and social life of the population listed in them.

2) Social communities opposing private-property relations among people and striving to organise the life of their members in conformity with their specific notion of collective ownership. The following types of commune are known: (a) Religious collectivist communes. Their main purpose was a sharing of religious ceremonies, while common property, joint labour and other elements of collectivism were seen as the best means of achieving this. Yet some of them reflected the working people's first attempts to oppose the exploitative system with a society based on equality. During the Hussite movement, for example, the town of Tabor emerged in Bohemia (1420-34), its creators having renounced property. A hundred years later, during the Peasant Wars that accompanied the Reformation, the ideas of general equality were graphically embodied in the uprising, led by Thomas Münzer, in Mühlhausen (1525), and particularly in the Münster uprising (1534), when radically-minded Anabaptists confiscated all money and declared

it common property; consumer goods were registered and used only with the authorities' permission, while land was divided into plots and tilled under their supervision. These first naive attempts to organise life on the basis of public ownership came to a bloody end. Bourgeois historians regard as a typical example of C. the so-called Christian Republic, established for the Indians by Spanish Jesuits in Paraguay (1610-1768); in actual fact, however, the Indians in this "republic" were forcibly held in specially assigned territories, or missions (today's reservations), surrounded by moats and palings, and their production activities, home and spiritual life were stringently controlled by the church. (b) Experimental communes of the 19th-century Utopian Socialists who set them up by way of a "social experiment" (see Utopian Socialism) in the belief that, if the possibility of communist relations among people was proved on their example, this would be enough for the principles of communism to triumph and for communes to crop up, one after another, in all countries and on all continents. Guided by this belief, the Utopians made quite a few attempts to establish communes, primarily in North America, where the essential conditions for them existed, such as free or cheap land, as yet not strictly established forms of life, and a huge army of immigrants, who welcomed anything novel. It was there that Robert Owen's communities, Charles Fourier's phalansteries and Etienne Cabet's Icaria were set up on the principles of joint labour, shared property and consumer goods. They did not survive long, however. Their historical significance lies in the fact that they proved the possibility of equality (q.v.) in relations among people, not in some afterlife but here on Earth, and provided the first experience of establishing and guiding relations among people in communist-type work collectives. They also showed the naivete of the hopes that the new social way of life, demonstrated by small isolated groups of people, could spread of its own accord. The collapse of these Utopias brought into bold relief the need for a class struggle to be waged to achieve

communism, whose laws had been formulated by Marx and Engels by the mid-19th century. The "communal movement" (the setting up of various communes), which is widespread among certain layers of young people and intellectuals in the West, is just as Utopian as the experiments staged by the socialists in the past. (c) The Paris Commune (q.v.) of 1871—the first attempt made by the working class to establish its dictatorship, the open "political form at last discovered under which [it would be possible] to work out the economical emancipation of Labour" (K. Marx and F. Engels, *On the Paris Commune*, 1971, p. 75) (see Paris Commune). (d) Communes that were organised during the first few years of Soviet power in Russia. The victorious October Revolution made communist ideas available to the broad population. The idea of C. in production, consumption and everyday life proved the easiest to grasp, so that, during the first few years of Soviet power, the commune was the prevailing type of emerging collective economy, i.e. the means of production were fully socialised and consumer goods were used in common. The first communes appeared in 1917, and in 1918 almost a thousand of them were already in existence; a year later their number had doubled and was still growing. Some of them were very large: the Novorepino Commune in Samara Gubernia (Region), for example, numbered 8,500 members and had 53,000 dessiatines (1 dessiatine equals 2.7 acres) of land and 3,000 head of cattle. The bulk of the communes, however, were small economies; 40 per cent of them had only 50 dessiatines of land each. When the New Economic Policy (see NEP) was introduced and commodity-money relations developed, the inadequacy of their economic base and the erroneousness of the principle of egalitarian distribution (q.v.) prevailing in them became evident. Most of them could not survive under the new conditions and disintegrated. The advantages of new forms of peasant co-operation, associations for the joint tilling of the land, and especially agricultural artels, became obvious. By the early 1930s, production communes

had practically disappeared, to be replaced by artels. The consumer communes in towns, which were based on lofty ideas but were short of essentials, united part of the proletarian sections of the population and students; as living standard improved, the material base for such C.s ceased to exist.

The history of communes as social associations reveals their contradictory nature: on the one hand, they embody the idea of the need for communist-type relations among people, and, on the other, they attempt to translate this idea into life through isolated local units, seeing communist society as made up of a definite number of identical "bricks". This is justified in historical terms, for the first communes emerged without radical changes wrought in the old society and could not but exist as isolated cells, socially isolated and set apart from the rest of the world. The actual trends in socio-economic development consist in the intensive erosion of all sorts of barriers separating various social units and the expansion of the ties connecting them based on an immense upsurge of the productive forces (see Communism).

**Communism**, the highest stage of the communist socio-economic formation, based on public ownership of the means of production, the immediate aim of which is the unrestricted, complete development of every person.

The idea of the harmonious development of the individual and of human relations appeared in the 15th century. At that time it was a Utopia, a dream that did not involve a material transformation of society (see Utopian Socialism; Egalitarian Communism). In contrast to Utopian Socialists, Marx regarded communist society as the inevitable outcome of the actual progress of history and of the class struggle. From its very inception, the Marxist teaching on C. was formulated as a scientific theory based on analysis of existing social relations and their evolution (see Scientific Communism).

The scientific theory of C. emerged from history being treated in a materialist way, i.e. as a law-governed process that is caused, in the final analysis, by the

development of material production. The investigation of this process led the founders of Marxism to the conclusion that C. is the outcome of "those material conditions, which alone can form the real basis of a higher form of society, a society in which the full and free development of every individual forms the ruling principle" (Karl Marx, *Capital*, Vol. I, p. 555). Proceeding from the accurate scientific analysis of the development of capitalism (q. v.) Marx provided in *Capital*, he showed that the establishment of communist social relations is initiated by a revolutionary transformation of capitalism and elimination of the contradiction between the social nature of production and private ownership of the means of production. Public ownership of the means of production and an immense upsurge of the productive forces serve as the grounds for the abolition of the social division of labour caused by the existence of private property, for the liquidation of the opposition between mental and physical labour (q. v.) and the change in labour itself, which gradually becomes the primary vital need of the comprehensively, harmoniously developed person.

C. differs from socialism (q. v.) in the tremendous development of the productive forces, capable of creating an abundance of consumer goods, which makes it possible to apply the principle "From each according to his ability, to each according to his needs" (see The Basic Principle of Communism). But C. not only creates an abundance of consumer goods to satisfy everybody's needs; it is also a society that moulds people, developing all their diverse human, creative powers. Man is not just a consumer striving to grab and utilise as many goods as possible; genuinely human needs are being developed in him, first and foremost the need for a creative, transformative activity. At present, the real material and technical foundation for effecting the change in the character of labour is automation (q. v.) of production. Labour bears no attraction for people in a class antagonistic society; it merely spoils their lives. Under C., the aim of which is to make a creator out of every person, human activities are spontaneous

and voluntary. Each member of communist society, liberated from tedious, monotonous labour in the sphere of material production proper, will enjoy an opportunity to develop all his abilities harmoniously (see *Harmonious Development of the Individual*). The change in the character of labour means that people cease to be partial producers of a commodity and enter into new relationships with one another, when each man is interested in the unlimited development of his fellow. In communist society, people will exchange their activities rather than objects. Marx characterised communism as production of the form of intercourse itself.

Changing the process of production and the character of people's activities works a change in all social relations, above all in those connected with property. While, under socialism, there are two forms of public ownership of the means of production — state property (belonging to all people) and collective-farm and co-operative property, under C. there is a single communist property.

In a class antagonistic society, the interests of the individual are opposed to those of society. In communist society, quite different relations develop. Everybody has an opportunity to develop without restriction, since this is in the interests of society as a whole, for every person is not a member of a specific social and class group, but a representative of the entire society; the unlimited development of every person now becomes, therefore, an essential condition for the unlimited development of all. Social transformations in society are no longer political in nature; the state is replaced by communist social self-government (q. v.), and certain forms of social consciousness and activities such as politics, law and religion, disappear.

Under C., genuine human history will unfold, while the historical age preceding the communist socio-economic formation, which was characterised by the domination of private property, is, according to Marx, the pre-history of human society, for progress is achieved during that age through the exploitation and inhuman

plight of the majority.

**Communist Attitude to Labour**, see Labour, Communist

**Communist Culture**, an intellectual culture, embracing the sphere of cultural production (knowledge, morality, upbringing and education) and formed on the basis of a very high development level of the productive forces and communist social relations.

C.C. emerges on the foundations provided by socialist culture. Under socialism, intellectual culture is characterised by democracy and evolution based on the Marxist-Leninist world outlook and socialist internationalism.

Having abolished class, estate and nationality privileges in education and intellectual activities, and thus eliminated the age-old confrontation engendered in antagonistic formations between people and culture, socialism creates a system of cultural and educational institutions that serves to develop all society's sections. The working people gain access to all achievements in the sphere of technology, science, art, etc.; thus a broad democratic base is established for further developing socialist culture. More and more sections of the population become involved in creative cultural activities. Socialist art evolves on the principles of realism and is concerned with the tasks and problems of the contemporary age, those of the struggle for a new society and the moulding of the new man. People develop new moral principles under the impact of the existing conditions of life and purposeful educational work, such as, for example, the high moral prestige of labour, a sense of collectivism (q. v.), etc., which are also manifested in relationships between people, and between the individual and society, and serve as stimuli in their activities.

Socialist culture is formed and develops on the basis of the scientific Marxist world outlook, which determines the content of various spheres of cultural life in ideological terms. Under socialism, people's education serves not only to spread knowledge, but also to shape a Marxist world outlook. The church is separated from the state, and the school from the church.

Distinctions are still evident in cultural



development between various strata of society, between town and countryside, and between the different nationalities making up the population of the socialist countries. There are contradictions between the general cultural level achieved in society and that of its individual members. As a whole, the culture of socialist society is based on the dialectical-materialist world outlook, on internationalism but part of society is still influenced by religion and sticks to nationalistic prejudices.

Socialist culture is developed conscientiously and systematically. It is guided by the state, the Communist Party and public organisations. The 25th CPSU Congress stressed the growth of the creative and civic activity of Soviet cultural workers and noted that it was necessary to establish a close unity of ideological, political, labour and moral education in the country. The Constitution of the USSR formalises the tasks facing the Soviet state: to improve uniform system of people's education, provide for the steady development of science and see that cultural treasures are widely used for the moral and aesthetic education of the Soviet people.

At a later stage, socialist culture will develop into C.C. Society's communist transformation can only be realised provided a comprehensively developed individual is created. Under certain social conditions, the influence exerted on society's intellectual culture by the rapidly developing technology will be regulated by men, and the future society will be characterised by a harmonious blend of science, technology, art, and all other manifestations of intellectual culture. As the material needs of society's members are more and more satisfied and the time spent on work in the sphere of material production is reduced, the development of the individual and satisfaction of his intellectual requirements will take priority. The role of culture in the life of society has already increased, and it will continue to do so. The nature of intellectual production itself, and the structure of social consciousness will change in developed communist society. The legal, political and religious forms of social consciousness will die away. Science, art and morals

will become major forms of man's intellectual culture. All branches of knowledge, unfettered by any social contradictions, will develop freely. A huge army of highly educated people working in science will greatly accelerate the rate of its development. One feature of C.C. is the intellectual unity of society; this does not, however, rule out scientific discussions as a form for developing science, including on problems of social evolution. Under communism, art will create an unprecedented variety of forms and styles, because people of the most diverse abilities, endowments, dispositions and tastes will be able to express themselves to the utmost. Art will become an integral part of everyday life and labour, a vital need for all society's members, and an extremely active force in education, or rather, a major means of education on a par with public opinion.

With respect to culture, communist society may be considered as homogeneous, because distinctions in cultural levels and life styles will be gradually erased, and cultural development levels in society's various sections and different peoples will become alike. C.C. will be international; cultures will merge once nations have done so. The process is inexorable but extremely protracted so that, in the early stages of communist society, culture will develop in national forms. Under communism, activities in the sphere of intellectual culture will no longer be the function of intellectuals alone as an exclusive section of society engaged primarily in highly qualified, creative mental work. Creative endeavour will become accessible to all society's members. Cultural values will be created with the immediate participation of all members of society. By its content, functions in society, and "mode of production" and "distribution" of intellectual values, C.C. will be humanist, harmonious, and addressed to all mankind. Each member of society will take an active part in cultural progress (see also Communist Morality, Communist Education).

**Communist Education**, the purposive, systematic, planned moulding of harmoniously developed people, committed to

the cause of communism and organically combining communist convictions with activities directed at building a communist society.

The immediate aim of the state in developed socialist society is to extend the real opportunities for the harmonious development of the individual and the fuller utilisation of cultural treasures by society's members in order to apply their creative powers, endowments and talents to the best advantage.

A person educated in the communist spirit is an integral one, an active public figure with profound knowledge and a Marxist-Leninist world outlook, firm moral principles and high cultural standards of intellect and behaviour; he is keenly aware of his responsibility to society and his collective, is physically fit and emotionally sensitive; his aesthetic sense is well developed; he is capable of both managing social affairs and controlling his own behaviour, as well as building his life according to aesthetic and scientific laws; labour, for him, is a vital, primary need, a means for the fullest creative self-expression, self-assertion and development of his gifts.

C.E. is achieved through special pedagogical methods of influence applied to people, and through their active participation in building communism, in the course of which people themselves undergo a certain change and their intellectual make-up is modified, too. Of great importance for C.E. is the purposeful organisational and educational activity of the Communist Party, as well as the individual's self-education based on his organic need for intellectual, moral and physical improvement. The right combination of objective and subjective factors ensures success in communist education, in spite of the complexity of the task and the extended period of time required.

The role of C.E. in socialist society is constantly growing, because the building of communism is becoming increasingly dependent on the level of consciousness of each member of society and the educational process is turning into one of the methods for regulating the activities of the whole social organism. C.E. of young people is particularly important, for it

is they who must build communist society.

The main aspects of C.E. are the following: the shaping of a scientific communist world outlook, the imparting of a communist attitude towards work (see Labour, Communist), internationalist and patriotic feelings, communist morality, as well as general and polytechnical, aesthetic (q.v.) and physical (q.v.) education. The fundamental purpose of C.E. is to inculcate a communist attitude towards work, which must become a primary vital need. The building of communism makes it necessary for each member of society to have a scientific view of the world, understand the course of and prospects for social development, correctly assess events, phenomena, and his own place and role in society. It is cardinally important for an integral, scientific world outlook to be formed on the basis of a study of Marxist-Leninist science — philosophy, political economy and the theory of scientific communism. The formation of a scientific world outlook includes atheist education (q.v.), the overcoming of survivals of the past in people's minds and behaviour (see *Survivals of the Past in the People's Minds and Behaviour*), and the imparting to them of ideological staunchness, revolutionary devotion to the ideas of the Communist Party, a keen class awareness, irreconcilability with respect to bourgeois and petty-bourgeois ideology and an ability to recognise ideas essentially hostile to communism in any guise and put up an uncompromising active struggle against them. Communist moral education sets the aim of making high moral principles into a person's own convictions, and the latter — into constant characteristic features and accepted norms of everyday social behaviour. This leads to the individual taking an active Marxist-Leninist position in life. Thus, a communist ideology is formed, that is a blend of deep knowledge of Marxism-Leninism and communist convictions.

Success in C.E. is ensured by the Party spirit, an irreconcilable attitude towards bourgeois ideology, a close connection between education and life, the masses' practical experience of and concrete tasks

in communist construction; by setting personal examples of model work and behaviour; by the correct combination of material and moral incentives and economic, administrative and ideological means of influence; the unity of words and deeds; a differential approach towards the different groups of the working people; and systematic work on implementing all the above requirements by stages.

At the present stage, the major means for raising the effectiveness of C.E. is a comprehensive, systems approach to it, which calls for an organic connection to be formed between ideological-political, labour and moral education.

**Communist Ideology**, the system of ideas that express the views of the most advanced class of our age, the working class, and its vanguard, the Communist Party. The essence of C.I. is Marxism-Leninism (q. v.). C.I. arms each new generation with the invincible weapon of historical truth, and a deep understanding of the laws of and prospects for social development, while relying on the firm foundation of Marxist-Leninist teaching.

C.I. is not just the quintessence of the elements of the class psychology formed under the impact of people's circumstances in life; it emerges as a scientific theory, reflecting the vital interests of the working class and all working people. In contrast to the ideologies of other classes, in particular that of the bourgeoisie and the petty bourgeoisie, C.I. is scientific by its nature. This stems from the fact that the proletariat's class interests coincide with the objective requirements for society's progressive development and that the proletariat as a class has an interest in fully cognising the laws of social development. This is why C.I. overcomes the mystification of objective historical laws in the class interests, which is typical of the ideologies of exploiting classes. Its scientific nature is also rooted in the way it takes shape and develops as a result of critical analysis and assimilation of the entire cultural heritage of the past. C.I. is enriched and creatively developed under the influence of the class struggle waged by the proletariat, and the experience gained by the world communist move-

ment. Lenin wrote about the inception of C.I.: "Socialism, as the ideology of the class struggle of the proletariat, is subject to the general conditions governing the inception, development, and consolidation of an ideology; in other words, it is founded on the sum-total of human knowledge, presupposes a high level of scientific development, demands scientific work, etc., etc. Socialism is *introduced* by the ideologists into the proletarian class struggle, which develops spontaneously on the basis of capitalist relationships" (V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 6, p. 161).

The scientific nature of C.I. is coupled with a spirit of revolutionary partisanship. As distinct from bourgeois ideology, which hides its class exploitative nature under a mask of objectivism, C.I. openly proclaims its partisan character, which is the result and political expression of highly-developed class opposites. The partisanship of C.I. does not contradict its scientific nature: on the contrary, it requires a consistent and profound mastering of the objective laws governing the social process. This is why the supreme scientific nature of C.I., taken in the strict and full meaning of the word, is intrinsically and inseparably linked with its revolutionary spirit. The organic interconnection between the scientific nature of C.I. and its proletarian party spirit is a major typical feature of C.I., determining its leading role in the revolutionary struggle of the working class, and in building communism.

Another major feature of C.I. is its internationalism (see Proletarian Internationalism), for it reflects the working people's vital interests irrespective of their nationality. C.I. has taken shape, consolidated and is developing today as an internationalist theory, accumulating the experience gained in the revolutionary struggle waged in all countries, and is basically hostile to nationalism (q. v.) and chauvinism, and manifestations of bourgeois and petty-bourgeois ideology.

C.I. is characterised by true humanism (q. v.), for the communist socio-political formation consistently and radically eliminates relations of exploitation (q. v.), dominance and subordination, and replaces them with genuinely human relations go-

verned by the motto: "Everything for the sake of man, for the benefit of man." C.I. is an ideology of historical optimism, based on a profound understanding of the objective laws that underlie social development and their use in practice. It contains man's finest and most lofty ideals in fighting for the realisation of communism, which inspire and bring together millions of people.

The Communist Parties are holders of C.I., they introduce it to the broad working masses, organising them and drawing them into building the new society, and at the same time actively fighting against bourgeois ideology and revisionist and dogmatic distortions of Marxism. An irreconcilable struggle against bourgeois ideology (see Ideological Struggle) is indispensable for consolidating C.I., which steadily expands its sphere of influence: more and more people the world over are emerging from under the influence of bourgeois ideology and coming under the banner of communism.

**Communist Morality**, a form of social conscience and social practice. Its main functions are to ensure society's historical functioning, co-ordinate public and individual interests, and regulate the individuals' behaviour by social means. Morality as a form of conscience has two levels, the ideological and the psychological, the former characterised by ethical principles, standards, values and rules of conduct, and the latter by moral needs, feelings and features. The possibility and specifics of moral regulation are determined by the fact that human actions are objectively determined not in a rigid and unique way, but are of an alternative nature, i.e. the individual has relative freedom of choice in deciding on his line of behaviour in each concrete situation, which makes him responsible for the choice he makes and generates a striving in him to co-ordinate it with society's requirements (standards, values, etc.). The antagonism inherent in exploiting societies (systems) between private and public interests rules out such co-ordination in principle. Hence the dual nature of any morality that is based on private-property relations. Alongside class values, how-

ever, general human ethical values also take shape under exploiting systems, expressing the needs and interests of progressive classes, first and foremost, of the working masses. Proletarian and communist morality, the latter emerging under socialism, is the most complete and consistent embodiment of progressive trends in mankind's ethical development.

C.M. is a manifestation of socialist society's ideological, political and moral unity, and of its advance towards social homogeneity. The main principles of C.M., formulated in the moral code of the builder of communism in the USSR, characterise the major achievements and goals of communist education (q.v.), a set of features that add up to a moral image typical of the advanced section of socialist society and are fostered in all its members as communism is built. Some of these features, such as a commitment to the cause of communism, love of the socialist homeland, and friendly and fraternal relations among the peoples of the USSR, and fraternal solidarity with the working people of all countries and all nations, reflect the unity of moral, ideological and political education, and of morality and politics inherent in socialist society.

As C.M. is fostered and socialist democracy takes deeper root in the moral conscience and behaviour of Soviet people, their relations with one another increasingly demonstrate the great humanism (q.v.) of communist ideals, and a harmonious blend of high ethical principles and beauty, inner perfection and highly-cultured behaviour.

The importance of the moral factor in the life of society has greatly increased as a result of the triumph of socialism. In a developed socialist society (q.v.) this tendency is particularly evident. The holding of social interests as close to the heart as one's own, as well as patriotism, collectivism, courage and a sense of duty, and other features of the Soviet man, which were instilled in him by the efforts of the CPSU, have been embodied in the feats accomplished by Soviet people during the first five-year plan periods,

the Great Patriotic War of 1941-45, the rehabilitation of the war-ravaged economy, the development of the virgin lands, the construction of the Baikal-Amur Railway and the exploration of outer space. The 1977 Constitution of the USSR stipulated the chief of these features and the need to develop them in new generations of the Soviet people, listing among them a conscientious attitude towards socially useful work in the chosen occupation, thriftiness, irreconcilability with respect to squandering and misappropriation of state and public property, respect for the national dignity, rights and lawful interests of other citizens, parental concern for the upbringing of children and filial concern for parents, etc. (see Art. 58-69 of the Constitution of the USSR). The moral factor is of special importance in the management and encouragement of labour activities; relationships between those who lead and those who are led are not only administrative and organisational, but also ethical in content, the importance of the latter steadily increasing under developed socialism.

Moral incentives to labour in socialist society are harmoniously blended with material ones, rather than opposed to them (see Material and Moral Incentives). Moreover, socialist distribution according to work, which is the most just form of distribution at the present stage of development of the productive forces, is of vast moral significance. Violations of this principle immediately tell on the moral and psychological climate of the work collective, and on the entire system of its ethical relations. Correspondingly, each step taken to improve the system of remuneration for work noticeably improves the moral and psychological climate within the collective and hence stimulates the productivity and quality of labour.

Moral incentives to labour (a sense of responsibility, duty and workers' conscience, public encouragement or censure) usually operate in unity with ideological and political incentives (commitment to the cause of communism, socialist patriotism) and aesthetic incentives (the impact of the design of working premises, the sense of rhythm and beauty of the labour

process, the worker's striving to pass on his aesthetic ideal to the product of his labour). All of this testifies to the great importance of a thorough approach to the problems involved in education and upbringing.

Mature socialism is characterised by the development of ethical principles not only in work, but in all other spheres of men's vital activities as well: in family life, everyday behaviour and informal relationships. At the present time, the CPSU stresses a radical improvement of ideological, political and educational work, and in particular, ethical education; it stresses the need for consistently opposing the antitheses of communist morality and for eradicating certain vestiges of the past hostile to socialism, such as money-grubbing and bribery, attempts to make use of society without giving it anything in return, mismanagement and squandering, heavy drinking and rowdy behaviour, red tape and a callous attitude to the people, violations of labour discipline and of law and order. To combat these phenomena, both conviction and coercion are used, influence by word and by force of law. In socialist society, morality and the law face social tasks that are basically and fundamentally identical, which means that legal norms and sanctions entail weighty moral and educational consequences, while the regulation of men's relationships by ethical means promotes their greater compliance with legal enactments.

As socialist society advances towards communism, the role of morality in tackling economic and social problems will steadily grow. It will take over some functions that are today carried out by political, legislative and socio-administrative institutions. At the present time, however, these institutions should be strengthened rather than weakened, since their activities do much to promote the formation of the people's moral culture and raise the effectiveness and quality of the working people's moral education.

**Communist Party of the Soviet Union,** the political organisation of the working class and the whole Soviet people, their ideological and political vanguard, the leading and guiding force of socialist society,

the nucleus of its political system, of all state and public organisations. The position the CPSU occupies and the role it plays in Soviet society are secured in the Constitution of the USSR (Art. 6). The CPSU unites in its ranks, on voluntary principles, the advanced and most conscientious part of the country's working class (q.v.), collective-farm peasantry (q.v.), and intelligentsia (q.v.).

The guiding role of the CPSU stems from the leading role played by the working class as builder of the new social order, from the nature and essence of socialism, from the nature of the Party itself as the vanguard of the most advanced class, and from the laws governing the building of communism. The aims the CPSU sets itself reflect the requirements of society's evolution towards communism; these are formulated in the Party Programme and in the decisions of CPSU Congresses. The rules for joining the Party and inner-Party relationships are stipulated in the Party Rules, which are the basic law of Party life.

The CPSU emerged on the political scene at the beginning of the 20th century as a militant party of the working class, striving to win power and transform society along socialist lines. It was created by Lenin as a Marxist party of a new type, guided in its activities by the most advanced ideological, political and organisational principles. The CPSU (the party of Bolsheviks), having fused scientific socialism with the mass working-class movement, armed the proletariat with a science-based programme for a democratic, socialist revolution, organised it politically and raised it to the struggle against the autocracy and the capitalist system. The victory of the Great October Socialist Revolution, achieved under the ideological and political guidance of the Bolshevik Party, signified that the country had embarked on the path of socialism.

Since October 1917, the Communist Party has been the party in power; it is leading the Soviet people's creative labour, its selfless struggle for the triumph of the new system. Under its leadership, the exploiting classes have been abolished, the socio-political and ideological unity of

the people has been formed and consolidated, and developed socialist society has been built (see also Social-Political and Ideological Unity of Society). Today, the CPSU is rallying the Soviet people to fulfil the historic task of building communism.

In its activities, the Communist Party draws on Marxist-Leninist ideology (see Marxism-Leninism), which is being developed and enriched by revolutionary practice, the experience gained while building communism. An organic merger of politics and science is the fundamental principle of Party leadership. The Constitution of the USSR (1977) proclaims that "the CPSU exists for the people and serves the people". Being the vanguard of the people, the CPSU holds the central place in society's political system, comprising its nucleus (see Political System of Socialism). The CPSU leads the Soviets, trade unions, co-operatives and the Komsomol, and unites and directs the endeavours of all state bodies, public organisations, and all the working people towards achieving the common goal. The guiding activities of the CPSU are carried out within the framework of the USSR Constitution, which decrees that the Party determines the general perspectives of society's development and the course of the home and foreign policy of the USSR, directs the great constructive work of the Soviet people, and imparts a planned, systematic and theoretically substantiated character to their struggle for the victory of communism.

The forms and methods of Party leadership, among which political and ideological influence holds priority, develop and improve as the role and goals of the Party change. Apart from this, the following forms of leading activities carried out by the Communist Party are the most important: selection and promotion of cadres capable of implementing its policy line in practice; comprehensive ideological and mass-political work to educate the working people in a spirit of the communist world outlook and morality; convincing the masses and rallying them together in order to fulfil the concrete tasks involved in building communism; checking on

and supervising the practical implementation of the social changes outlined and their conformity with the set targets.

The CPSU does not order state and public organisations about, or try to replace them or take over their functions. It sees its role in ensuring, in accordance with its general line and applying Party methods, the implementation of its course at all levels and in all links of the state and social system with the help of Communists and Party organisations. Party committees elaborate recommendations and proposals that are well-substantiated in political and theoretical terms for corresponding state and public organisations, and Communists working in these organisations persuade the authorised representatives and other working people of these organisations; Party committees also select efficient leaders and supervise their work. Drawing on their political prestige and the people's confidence, the Party bodies work to augment the independence and responsibility of the bodies of people's power and administration, and of public organisations.

Improvement of all the forms of state and public organisations of the working people, with the Party at their head, ensures the all-round development of socialist democracy (q. v.), involvement of the working people in the management of society and state, and a genuine rule of the people. Relations among the Party's leading bodies, its organisations and Communists are built in accordance with the CPSU's nature and goals. The basic principle of the CPSU organisational structure is democratic centralism (q. v.).

The Party is built according to the territorial-production principle. Primary organisations, which are the foundation of the Party, are established at Communists' places of work and are united in district, city, regional and republican organisations on the territorial principle. Local Party organisations, the component units of the CPSU, embrace the entire territory of the USSR. They implement Party policy and the directives of its higher bodies within their territorial bounds.

The highest body of the CPSU is its Congress. Congresses are convened regular-

ly by the Central Committee, at least once every five years. The CPSU Rules also envisage the convocation, when necessary, of Party conferences. In the interval between Congresses, the activities of the Party and its local bodies are led by the CPSU Central Committee.

Issues involved in Party activities are discussed and resolved in the CPSU on broad democratic lines; at the same time, strict Party discipline is observed. The combination of democracy and centralism in Party life and in its structure, on the one hand, increases Communists' activity and, on the other, helps in the pursuance of a single policy everywhere and the implementation of decisions adopted.

As was emphasised at the 26th Congress of the CPSU, an important condition for successful Party guidance is the Leninist style in work — a creative style hostile to subjectivism and characterised by a scientific approach to social processes; it demands exactingness with respect to both oneself and others, renounces self-conceit and opposes all manifestations of red tape and a formal approach. The Party works to create favourable conditions everywhere for developing criticism and self-criticism (q. v.), for sound criticism to find the necessary support and for the Communists' rational and well-substantiated proposals to be implemented. The Party considers it very important to develop the Communists' activeness, enhance a businesslike approach to work and raise the responsibility of all Party organisations, their leadership and each Communist for the fulfilment of decisions adopted.

In implementing and developing the Leninist norms of Party life, such as the accountability and electiveness of leading Party bodies, freedom of discussion and criticism, publicity in Party life, collective leadership, the ideological and organisational unity of Party ranks and equality of all Communists, the CPSU acts as a socio-political organisation characterised by the most democratic relationships, and the Politbureau of the Central Committee as the militant headquarters of the many-million-strong Party. It is here that the collective mind of the Party is condensed and Party policy, reflecting the interests

of the whole of Soviet society, of all Communists and non-Party people, is determined.

The social composition of the CPSU reflects the class structure of Soviet society and the vanguard position of the working class. As of 1 January 1981, 43.4 per cent of Party members were workers, 12.8 per cent, peasants (collective farmers), and 43.8 per cent, office workers and other categories of the population. The Party gives workers pride of place in its ranks. The CPSU is characterised by a constant improvement of the political, general, and specialised education of its members. It is the militant vanguard of the Soviet people: as of 1 January 1981, it had 17,430,000 members and candidate members. The Party does not aim to expand its ranks, but works to improve the quality of its composition and select for membership the most advanced and politically active representatives of the working people. The requirements with respect to those applying for Party membership have been made more stringent in accordance with the decisions of the 23rd, 24th, 25th and 26th CPSU congresses.

The numerical and qualitative growth of the CPSU membership and the increase of the Communists' activeness and responsibility reflect the Party's growing role as the leading force of socialist society. The process involves fundamental changes in social development: increasing the scale and complexity of the tasks involved in building communism, greater vigour and consciousness on the part of the masses, the further evolution of socialist democracy, as well as the growing importance of the theory of scientific communism (q. v.), its creative elaboration and propaganda, and the need to improve the masses' communist education (q. v.). "The dynamic development of Soviet society," it was noted at the 25th CPSU Congress, "the growing scale of communist construction, and our activity in the international arena insistently require a steady raising of the level of Party guidance of economic and cultural development, the education of our men and women, and improvement of organisational and political work among the masses".

The CPSU is an integral part of the international communist movement (q. v.), one of its combat contingents. The Party's foreign policy is built on the principles of proletarian internationalism, concern for augmenting the world socialist community, the unity and cohesion of Communists of all countries and the striving to consolidate international peace and security. As was noted at the 26th CPSU Congress, "*To safeguard peace — no task is more important now on the international plane for our Party, for our people and, for that reason, for all the peoples of the world.*" The CPSU discusses the problems that arise with the fraternal Communist Parties in a spirit of genuine comradeship, within the framework of the established norms of respect for the independence of each party. At the same time, the CPSU invariably defends principled internationalist positions and irreconcilably opposes any views and actions incompatible with communist ideology.

**Communist Social Self-government**, the system of social administration typical of communism, some elements of which already emerge under socialism.

Social self-government existed before class society appeared, under the primitive-communal system. When society split into antagonistic classes, it was replaced by society's political organisation, with the state as its foundation. C.S.S. replaces the political system of socialist society (see Political System of Socialism), being a new form of self-government and democracy, which corresponds to communist society, the highest stage of social evolution.

C.S.S. develops directly from the political organisation of socialism, which is based on the socialist state led by the Communist Party. The withering away of the socialist state means precisely its development into C.S.S., the term "withering away" only emphasising the natural and gradual nature of this process. It is those elements, bodies and methods of activities typical of society's management by the state that are withering away, i.e. gradually growing superfluous. The elements of social self-government, inherent in the socialist



state and the entire political organisation of socialist society, are developing and gradually becoming definitive.

One specific feature of society's management under communism will consist primarily in the bodies intended to carry out administrative social functions and their activities shedding their political nature, insofar as political relationships, i. e. those relations among classes, nations and states which comprise the sphere of politics, will cease to exist as class and national distinctions are erased and isolated states wither away. This is precisely what Engels meant when he said that, under communism "the government of persons is replaced by the administration of things, and by the conduct of processes of production" (K. Marx and F. Engels, *Selected Works* in three volumes, Vol. 3, p. 147).

Another specific feature of C.S.S. is that administrative activities will cease to be a regular occupation and the social group whose sole "trade" is managerial activities will disappear. This does not, by any means, signify that there will be no specialisation in the sphere of administration. On the contrary, developed communist society presupposes a considerably higher stage of social organisation, as well as of the scientific organisation of labour. Alongside this, however, a major principle of communist self-government will be implemented — the obligatory participation of each adult member of society in managing public affairs on the principle of electiveness and rotation.

For C.S.S. to emerge, the material and technical base of communism must be created, communist social relations developed and a new individual shaped, i. e. such a high level of consciousness in all members of society be achieved that legal and moral standards merge into uniform norms of behaviour for all members of communist society and the need for their compulsory implementation disappears.

Major factors that are immediately involved in the preparation for the transition to C.S.S. are a further development of socialist democracy (q.v.) and drawing of all citizens into the

administration of society. To fulfil this task, the working people's material and cultural standards should be raised considerably, the amount of free time (q.v.) should be increased, and the political organisation, promoting the population's involvement in managerial activities, improved; the masses should be taught the science of management. One line in the establishment of C.S.S. is to develop democratic principles in the activities of the administrative apparatus, apply the principles of electiveness and accountability on an ever growing scale in order to spread them gradually among all leading workers of the administrative machine, and improve the organisation and systematically reduce the number of salaried officials on executive bodies. The bodies of state power should be turned into social self-government bodies and existing social organisations (q.v.) should be modified so as to show more independent endeavour. The Programme of the CPSU emphasises that communist self-government shall unite Soviets (q.v.), trade unions, co-operative and other mass organisations of the working people.

C.S.S. will be based not only on the development trends characteristic of socialist society's political organisation but also on all new elements that emerge at the higher stage of communism, with its unprecedented economic and cultural standards and a high level of conscience and morality in all members of society; it will replace the existing political organisation of socialist society only when developed communist society is an accomplished fact.

**Complete and Final Victory of Socialism** characterises a firmly established socialist society. The complete victory of socialism implies radical transformations in all spheres of society: the creation of a socialist economy, political system, and culture, abolition of the exploiting classes (q.v.) and, consequently, of forces inside the country who might support the restoration of capitalism, and the final victory of socialist forces inside the country. The final victory of socialism implies irreversibility of socialist achievements as far as the world-

wide balance of power is concerned, a balance of power in the world arena that favours socialism so that restoration of capitalism in socialist countries from outside, by imperialist reaction, becomes impossible. Consequently, the complete victory of socialism is connected with internal conditions, and its final victory, with the external conditions under which the socialist revolution develops.

The differentiation between the internal and external criteria for the victory of socialism followed, as far as theory is concerned, from the thesis that socialism can initially triumph in a single country, but cannot do so simultaneously in all capitalist countries, and in practical terms this distinction became exceedingly relevant with the triumph of the Great October Socialist Revolution. Speaking of the development of the socialist revolution in Russia from the standpoint of its internal conditions, Lenin argued that we have "all that is necessary to build a complete socialist society..." (V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 33, p. 468). He thought, however, that the final victory of socialism could be ensured if a socialist revolution succeeded at least in several developed capitalist countries. It should be remembered, also, that sometimes Lenin implied final victory of socialism when he spoke of its complete victory.

A sharp struggle went on within the CPSU for a long time over the possibility of building socialism in the Soviet Union. The supporters of Trotsky and Zinoviev (see Trotskyism) asserted that socialism could not triumph in the USSR without a successful socialist revolution in the West. In rebuffing these defeatist ideas, the Communist Party noted the inadmissibility of confusing the complete victory with the final victory of socialism. The Party showed that the Soviet people could build up a complete socialist society. At the same time it emphasised that the victory of socialism could not be final in one country. "The only guarantee," ran a resolution of the 14th Party Conference, "of the *final victory of socialism*, i. e. guarantee against resto-

ration of capitalism is, consequently, a victorious socialist revolution in some countries."

Proceeding from Lenin's tenet on the possibility of the victory of socialism in the USSR, the CPSU developed and consistently implemented a general line for building socialism. By the end of the first five-year-plan period (1932), the foundations of a socialist economy had been constructed. Once an agrarian country, the Soviet Union became an industrial one. Through collectivisation of agriculture the last exploiting class, the kulaks, was eliminated. Socialist changes during the second five-year-plan period (1933-37) established socialist production relations throughout the national economy and eliminated the internal forces that wanted to restore capitalism. The Eighth All-Union Congress of Soviets in 1936 summarised the social changes in the country and declared that socialism had been built, in the main, in the USSR. At that time, however, the socialist gains in the USSR were not final. The only socialist country in the world, the Soviet Union was surrounded by capitalism, so, even though the internal forces for the restoration of capitalism had been eliminated, the hostile external forces might still have restored it.

Following the Second World War, radical changes occurred in the balance of forces on the world scene in favour of socialism. The might of the Soviet Union increased further. Having restored, within short time, the national economy that had been ravaged by the war, the Soviet Union scored tremendous successes in developing industry and agriculture, science and technology, and in strengthening the country's defences. A most important factor that changed the world balance of power in favour of socialism was the emergence and progress of the world socialist system (q.v.) (see also World Socialist Community). The positions of imperialism had also weakened as a result of the disintegration of the colonial system (q.v.).

Summarising these social changes, the CPSU concluded at its Twenty First Congress (1959) that socialism had won

finally as well as completely in the USSR, because restoration of capitalism by external forces was now out of the question. The complete and final victories of socialism are interrelated. In the USSR, the complete victory of socialism brought its final victory nearer. Also, the final victory of socialism in the USSR ensures the socialist gains in other socialist countries. On the other hand, experience shows that the victory of the socialist system in one country or another can in the present conditions be considered as final and a capitalist restoration precluded only if the Communist Party, being the leading force in society, firmly pursues the Marxist-Leninist policy in developing all spheres of social life; only if the Party untiringly strengthens the country's defences and safeguards its revolutionary gains, if it maintains vigilance and teaches the people vigilance against the class enemy, irreconcilability towards bourgeois ideology; only if it observes as sacred the principle of socialist internationalism, and strengthens unity and fraternal solidarity with the other socialist countries. The victory of socialism as a social system is a prerequisite for the establishment of mature socialism (see Developed Socialist Society). Having reached maturity, socialism lays the groundwork for a gradual transition to communism.

**Concrete Social Studies**, see Empirical Social Studies

**Constitution of Developed Socialism**, the Fundamental Law of the state of the whole people, confirming the political and economic systems formed under developed socialism, the level of social development and culture achieved in the USSR, the basic rights, freedoms and duties of Soviet citizens, the national-state and administrative-territorial structure of the Soviet Union, the system and principles of the organisation and activities of state power and administrative bodies.

The Constitution now in force in the USSR was adopted at the Seventh (Special) Session of the Supreme Soviet of the USSR, on 7 October 1977; it

is an outstanding document of our time, summing up the 60-year development of the Soviet state, the great victories scored by the CPSU and the entire Soviet people. It is the world's first Fundamental Law of the socialist state of the whole people, graphic evidence of the ideas of the October Revolution translated into life, a lofty charter of developed socialism. The new Fundamental Law of the USSR is a result of the creative endeavour of great masses of the working people. It embodies their experience, knowledge and will, their concern for the prosperity of their Socialist Motherland, for the growth of its international prestige.

The Draft Constitution was widely discussed at about one and a half million meetings of working people, specially devoted to it, in enterprises, on collective farms, in military units and residential districts. Over 140 million people, i.e. more than two-thirds of the country's adult population, took part in the discussion. All CPSU members actively participated in the debates: over 3 million of them took the floor at more than 450,000 open party meetings. Over 2 million people's deputies carefully considered the Draft Constitution at sessions of Soviets of all levels, from village Soviets to the Supreme Soviets of the Union Republics.

The adoption of the 1977 Constitution was objectively conditioned by the profound changes that have taken place in the Soviet Union and have been recorded in the Fundamental Law. The 1977 Constitution of the USSR reflects socio-political unity of Soviet society, the leading force of which is the working class; it characterises this society as that of mature socialist social relations, in which a new historical community, the Soviet people, has emerged as a result of the rapprochement among all classes and social strata, the legal and actual equality of all nations and nationalities, their friendship and fraternal co-operation; it confirms that the Soviet state, which carried out the tasks of the dictatorship of the proletariat, has developed into a state of the whole people; it reveals the essence of the Soviet state of the whole people, which expresses

the interests of the workers, peasants, and intelligentsia, the working people of all Soviet nations and nationalities, and determines its main tasks — to establish the material and technical base of communism, improve socialist social relations and transform them into communist relations, mould the new man of communist society, raise the working people's material and cultural standards, ensure the country's security, and promote peace and international co-operation; it defines the principal goal pursued by the Soviet state of the whole people — the building of communism. As distinct from the Constitution of 1936, the Fundamental Law now in force extensively characterises the vanguard role of the Communist Party (Art. 6): "The leading and guiding force of Soviet society and the nucleus of its political system, of all state organisations and public organisations, is the Communist Party of the Soviet Union. The CPSU exists for the people and serves the people." One of the principal features of the 1977 Constitution is that it records the extension and improvement of socialist democracy. The democratic principles underlying the formation and activities of the Soviets of People's Deputies have been further developed; the set of socio-economic rights is presented in greater detail, and the political rights and freedoms enjoyed by Soviet citizens are formulated more exhaustively than in the Constitution of 1936. Particular attention is paid to further enhancing socialist democracy, which is the main line in the evolution of Soviet society's political system. Greater space is given to the issues involved in developing the Soviet economic system based on socialist ownership of the means of production in the form of state property (belonging to all the people) and collective-farm and co-operative property. The Fundamental Law points out that the economy of the USSR is an integral national-economic complex consisting of all elements of social production, distribution, and exchange effected on its territory. The 1977 Constitution confirms the social basis of the USSR, which is an unbreakable alliance of the workers, peasants, and

intelligentsia. Special chapters deal with the Soviet Union's peaceful foreign policy and defence of the Socialist Motherland.

Each Soviet Constitution reflects a stage in the historical development of Soviet society and state: the RSFSR Constitution of 1918, the world's first Fundamental Law of a socialist state, summed up the results of the struggle of the people's masses in the Great October Socialist Revolution to overthrow the rule of the exploiters; it generalised and confirmed the social basis for establishing and consolidating Soviet power. The USSR Constitution of 1924 reflected the formation of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and laid the legal foundations for further consolidating the cohesion, friendship and co-operation among the constituent republics, all the nations and nationalities of the single Soviet state. The USSR Constitution of 1936 reflected an important stage in Soviet society's development — the liquidation of the exploiting classes and private ownership of the means of production, announced that the foundations for socialism had been laid in the USSR and proclaimed the principles behind the socialist rule, which laid the groundwork for the Soviet people's further creative endeavour as they tackled the tasks of building communism.

The 1977 Constitution of the USSR is legal confirmation of a new historical achievement — the building of a developed socialist society in the Soviet Union. It is an advancement on the 1918, 1924, and 1936 constitutions; the experience accumulated by the fraternal socialist countries in formulating constitutional provisions was also taken into account during its elaboration. The 1977 Constitution lays down the main principle for people's rule in the Soviet Union — the omnipotence of people's power vested in the Soviets of People's Deputies, which are the political foundation of the USSR, and formulates the basic principles of the Soviet system and the major features of developed socialism. It is justifiably called the law of life of developed socialist society. The 1977 Constitution of the USSR provides the

legal groundwork for Soviet legislation. The constitutions of the Union and Autonomous republics and other legal acts are adopted on the basis of the Constitution of the USSR, the provisions of which are vested with supreme legal force.

The Soviet Constitution fully corresponds to Lenin's proposition that "it embodies what experience has already given, and will be corrected and supplemented as it is being put into effect" (V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 28, p. 35). The new Constitution contributes to the theory and international practice of the construction of socialism, enriching them with the experience gained in organising the first ever socialist state of the whole people. The adoption of the Soviet Constitution is an important landmark in the history of the Soviet state and a powerful incentive in the international struggle of the working people the world over for freedom, democracy, social progress and lasting peace.

**Convergence and Fusion of the Forms of Socialist Property** is a major law governing the development of socialist into a communist society.

Socialism is characterised by two forms of social ownership of the means of production (see *Social Socialist Property*). In the USSR, these are state (public) and collective-farm and co-operative property, which are continuously developing and, at a certain stage, will fuse to form a single communist property.

Public socialist property differs fundamentally from communist property. It is closely associated with the principle of the workers' material interest in the results of their labour, with that of the distribution of material wealth in accordance with the quantity and quality of work done, with the existence of commodity-money relations, money, credit, etc. Universal communist property will dispense with these categories. Moreover, unlike public socialist property, it will belong to a people not divided into classes. A basic aspect of the development of socialist state property into communist property is its fast growing volume. This means an increase in the fixed productive and non-productive assets as a result of a tremendous growth

in capital investment. Another important line is expansion of the sphere of public property, which gradually comes to embrace not only most production, but also the service sphere. Many individual needs are still met through housework, but will be increasingly met by the state and society (development of public catering, everyday services, child-care institutions, places for rest and recreation, etc.). The development of state property also involves concentration of production, enlargement of state enterprises, and concentration of a considerable portion of the means of production and manpower in large-scale enterprises. Production and scientific-cum-production associations are being formed; specialisation, co-operation and combination of production are growing, its location improving, and economic ties among industries and regions becoming closer, etc. The growing socialisation of public property is accompanied by improved planning and management, growing participation by the people in running public enterprises, control over the production and distribution of material wealth, etc. Public property is now developing in the context of the on-going scientific and technological revolution (q.v.) and in close connection with radical technical re-equipment, the use of new technology in all production processes, and profound changes in working and living conditions.

The transition to a single communist property also presupposes the development of collective-farm and co-operative property. This is expressed in an increased socialisation of the means of production, in the course of which this property acquires features of public property. The collective farms' non-distributable assets are growing, including machines, production premises, draught animals and productive livestock, perennial plantations, cultural and everyday services buildings. In their material make-up they are becoming increasingly like the assets of public enterprises. This process is also promoted by a combination of agricultural and industrial enterprises, the formation of agro-industrial complexes, which make more effective use of machines, investment and manpower. The share of collective farming in agricul-

tural production is growing. The production of grain and the staple industrial crops has been fully socialised in the USSR, but the production of animal produce, vegetables, grapes and other garden products has not been socialised to the full, a portion of it being produced on the collective farmers' personal subsidiary holdings. "Experience shows," the 26th CPSU Congress said, "that such holdings can be an important additional source in the supply of meat, milk, and some other produce. Individually-owned vegetable and fruit gardens, poultry and cattle are part of our common wealth." The growing collective farming and the increasing socialisation of collective-farm means will form the economic basis for the disappearance of the collective farmers' personal subsidiary holdings in the future. Inter-collective-farm ties are expanding, the result being that a portion of collective-farm and co-operative assets are coming into the joint ownership, use and management of several collective farms. This being so, some assets grow in sophistication and become the property of several rather than one farm. The activities of inter-collective-farm enterprises are closely linked with those of public enterprises. As collective-farm production develops, the resources of virtually all collective farms will fuse with those of the state. This will tend to expand and deepen production ties between state enterprises and collective farms especially because of the need for a further mechanisation and electrification of agricultural production. State industrial enterprises are supplying collective farms with more modern machines, fertilisers and other major producer goods, and setting up branches in the countryside.

The development and convergence of the two forms of property in no way means that the collective-farm and co-operative form of property has outlived itself and should be discarded. In the course of building communism, the advantages of this form should be used more fully and effectively. The development of collective-farm and co-operative property is closely linked with the transformation of the collective farmers' agricultural labour into a variety of industrial labour, with improvement of the re-

muneration and with broad development of the emulation.

The forms of remuneration according to the work done are becoming increasingly similar in the state and collective-farm sectors and the remuneration for labour on collective farms in different zones is levelling out. Payment according to work-days has been replaced by guaranteed monetary wages on a level with the rates for the corresponding categories of state-farm workers. Other social measures have also been implemented, such as paid leave for collective farmers, pensions, social insurance, etc. In distributing collective-farm incomes, provision is made for a rational combination of accumulation and consumption, a continuous growth of production, emergency and cultural and domestic service assets. All this leads to extended reproduction of collective-farm property, and growing socialisation of agricultural labour. These processes prepare the ground for a single public communist property and, on its basis, for social relations inherent in the higher form of human society.

**Convergence Theory**, a bourgeois apologetic theory, maintaining that capitalism and socialism are inevitably converging and will eventually merge into a socially homogeneous hybrid society. The term is borrowed from biology, where it is used to designate the process of the appearance of similar features and functions in the structures of living organisms as a result of their adaptation to identical environments. C.T. is based on the method of technological determinism, according to which social development is conditioned by science and technology, independently of the nature of production relations. Its adherents maintain that the scientific and technological revolution (q.v.) has produced an "industrial society" in its two varieties—"Western" and "Eastern". All "industrial societies", they maintain, are trying to use their natural wealth rationally and raise labour productivity in order to improve living standards and achieve the general welfare. Hence the "industrial society" is characterised not only by a rapid development of science and technology, but also by a lack of an-

tagonistic classes. Having overcome former spontaneity, it is developing according to plan, without economic crises; social inequality is virtually non-existent. By the "Western" variety of "industrial society", bourgeois ideologists imply contemporary capitalist society (see State-Monopoly Capitalism), ascribing to it certain characteristics that are only inherent in socialism. This is evidence that they have been induced to recognise the strength and vitality of the socialist system, though in the relatively recent past they called it a historical anomaly and a shortlived, abortive experience. At the same time, they try to ascribe to the socialist system certain features typical of capitalism, such as exploitation of man by man, social antagonism and suppression of the individual. They intentionally obliterate the qualitative differences between the two opposing social systems — capitalism and socialism — and try to prove that the revolutionary transition from the former to the latter is both illegal and unnecessary. This is the socio-political essence of the anti-communist concept of a "uniform industrial society" which is one of the components of C.T. Bourgeois ideologists maintain that both the "Western" and the "Eastern" varieties of "industrial society" inevitably develop similar features under the influence of scientific and technological progress, which accumulate until the two systems are synthesised into a single "uniform industrial society", in which the advantages of socialism and capitalism are combined and their shortcomings are eliminated.

Attempts are made to substantiate the inevitability of convergence in all aspects of social life in the two systems. In the economic sphere, the proponents of convergence intentionally disregard the basic difference between capitalist and socialist relations of production, while at the same time inflating out of all proportion those features that are acquired by capitalism as a result of the struggle between the two social systems and the scientific and technological revolution — mainly the growth of state-monopoly capitalism and greater intervention by the bourgeois state in economic processes. State-monop-

oly socialisation, even if introduced on the broadest possible scale, cannot prevent the spontaneous nature of capitalist economic development, whose proportions are, in the final analysis, determined by crises of overproduction. Elements of socialist relations cannot emerge in the sphere of capitalist production, and capitalist elements cannot ripen within the socialist economy. The fact that, under socialism, objective economic laws, including the law of value, are used to advantage and the principle of material incentives is systematically applied, does not mean that socialist principles are discarded or that elements of capitalist "market economy" are introduced, as bourgeois ideologists assert. Under socialism, commodity production, the law of value, price, profit, effectiveness of capital investment and other economic categories are filled with a socialist content and differ radically from the same categories of capitalist economics. Bourgeois ideologists allege that processes leading to the convergence of the two systems are also under way in the socio-political sphere. Private ownership in the "Western" variety of "industrial society" has allegedly become a mere formality, for the bourgeoisie has been deprived of power and the dominant positions have been taken over by managers and technocratic politicians, who are mainly concerned with the common good, while the majority of the population consists of middle sections, or the middle class, which is growing unrestrainedly. In the "Eastern" variety of "industrial society", i. e. in the socialist countries, the growing stratum of scientific and technical intellectuals will also eventually assume dominant positions, thus ousting the working class and communist parties from power. Finally, in the sphere of culture, the proponents of C.T. maintain, ideologies are being destroyed; the Marxist-Leninist ideology, in the first turn, is being replaced by a "social knowledge", devoid of any ideological nature. One part of C.T. is the concept of "deideologisation" (see "Deideologisation", Theory of). The apologists of "convergence" stake on peaceful coexistence in the sphere of ideology.

C.T. has been elaborated as the "scientific" foundation of the global strategy of

imperialism, aimed at undermining the economic, political and ideological mainstays of socialism from within. Right and "left" opportunism (q.v.) and revisionism (q.v.) serve to achieve these counter-revolutionary aims. Lately, C.T. has been criticised by some bourgeois politicians and ideologists, often from even more rightist, anti-communist positions; such "critics" accuse the adherents of "convergence" of renouncing the "active struggle against communism." Today, bourgeois politicians and ideologists are engaged in inventing new concepts, trying to capitalise on the trends promoting detente and the assertion of the principles of peaceful coexistence between states with different social systems. One such attempt is the demand for a "free exchange of information and ideas" and unhindered spread of bourgeois ideology and cultural and ideological stereotypes (see "Mass Culture") in the socialist countries. This, together with C.T., is aimed at undermining the foundations of socialism (see also Technocratic Theories of Society).

**Counter-revolution**, a regressive social process, a reaction to social revolution, objectively aimed at preserving or restoring the moribund social system.

C. in one form or another is a corollary of all revolutions. The revolution generates C. by its very development, as Marx pointed out (see K. Marx, F. Engels, *Collected Works*, Vol. 10, p. 47), because the ruling classes, connected with the moribund system of production relations, never give up power of their own free will, but always stubbornly resist a new system.

The confrontation between the revolution and C. is an objective law of the class struggle during the changeover from one socio-economic formation to another. It reaches its culmination when the question of power, which is the principal issue at stake in any revolution, is being decided. The outcome of the struggle differs widely from one specific situation to another and is not predetermined, being dependent on the balance of power between the parties and their ability to forestall their adversary in mobilising all the resources and using them to advantage, on the proficiency of political leadership, etc.

In some cases C. wins and the revolution is defeated, e.g. the 1848 Bourgeois-Democratic Revolution in Germany, the Paris Commune (q.v.) of 1871, the November 1918 Revolution in Germany, the Democratic Revolution of the 1930s in Spain, the Chilean Revolution of 1970-1973. In other cases the revolution crushes the reactionary forces and triumphs (e.g. the Great October Socialist Revolution, the victorious socialist revolutions in several European countries, in Cuba, etc.). All revolutions are inevitably faced with overt or covert resistance put up by reactionaries.

C. resorts to diverse forms of struggle and subversive activities, such as military action, civil war (q.v.), mutiny, conspiracy, acts of sabotage and subversion, foreign intervention, blockade, etc. The decisive victory of the new system deprives C. of the strength to resist openly, so that it assumes more clandestine, disguised forms. By applying ideological means and with the support of revisionist and nationalistic elements C. may pose a serious threat even for a consolidated new system (as was the case in Hungary in 1956 and in Czechoslovakia in 1968). Learning from its defeats, it invents more subtle and sophisticated forms of struggle against the revolutionary forces. In its struggle against the revolution, it often resorts to preventive measures. The extreme form of C. is fascism (q.v.) which, if it comes to power, means the establishment of C.'s most reactionary terrorist dictatorship.

The danger of counter-revolutionary activities increases when the class forces are more or less balanced, when the revolutionary classes are not yet capable of taking all power in their hands and winning a decisive victory, and the ruling classes find themselves unable to control the situation. At such moments, the struggle becomes more acute, C. steps up its activities and makes use of the levers of power still at its disposal, its positions and influence, as well as the mass media, to obstruct the revolutionary process, or even reverse it. If it does not meet with a powerful rebuff, it becomes still more brazen and utilises the unstable political situation in its own interests. To check the reactionaries, the revo-



lutionary forces must constantly display initiative, cohesion and vigour.

The social roots of C. are found mainly among the exploiting classes, which are deprived of power, income and privileges as a result of the revolution. These classes comprise an insignificant section of society, so that, to confront the revolution, they need substantial support from the masses. Counter-revolutionaries do all they can to split the ranks of the suppressed classes; they resort to deceit, promises, blackmail and demagogy to win politically backward, philistine and vacillating strata of the population over to their side. They take advantage of petty-bourgeois uncertainty, inertia, force of habit and the international ties of reactionary circles, the property and financial resources still remaining at their disposal, their ties with the highly-qualified specialists in industry and administration, the mass media and the army. C. makes the most of any errors made by the revolutionary classes and parties, as well as of extremist actions by leftist elements and groups in order to frighten off certain social sections from the revolution. The struggle against C. may be successful if its influence is checked in time and it is isolated from mass social forces and organisations. Prompt action must be taken to liquidate counter-revolutionary hotbeds, put a stop to leftist gambles and, most important, implement radical revolutionary reforms in the interests of the working people and tackle creative revolutionary tasks. The history of the revolutionary movement proves that victory over C. may only be achieved by way of developing the revolution, bringing it to its consummation.

From the point of view of the broad historical perspective, C. is doomed, since it opposes the historical necessity of establishing a new, progressive system, yet it may retard social progress, cause zigzags and retreats in evolution, thus making the revolutionary struggle more painful. It inflicts more deprivations on the suppressed classes and sometimes provokes mass bloodshed, for as a rule it brings terror in its wake.

In their struggle against the revolution, counter-revolutionaries usually find support among world reactionaries by entering into international alliances. One example is

the Holy Alliance set up by the European monarchs after the victory over Napoleon to suppress the revolutionary movement. Today, world reaction has its stronghold in imperialism. Despite the growing trend towards detente, imperialist reactionary forces are stubbornly trying to set up a "holy alliance" spearheaded against the revolutionary movement. They brazenly intervene in the internal affairs of other states (see Export of Counter-revolution), violating the generally accepted norms and principles of international law. The socialist countries and the world communist movement are waging a resolute struggle against the imperialist export of C. and rendering every kind of assistance to peoples who have fallen prey to aggression.

**Criticism and Self-criticism**, the method, applied by the Communist Party, and in socialist society also by the entire people in their revolutionary transformative activity; the motive forces in the evolution of socialist and communist society; and a principle of moral education and self-education.

The application of this method is based on the Marxist theory of knowledge, a materialist interpretation of nature and social phenomena. Objectively, C. and S. are born of dialectical contradictions, differences in the interests of classes and social groups emerging during historical development and the struggle between the old and the new, the progressive and the conservative, inherent in all spheres of social life.

Under capitalism, which is characterised by acute social antagonisms, Marx saw the "weapon of criticism" as a means for the proletarian class struggle. Lenin also emphasised many times that C. and S. are vitally important for the accomplishment of a socialist revolution and for the activities of the Communist Party.

Under socialism, where social processes are free from antagonistic contradictions, the new and the progressive win their positions in a different way as compared to exploiting societies. Nevertheless, the establishment of the new and the overcoming of obstacles to its development are only possible by timely resolving social contra-

dictions with the help of C. and S., and the struggle of opinions and ideas. As production, social relations, and the people's consciousness develop, the need arises to reassess and improve experience, practice, and current theoretical concepts and notions. C. and S. serve as a means to this end, consolidating that which is new. Account must be taken of the fact that, in bourgeois society, the proletariat and its party utilise the "weapon of criticism" to overthrow the old system, while under socialism C. and S. are essentially aimed at strengthening and developing the foundations of socialist society. The need for C. and S. is also rooted in the fact that subjective mistakes are inevitable in such a tremendous cause as the building of a new society. Collective leadership in large measure prevents mistakes and errors but it cannot exclude them altogether. The Marxist-Leninist Party does not conceal or ignore them. The 25th Congress of the CPSU decreed that "every aspect of the activity of this or that organisation, of this or that individual should be given an objective evaluation... that the existing shortcomings should be subjected to all-round analysis in order to eliminate them" (*Documents and Resolutions. XXVth Congress of the CPSU*, p. 83).

The content, nature, forms and methods of C. and S. in socialist society are determined by social relations, the principles of party life, and the aims and tasks of social development. Criticism is a consequential political act, involving, to a certain extent, the interests of the broad public; the attitude towards it is determined by the positions from which it is launched, by the aims it pursues and the result it actually achieves. The Communist Party and the socialist state only support criticism that helps society advance along the path of progress and successfully tackle the tasks that arise. The CPSU has always been ruthless in its criticism of imperialism's reactionary policy and of bourgeois ideology. There can be no compromise in criticising and fighting these phenomena. At the same time, the CPSU tries to resolve differences of opinion and contradictions with its comrades-

in-arms through painstaking comradely criticism and conviction. Criticism is more useful if it is delivered in a good-natured way. The best kind of criticism, that most acceptable to society, takes the form of well-substantiated and tactful suggestions and is based on real and tested facts.

C. and S. depend in their development on the sum-total of objective and subjective conditions: the economic and political maturity of socialist society, the internal and external situation, the nature of the tasks facing the country, the extent of democracy, and the level of consciousness of Communists and other citizens. To develop C. and S., the CPSU and the Soviet state are working to create the necessary conditions and safeguards by making full use of all democratic institutions socialist society has at its disposal and by demanding that socialist legality be stringently observed. The right to criticism in the Soviet Union is stipulated in the Constitution of the USSR (1977) (Art. 49).

Regular party, trade union and Komсомol meetings, as well as general meetings of the working people, conferences and congresses, sessions of Soviets, plenary sessions of elected leading bodies of party and public organisations, all kind of assemblies, the mass media, etc. all serve to make C. and S. heard, whether they concern inner-party life or national affairs. The CPSU is working to provide the necessary social support for positive criticism everywhere, in order to consider and implement every useful critical remark. It has become a habit with most working people's collectives and Party organisations to sum up all critical remarks and proposals made at meetings, conferences and congresses, and take measures to ensure and rigorously check upon their implementation. The Soviet press regularly informs the public about what has been done in response to letters, as well as critical articles printed in newspapers and periodicals. The broad Party and public support rendered to critical proposals makes Party and government bodies, and public organisations and their workers pay close attention to criticism from the masses and

react to it promptly and efficiently. This approach makes the broad public more active and willing to take the initiative and teaches them to be principled and irreconcilable towards anti-social phenomena.

The attitude to criticism, and the ability to listen and respond to it efficiently are a touch-stone of the political maturity of Communists, leaders, and all members of Soviet society. The Communist Party ruthlessly censures those who show bureaucratic self-conceit and vanity and reject criticism off-hand. "He who has lost his ability to make a critical assessment of his activity, he who has lost touch with the masses, who breeds toadies and bootlickers, and who has lost the trust of the Communists cannot be a Party leader" (*Documents and Resolutions. XXVth Congress of the CPSU*, p. 86).

C. and S. assume growing importance today because of the increasing scale and complexity of the tasks involved in building communism, as well as the predominance of intensive factors in economic development and the greater effectiveness and better quality of all work.

**Cultural Revolution**, transformation in the sphere of culture implemented in order to fulfil the tasks effecting a radical socialist change in society (transforming the social essence of culture, establishing, in the shortest possible time, the conditions for going over from a bourgeois to a socialist culture, etc.). The need for C.R. was substantiated by Lenin, who showed that not all the cultural prerequisites necessary for building a new society can mature under capitalism, since many of them are only created after a socialist revolution (q. v.). C.R. makes it possible to tackle such fundamental tasks as the introduction of a new organisation of labour, a new system of management, broad democratisation of all social activities, ideological education, the struggle against bourgeois morality and religion (see also *Survivals of the Past in the People's Minds and Behaviour*). Lenin emphasised that C.R. by no means spells an off-hand, indiscriminate rejection of all preceding culture and all positive achievements by mankind.

The concrete tasks and forms of C.R.

depend on the cultural level and structure of society's cultural life, which have been established in a given country. They bear the imprint of the national and historical features typical of the countries that have taken the path of radical social change. The overwhelming mass of the Russian people had no access to cultural achievements, and mass illiteracy was inherited from the past. The first act of C.R. in Russia, therefore, was to hand over all cultural institutions — museums, theatres, libraries, etc. — to the state. They were all made to serve the people. In 1918, the Council of People's Commissars, the highest body of state power in Soviet Russia, issued a decree, "On the Eradication of Illiteracy among the Population of the RSFSR". The education of the illiterate assumed the most diverse forms. In 1923, a voluntary society called Down with Illiteracy was set up. From 1928 to 1932, the fight-illiteracy campaign assumed especially wide scope owing to active participation of Kom-somol members. The system of general education schools and of higher education was also modified. A uniform labour school was instituted in 1918. All the restrictions that had existed in tsarist Russia on entering a higher educational institution were abolished. Tuition became free both in schools and higher educational institutions. Special allowances were paid to those in need, and students received grants. To help young people from the working class and the peasantry who wished to enter higher educational institutions, special workers' faculties were set up. The social composition of the students' body gradually changed, with students of worker-peasant stock comprising a growing share. Women were granted equal rights to education with men. Extra-mural institutions, such as libraries, clubs, village reading-rooms, Palaces of Culture, museums, etc. assumed a large share of the educational work. In this way, the essential conditions were created in the country for the emergence of a new intelligentsia (q. v.), whose interests were closely tied up with the tasks of building socialism, and for the broad population to take an active part in all spheres of social life. Especially rapid cultural growth was seen in the former outskirts

of Russia: schools with teaching conducted in native tongues and higher educational institutions were established there. Many nationalities acquired written languages of their own for the first time ever. National art flourished, and the ranks of the national intelligentsia swelled. C.R. was carried out under the guidance of the state and with the working masses' active participation.

In some East-European People's Democracies, a rather high cultural standard of the population had already been achieved under capitalism (e.g. in Germany and Czechoslovakia), so they did not face the task of eradicating illiteracy, but had other problems of their own: in Germany, for example, society's intellectual life was strongly influenced by fascism (q.v.), and in Czechoslovakia, the bourgeois world outlook had taken deep root in various sections of society. In Bulgaria, C.R. proceeded in a specific way because the bulk of the Bulgarian intelligentsia had always had close ties with the people and were progressive-minded. In Hungary and Poland, C.R. was seriously impeded by the strong influence of the Catholic Church. The Socialist Republic of Vietnam, the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, and Cuba faced mass illiteracy among the working people.

The significance of cultural and intellectual factors in life has been increasing under developed socialism. Cultural achievements create new opportunities for ideological and educational work. New conditions for developing cultural production are being formed by utilising the advance provided by the scientific and technological revolution.

## D

**Defence of the Socialist Homeland**, a law of the socialist revolution and the building of socialism and communism, reflected in the corresponding home and foreign political activities of the Communist Party and the government, a moral and legal duty of the citizens of a socialist country.

According to the Constitution of the USSR (1977), D.S.H. is one of the most

important functions of the state and the concern of the whole people. In order to defend the socialist gains and the Soviet people's peaceful labour, its sovereignty and territorial integrity, the Soviet Union maintains the Armed Forces of the USSR and has introduced compulsory conscription for all males.

The Constitution of the USSR emphasises that D.S.H. is the sacred duty of every citizen of the USSR and that military service in the ranks of the Armed Forces of the USSR is an honourable duty.

A scientific view of D.S.H. was elaborated by Marx and Engels. While exposing the bourgeois ideologists' slander to the effect that Communists were going to abolish the concept of Homeland, they showed that, under the exploiting system, the working class is deprived of a true homeland, though it is far from indifferent to the fate of its native land; moreover, as a socialist homeland emerges to replace the bourgeois one after a proletarian revolution, the working class is faced with defending it against counter-revolution (q.v.). Lenin also made a great contribution to the theory of D.S.H. The formation of the Soviet Armed Forces and the organisation of the defence of the young Soviet Republic were closely connected with his name. "Since October 25, 1917, we have been defencists. We are for 'defence of the fatherland'; but that patriotic war towards which we are moving is a war for a socialist fatherland, for socialism as a fatherland, for the Soviet Republic as a *contingent* of the world army of socialism" (V.I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 27, pp. 162-63). The slogan "Defence of the Homeland" was used by imperialist ideologists and social-chauvinists to justify the imperialist war and split the proletarians in various countries; now it was filled with an entirely different content, expressing the organic unity of the patriotic (national) and international tasks facing the working class and all working people. The problem of defence of the homeland becomes especially urgent following the socialist revolution, a radical social upheaval that, in the final analysis, leads to the complete elimination of the exploiting classes. The need for armed defence of the proletariat's gains follows

from the aggressive nature of imperialism and the tendency among all forces of the old world to unite and launch increasingly fierce attempts to overthrow the working people's power (see also Civil War).

D.S.H. is inspired and organised by the Marxist-Leninist party. Under its leadership, the Soviet people defended the world's first socialist homeland against armed intervention during the Civil War (1918-20) and then in the Great Patriotic War (1941-45), a mortal battle against the shock forces of imperialism, Nazi Germany and its accomplices.

Once socialism grew beyond the boundaries of a single country, its defence assumed an inter-state dimension: a united system of defence has emerged, sealed by bilateral agreements and the Warsaw Treaty. Vigorous efforts by the Soviet Union and the fraternal socialist countries aimed at creating such a system frustrated the imperialist attempt to put an end to the popular-democratic system in the People's Democratic Republic of Korea, prevented the restoration of capitalism in Hungary and the reprisal against revolutionary Cuba, and curbed the "quiet counter-revolution" in Czechoslovakia. The US armed aggression against the heroic people of Vietnam also failed. Today, D.S.H. involves safeguarding the economic, political and cultural achievements of all the countries comprising the world socialist community (q. v.). The gains of socialism are now embodied in the balance of world forces, which has changed in favour of the working class and all working people, and in the growth of the world liberation movement. The most urgent problem today is to prevent a new world war. It is no longer enough to defend the revolutionary gains from external encroachments and rebuff imperialist policies of aggression and *diktat*. To effectively oppose the danger of war posed by the imperialist reaction, it is necessary to work towards establishing international relations based on the principles of peaceful coexistence (see Peaceful Coexistence of States with Different Social Systems; Struggle for Peace, *Detente*). The struggle for peace launched by the USSR and other socialist countries on the basis of the Peace Programme adopted at the 24th,

and further developed at the 25th and 26th CPSU Congresses, has achieved considerable success. There are still influential forces in the capitalist countries that stick to the Cold War categories and come out for an arms race and stockpiling of weapons and nuclear potentials, that preach rabid anticommunism and anti-Sovietism, and are prepared to take part in all kinds of adventuristic actions. The CPSU is therefore compelled, as was pointed out at the 25th and the 26th CPSU Congresses, to pay due attention to strengthening the country's defence capability and modernising its armed forces as long as NATO is operative and the militarist circles continue the arms race. The USSR and the other members of the Warsaw Treaty Organisation will strengthen their military-political alliance.

D.S.H. and the defence of the socialist gains involves various spheres of state activity and has different forms. In peacetime, it includes the all-round preparation of the country and the army for rebuffing attempts on the part of imperialism and other reactionary circles to undermine the positions of socialism by military or other means and export counter-revolution. In wartime, it assumes the form of open military confrontation with the enemy, which involves making the frontlines and the rear an integrated whole, and mobilising the total strength of the country (and of the coalition of socialist states) to completely rout the aggressor.

The most important conditions for reliable D.S.H. are: strengthening of the economic, social, political, and ideological base of the socialist community's defence capability; improvement of the socialist countries' military organisation; correct policies pursued by Marxist-Leninist parties and the socialist state. The building of the material and technical base of socialism and communism, the development of socialist social relations, an increase in the effectiveness of social production resulting from scientific and technical progress, and the extension of economic integration (see Integration, Socialist) enable the socialist countries to maintain their defence potential at the level required to snub all aggressors. Changes in society's social structure,

the rapprochement of the working class, the co-operated peasantry and the intelligentsia, of all nations and nationalities, and the consistent development of socialist democracy (see Democracy, Socialist) promote closer cohesion of the people and the army. The growth of communist consciousness and the conviction that the freedom and independence of the homeland must be defended by all available means, the support given by the socialist community to the young progressive states, and the assistance rendered to peoples that have been victims of aggression and are engaged in combating imperialism and neo-colonialism, add to the moral, psychological and emotional strength of the defenders of the socialist homeland (see also Proletarian Internationalism).

**"Deideologisation", Theory of, a bourgeois concept** widely used to oppose Marxist-Leninist ideology and to undermine the ideological foundations of the socialist system. Its adherents describe ideology as a false view of the world, distorting reality and serving a certain group of persons as a means for attaining definite political objectives. The US sociologist Daniel Bell, one of the authors of this theory, regards ideology as ideas turned into social levers, which are set in motion in order to channel public opinion in a chosen direction; ideology thus interpreted has nothing to do with the truth or falsity of its principles and propositions, and is aimed at justifying the interests of the opposing forces. Such theses are employed to refute the scientific nature of communist ideology on the pretext that there cannot be any science-based ideology in general. While Marxist ideology prevails in the socialist countries, in the West there is no dominant ideology: there is only "pure" social science (sociology, political science, etc.) which is allegedly consonant with the era of scientific and technological progress and the growing rationalisation of all aspects of social life. It leaves no place for any single ideology, which is nothing but a survival of the past. Yet the hopes bourgeois ideologists placed in the "decay" of socialist convictions among the popular masses in the socialist countries under the impact of scientific and technological progress and improved material standards and

in a diminishing status of Marxist-Leninist ideology have come to nothing (see Communist Ideology). Many of them have been compelled to recognise the failure of their forecasts of some inexorable "deideologisation" underway in the world. The anti-communist Milovan Djilas, for example, called his own thesis to the effect that Marxist ideology is bound to disappear a great illusion. Increasingly current today is the thesis of the need for substituting "reideologisation" for "deideologisation". This implies the creation of a universal ideology opposed to Marxism-Leninism. Calls to elaborate an ideology which would bring success to corporate activities, are found on the pages of *Fortune* magazine, the mouthpiece of US monopolies.

Bell had to recognise that his thesis of the "end of ideology" referred to the ideologies of the past (he considered Marxism as one of them), rather than to ideology as such. The "end of ideology" does not signify that all social conflicts have been resolved and that intellectuals have for ever renounced their search for a new ideology. There is no clearly-defined concept behind the term "new ideology"; the sworn enemies of Marxism-Leninism reject ideology as a reflection of social being from the angle of the interests of a certain class; they attempt to present "new", "universal" ideology as expressing (with the help of such abstract notions as "freedom", "democracy", etc.) general human, non-class strivings, typical of "normal human nature". But the reference to "general human interests" and to abstract philosophic, sociological and other categories cannot conceal that the bourgeoisie is in no position to create a new, dynamic and promising ideology capable of competing with Marxism-Leninism, for it is unable to find a realistic solution to the major problems of social development and mobilise the popular masses for tackling the progressive tasks raised by our times (see Modern Epoch).

**Democracy, Bourgeois**, a form of bourgeois state which began to take shape after the bourgeois revolutions that scored victories in England in the 17th and in France in the late 18th centuries. The process took several decades, with the working class and popular masses rather than the bourgeoisie

waging a stubborn struggle for the consistent implementation of the democratic ideas proclaimed by progressive thinkers from among the revolutionary bourgeoisie. The first independent action launched by the proletariat in France in 1848, resulted in the bourgeoisie betraying the revolutionary cause. Lenin echoed Marx when he remarked that "the bourgeoisie strives to put an end to the bourgeois revolution half-way from its destination, when freedom has been only half-won, by a deal with the old authorities and the landlords. This striving is grounded in the class interests of the bourgeoisie". (V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 12, p. 335.)

The economic roots of B.D. lie in such prerequisites for the capitalist mode of production as the possibility of buying and selling labour power and exchanging commodities on the market in accordance with the law of value. Private capitalist enterprise required political confirmation of the principles of personal freedom and formal equality of all citizens before the law. The proclamation of these principles at the dawn of capitalism was historically progressive, for it spelled the elimination of feudal bondage that chained the peasant to the landlord, and the abolition of feudal privileges, while creating the legal and constitutional base for the struggle for social progress. The entire set of bourgeois-democratic institutions was built on that base: universal suffrage; division of the various forms of power and official recognition of the pre-eminence of legislative power; the rights and freedoms of the individual (active and passive suffrage, inviolability of the person and the home, privacy of correspondence, freedom of conscience and of speech, of the press and of assembly, freedom of movement, etc.); open hearing in court and the jury system, elected local self-government bodies, etc.

Democratic institutions under capitalism are invariably limited, and in many respects even formal, in nature. Thus, the equality proclaimed in the political sphere is in irreconcilable contradiction with the economic system of capitalist society, its relations of exploitation and oppression. The benefits of individual freedom are mostly

enjoyed by the prosperous strata of the population, while for those who have to spend their whole life toiling for their daily bread, freedom is often no more than an empty phrase. Freedom of the press and other similar freedoms mainly serve the interests of the big capitalist monopolies, which control the newspapers, periodicals, radio stations, cinemas, theatres and TV networks using them to befuddle the public as they see fit.

Marx, Engels and Lenin exposed the limited and formal nature of B.D. and, at the same time, emphasised its relatively progressive character compared with the other forms of the bourgeoisie's class domination (see Dictatorship of the Bourgeoisie). The proletariat and all working people are far from indifferent to the form the bourgeois state assumes, for this is what largely determines the way they struggle for both their everyday economic interests and the final goals set by the revolutionary working-class movement. The existence of legal ways and means of struggle makes it easier to establish revolutionary political working-class parties, combine the workers' movement with scientific communism, disseminate socialist ideas and rally forces for the onslaught on capital. The more cohesive and conscientious the working class is, the better the chance of its using certain democratic institutions, particularly parliaments, in its own interests (see Parliamentary Activity of Communists). At the same time, the better use the working-class movement and its communist vanguard make of democratic rights and freedoms, the more the ruling bourgeoisie strives to curtail or eliminate them altogether, to repeal the laws it has itself proclaimed and resort to violent means for suppressing the masses. If the balance of class power and other factors allow it, the most reactionary sections of the bourgeoisie abolish democratic institutions, introduce martial law and use violence with respect to the revolutionary working-class movement, even going as far as assassinating proletarian and other progressive political leaders. This trend has become particularly evident under monopoly capitalism, the political superstructure of which was aptly characterised

by Lenin as a turn from democracy to reaction; the extreme embodiment of this turn is fascism (q. v.).

Today, the proletariat is the principal champion of democratic institutions: it has to put up a stubborn fight to defend them against encroachment by the most reactionary circles of the monopoly bourgeoisie. This struggle is becoming increasingly important, for, given favourable internal and external conditions, the opportunity may arise for democratic institutions to be used for preparing revolutionary transformations and advancing towards socialism. "Capitalism and imperialism," Lenin wrote, "can be overthrown only by economic revolution. They cannot be overthrown by democratic transformations, even the most 'ideal'. But a proletariat not schooled in the struggle for democracy is incapable of performing an economic revolution" (V.I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 23, p. 25).

The struggle for democracy is a component part of that for socialism — such is the principle of the world communist movement. It is not, of course, B.D. as a state form that is implied here, for this is doomed to extinction, but the sum total of democratic principles and institutions that constitute an irrevocable achievement of the working class and all the working people, and are an important weapon in their fight for social progress (see also Democracy, Socialist).

**Democracy, Socialist**, a general political form of the socialist state.

Democracy is an intrinsic feature of the socialist system. Labour freed from exploitation is the basic condition for personal freedom, and man's need for work and the ensuing right to remuneration according to his labour input is the basic condition for equality. The socialist system of economic organisation, relying on public ownership of the means of production, ensures genuine rule by the people. Equality, personal freedom and people's rule are the historical goal of socialism and communism. S.D. as a synonym of the broad popular masses' creative endeavour is not only an objective set by the new society; it is also an important means for attaining its other objectives — e. g. economic and cultural growth.

Socialism creates its own democratic system, consonant with the new conditions of production, and strongly promotes socialist and communist social relations. This objective, however, cannot be achieved at once. The formation and evolution of S.D. is an objective process determined by a diverse set of internal and external factors.

The socialist state emerges as an instrument of the dictatorship of the proletariat (q. v.) directed against the exploiting classes; it defends the basic interests of the broad popular masses, who are building a new society. The birth of proletarian dictatorship signified the appearance of a new historical type of democracy. From its very inception, the Soviet socialist state was built as a consistently democratic organisation of the working people, who acquired a real opportunity, through the Soviets (q. v.) and other mass organisations, to determine their country's fate and manage social affairs for the first time in history.

The experience gained by the Soviet Union and other socialist countries makes it possible to distinguish major features typical of S.D. as a historical phenomenon. The representative form of government, civic rights and democratic institutions and traditions, which have been established and upheld by society over centuries, are used creatively in the state administration under socialism. They are filled, of course, with a new content, are modified and improved to serve the fundamental purpose — that of establishing and developing efficient power by the people. But socialism cannot confine itself to past experience; it creates new democratic forms corresponding to the economic conditions obtaining in socialist society and gives democracy unprecedented scope.

Under socialism, for the first time ever, the task is set of drawing all citizens into the management of affairs of state. In this, the organisation of government bodies elected on the basis of universal, equal and direct suffrage by secret ballot is highly instrumental. Alongside representative democracy, various forms of immediate democracy are developing under socialism; these are embodied in the activities of public and other organisations established



by the population, in the system of people's control, nation-wide discussion of fundamental draft laws (a fine example is the all-Union discussion of the Draft Constitution of the USSR in 1977).

The constitutions of the socialist countries legalise the entire set of man's rights and freedoms — freedom of speech, the press and assembly, of demonstrations and meetings, freedom of conscience, personal immunity and the sanctity of the home, and freedom of movement. Socialist society guarantees all citizens the exercise of these rights, placing the necessary material means at their disposal. At the same time, it imposes certain civic duties on its members, such as the duty to work conscientiously, to observe labour and public discipline, to defend the Socialist Homeland, etc.

While providing citizens with broad opportunities for freely expressing their will and opinion on certain public matters, the socialist state nips in the bud all attempts to use freedom of speech and other political freedoms to the detriment of the working people; propaganda of war, racial hatred, national prejudice and anti-socialist or anti-humane views is prohibited by law.

The greatest achievement of S.D. is the proclamation and guarantee of man's social rights; the right to work and rest, to education and material maintenance in old age and in case of disablement. The realisation of these rights of citizens of the Soviet Union and the other socialist countries has in large measure been ensured by the fact that the economy under socialism develops according to plan, that economic crises and unemployment have been eradicated and a large share of the national income goes to meet the needs of the working people through wages and social consumption funds. Social rights are constantly being extended and filled with new content as the socialist economy advances and social wealth is multiplied.

Behind the evolution of S.D. is the Communist Party, which guides all state and public organisations of the working people, its policy reflecting the interests of all classes and strata of socialist society.

S.D., as the highest ever type of democratic organisation of society, has covered

a long road, evolving new forms of organisation of political life and creating democratic institutions and traditions. Violations of socialist legality and other negative phenomena connected with the personality cult (q. v.), have done serious harm to S.D. in the USSR; the restoration and development of the Leninist principles of Party and state life, however, ensured a further improvement of it.

As socialism has grown beyond a single state and become a world socialist system, various forms of socialist statehood have taken shape, reflecting specific national conditions, the economic and socio-political development and maturity of socialism, etc. For all their variety, however, S.D. is the socialist state's universal political form. Work is carried out in the socialist countries to extend S.D., its most typical features being increased involvement of the broad population in direct government of the state, creation of the conditions essential for a strictly scientific approach to decision making in all spheres and for more efficient operation of the state machine (see *Scientific Management of Society*). The comprehensive development of Soviet society's political system is an important aspect of building communism in the USSR. The adoption, on October 7, 1977, of the new Constitution of the USSR, the Fundamental Law of the world's first socialist state of the whole people, was an important landmark on this road (see *State of the Whole People*).

As a form of the state, S.D. will eventually develop into a system of communist social self-government. The forms and methods of popular rule and the principles of personal freedom that have emerged under socialism will develop in a natural way in communist society, shedding their political nature (see *Communist Social Self-government*).

**Democratic Centralism**, a fundamental principle for governing socialist society, building and organising the activities of the Communist Party, the socialist state, and public organisations.

D.C. implies combining democratism (i. e. full power of the working people, their independent activity and initiative, elected ruling bodies and their accounta-

bility to the masses) with centralisation, i. e. leadership from a single centre, subordination of the minority to the majority, and strict discipline. D.C. underlies party, state and economic administration in the USSR and the other socialist countries. The Soviet Constitution (1977) stipulates that the Soviet state and its activities shall be organised according to the principle of D.C., i. e. all bodies vested with state power from top to bottom shall be elected and accountable to the people, and lower bodies shall be obliged to comply with decisions taken by higher ones. D.C. couples single leadership with the initiative and responsibility of each state body and official for the job he holds.

The principle of D.C. was outlined by Marx and Engels and implemented by them for the first time in the Communist League, and later in the First International. They were prompted by the working-class movement's need to unify its forces in the struggle against capitalism, consolidate its proletarian vanguard and make it cohesive.

Lenin creatively elaborated the principles of D.C. under the new historical conditions, when the age of proletarian revolutions had come. The principle of D.C. has been fully implemented for the first time by the CPSU, in its organisational structure and activities. It was proclaimed at the First (Tammerfors) Bolshevik Conference in 1905, and then by the Fourth (Unity) Congress of the RSDLP in 1906, which wrote in the Party Rules that "all Party organisations shall be built according to the principle of democratic centralism".

D.C. has stood the test of time, proving most effective in forming a Communist Party both in an exploiting society and under socialism. Today it constitutes the unshakeable foundations of the organisational structure and activities of the Marxist-Leninist Communist and Workers' Parties.

The need to build the Communist Party according to democratic principles stems largely from the decisive role played by the working class and working masses in making history. The organisation of inner-Party life on the basis of D.C. ensures that

the Communists have the decisive say in working out Party policy and forming its leading bodies, and creates the essential prerequisites for their vigorous activities to implement the Party's objectives and programme. The need to build the Party on the basis of centralism arises from the class nature of society, as well as the nature and goals of the Party itself as a political organisation of the working class aimed at overthrowing the exploiting system and building socialism. In capitalist society, Lenin wrote, "in its struggle for power the proletariat has no other weapon but organisation" (V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 7, p. 415).

In socialist society, with the Communist Party as the political leader in effecting broad socio-economic transformations, the high demands made on the Party's cohesion result from its social role as the people's vanguard, the need for the consistent implementation of socialist ideals, for a concerted socio-political, economic and cultural policy, and for a firm foreign policy. The party's ideological and organisational unity is indispensable for it to be able to withstand the pressure exerted by imperialist ideology on both the working people and Communists themselves. The Communist Party is built and operates on the basis of uniform ideological, tactical and organisational principles. It is led by the Party Congress, its highest body, and in the interval between Congresses — by the Central Committee. Decisions adopted by the Party Congress and its Central Committee are binding for all Communists. All organisations included in the Party are subordinated to the Party centre; decisions and directives of higher Party bodies are obligatory for lower Party organisations; the minority in the organisations and their leading bodies is subordinate to the majority. Centralism also implies that Party bodies are accountable to their Party organisations and to higher bodies, as well as strict Party discipline and an equal responsibility to the Party of all its members, irrespective of the posts they occupy. Those who refuse to comply with a decision taken by a higher Party body, place themselves outside the Party. The Rules of the CPSU and of other Communist Parties provide

for special safeguards against disruption of Party unity and Party discipline. Party discipline and a democratic approach to Party affairs are mutually dependent. It is impossible arbitrarily to strengthen centralism and narrow down Party democracy without causing considerable harm to the Party's vitality, its leading role and the respect it enjoys. It is equally impossible not to inflict serious harm on the Party, if the need for centralism, exactingness and strict Party discipline is ignored while democracy is extended. The correlation between democracy and centralism is determined by specific historical conditions and the maturity of inner-Party relations, as well as by the tasks facing it. During the building of communism, the CPSU policy, aimed at the all-out development of Party democracy and simultaneous strengthening of Party discipline, is the main line for developing inner-Party relations.

After the victory of a socialist revolution, and as socialism grows stronger, D.C. takes firmer root in the system of state power and administration. The need for the socialist state machinery to be built and to function on the basis of D.C. was substantiated by Lenin, who stressed the importance of combining uniformity in decision-making on fundamental issues of state policy with the use of diverse democratic forms of administration locally. "Stereotyped forms and uniformity imposed from above have nothing in common with democratic and socialist centralism. The unity of essentials, of fundamentals, of the substance, is not disturbed but ensured by *variety* in details, in specific local features, in methods of *approach*, in *methods* of exercising control" (V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 26, p. 413).

The implementation of the principle of D.C. in managing the economy is especially important under socialism. "Our task," Lenin said, "now is to carry out democratic centralism in the economic sphere" (V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 27, p. 208). D.C. in economic policy is based, in material and technical terms, on modern large-scale socialist production, and in economic terms — on socialist ownership of the means of production, which joins all

branches of production into a single whole. The fact that state power is in the hands of the working people, as well as the socio-political and ideological unity of society and the community of the basic interests of society, classes, collectives and individuals, creates the essential socio-economic conditions. D.C. in building up the economy makes it possible to introduce uniform state planning and utilise material and labour resources in the most rational way. As socialism advances and gains in strength, the objective opportunities increase for the further development of both democracy and centralism.

Underestimation or rejection of D.C. as the principle for guiding socialist society, and building Party and state, which is typical of right-wing and "left" revisionists, testifies to their non-scientific approach to socialism and to their being influenced by bourgeois and petty-bourgeois ideology.

"Democratic Socialism", an inconsistent, motley ideological concept elaborated by representatives of different (petty-bourgeois and liberal-bourgeois) political trends opposed to the consistent and science-based ideology of real socialism rather than to capitalist ideology. It is the most widespread form of imitation socialism. "D.S." is the official ideology of the right-wing Social-Democrats, in power in several capitalist countries, who adhere to bourgeois-apologetic or anti-communist positions. Bruno Kreisky (Austria) and Willy Brandt (FRG) are its typical representatives. "D.S." is also popular among left-wing Social-Democrats (Young Social-Democrats in the FRG, F. M. Nicolaisen in Denmark, et al.), who sometimes severely criticise the capitalist system, but as a whole lay special stress on system-modifying reforms of capitalism, rather than on its revolutionary transformation into a socialist society. "D.S." is manifest in the form of the "socialist model" put forward by right-wing revisionists and renegades, such as Roger Garaudy, Ernst Fischer and Ota Šik, who have broken away from Communist Parties and are trying to counterbalance the experience gained by real socialism with their revisionist views (see Revisionism). "D.S." can also assume the form of a flirtation with socialism by certain representatives of

the left-wing liberal bourgeoisie, who are trying to formulate their own "socialist" alternative solution to society's problems. "D.S." can be traced in the reformist views of Left Catholics (A. Comin, G. Montaron, L. B. Morales), who sharply criticise the vices of modern bourgeois society, but cannot see any realistic way to rid the people of capitalist exploitation and estrangement. This concept is current among young people in the New Left movement, too; they try to replace their inadequate theoretical knowledge and the vagueness of their class positions with a purely emotional approach to all problems. The concept of "D.S." is widely applied by Zionist socialists — "Kibbutzists" (M. Butler, D. Ben-Gurion), and in the form of special "Latin American", "African" or "Japanese" varieties of socialism.

Whatever guise it assumes, however, "D.S." invariably serves the revisionist and bourgeois ideologists, being, in fact, an ideology that is socialist in word but revisionist in deed. Renunciation of the ideas of scientific socialism and its fundamental propositions concerning the need for a radical, revolutionary transformation of society through a dictatorship of the proletariat (established by either peaceful or non-peaceful means), the elimination of private ownership of the means of production and of the entire system of capitalist social relations, concerning the leading role of the working class and the abolition of exploitation is typical of all theoretical concepts and programmes based on "D.S.", no matter how diverse and eclectic they may be. While totally ignoring the successes scored by real socialism (see World Socialist Community), "D.S." theorists accuse Communist Parties of not paying enough attention to the development of democratic institutions in the life of society.

In fact, the concepts of "unlimited democratisation" of social life, energetically promulgated by "D.S." adherents, are dead theoretical schemes based on a false, supra-class view of democracy; they ignore the objective dependence of the processes involved in its improvement on the concrete conditions and the development level of certain aspects of social life. Abstract phrase-mongering about democracy and

its unrestricted development in fact serves one aim: to isolate the working people from the Communist Parties that lead them, and divert their attention from the actual struggle for socialism, replacing it with a "struggle" for the democratisation of social life interpreted in a bourgeois way (see Democracy, Bourgeois). "D.S." has been made the pivot of the theoretical schemas of Social-Democrats and other political trends essentially in an attempt to confirm the proposition concerning the "reconciliation" of the working class with the state-monopoly system. "D.S." is also used to exert an ideological influence on the working masses in the socialist countries, particularly the young. The concept presents an especially great danger for the international working-class movement, because its apologists use socialist terminology in their theoretical schemas and verbally support socialist transformations, while actually leading it away from socialism. This is why "D.S." ideologists have a considerable working-class following, consisting of people insufficiently versed in ideological issues though genuinely committed to the cause of socialism.

To this day, "D.S." remains an amorphous, vague and eclectic concept, in both logical and theoretical terms. Neither Social-Democrats, nor other supporters of "D.S." could elaborate a uniform concept, so a pluralism of views had to be declared a typical feature of it. Modern conceptions of "D.S." rely on abstract humanistic, ethical and religious principles of supra-class social justice, a better life, freedom and peace throughout the world. Practically every party calling itself democratic socialist has its own distinct concept and interprets the fundamental issues of social transformation along so-called democratic lines in its own specific way. The main one among them is, in their opinion, to abide by the principles of "pluralistic democracy", i.e. attempt to attain socialism through reforms (see Reforms, Social), counting only on the bourgeois parliamentary system and a peaceful takeover of power as a result of elections. Though Marxists see social revolution as decisive for a radical transformation of society, they do not reject reforms as a way of social change

either: however, they find it necessary to draw a clear line between changes that, under the given historical conditions, can be attained through reforms and those that can only be implemented as a result of social revolution.

The ideologists of "D.S." ignore the fact that any way in which the working class gains power is essentially democratic, as it is directed at eradicating exploitation and transforming the state that exploits the working majority into one whose main purpose is concern for all society's workers.

Taken as a whole, the ideological programme of "D.S." renounces socialist transformations, which is graphically proved by the activities of Social-Democratic governments, which attempt to implement the ideas of "D.S." While in power, they do not even try to effect radical changes in the political or economic system of modern capitalism; they confine themselves to introducing minor, inconsequential reforms. This shows that the ideology of "D.S." is socialist only in word, while its genuine purpose is to perpetuate capitalism, rather than change it into a socialist society, i.e. to reform capitalism within its own bounds.

Detente — a qualitatively defined state of international relations that reflects their intentional restructuring on the principles of peaceful coexistence, equality, and the mutual security of all peoples and states. Only under detente will enough trust be created among states with antagonistic social systems to provide a realistic chance for reducing the military confrontation, stopping the arms race, and achieving disarmament.

With detente is connected a changeover in relations between states with opposite social systems from the cold war era of heightened tension, pressure and confrontation to a period of more peaceful and more civil relations in which these states take account of each other's national and class interests. This changeover represents the abandonment of great-power ambitions and isolationism for the pursuit of contacts, talks and exchanges, for equality in international affairs and a search for compromises on issues of dispute.

All this requires that war and preparations for it be eliminated from the life of

mankind and that its resources be redirected towards peaceful, constructive pursuits. The Communists were the first to make this point. The 20th Congress of the CPSU in 1956 pointed out that a world war was not fatally inevitable and that mankind should prevent it.

Prerequisites for detente took shape gradually, in the course of the class-based confrontation between the socialist and the capitalist systems, in the context of the advancing world revolutionary process and the weakening of capitalism's positions. With the rapid progress in science and technology and with the two world systems possessing nuclear weapons of mass extermination, the problem of mankind's survival became critical.

During the late sixties and early seventies, a number of countries in Europe became aware of the impending disaster. Taking into account the higher interests of social development as a whole, they brought their foreign policies in line with these interests. This led to the signing of a number of major agreements and treaties, ushering in the era of political detente. As was stressed at the June 1980 Plenum of the CC CPSU, "detente is the natural result of the alignment of forces in the world arena over the last several decades. The strategic military balance that has been reached between world capitalism and world socialism is an achievement of fundamental, historical importance. This factor restrains the aggressive aspirations of imperialism, and is in the true interests of all peoples. All schemes to shake this balance are doomed to failure". Detente therefore signals a new stage of competition and struggle between the two social systems. The code of detente is most fully spelled out in the Final Act of the Helsinki Conference on security and co-operation in Europe, signed by the heads of European states, the US and Canada in the summer of 1975. This code includes: (1) sovereign equality and the respect for the rights inherent in sovereignty; (2) non-use of force or the threat of force; (3) inviolability of borders; (4) territorial integrity of states; (5) peaceful settlement of disputes; (6) non-interference in internal affairs; (7) respect for human rights and the basic freedoms, including the freedom

of thought, conscience, religion and beliefs; (8) equal rights and the right of peoples to determine their own destiny; (9) co-operation among states; and 10) the conscientious fulfilment of obligations in the field of international law.

In addition, the Final Act spelled out an entire set of confidence-building measures and steps to promote security and disarmament. The signatory states pledged to foster the creation of an atmosphere of trust and respect among nations in every way. This is in line with their commitments to abstain from propaganda of wars of aggression and from using force or threat of force. Detente embodies all the positive phenomena and changes in the life of peoples and states, changes that have helped to normalise the international climate and improve the contemporary spiritual environment. Detente can therefore be called with full justification one of the greatest values and achievements of all peoples. Detente cannot be discussed in terms of whether it is "profitable" or "not profitable", "good" or "bad", for it is the only rational alternative to mankind's spontaneous slide down a slope at the bottom of which lies nuclear catastrophe at the hands of the imperialists.

Detente is a class-based as well as a universal concept that reflects a complex and multi-dimensional process by which international affairs are becoming more democratic and more humanistic. In it collide and intersect the interests of the most varied social and political forces of the present. By its nature detente is fluid. It has its high points and its low points; like coexistence and competition between the two world systems, it is a permanent fixture of international life. Furthermore, detente's force, the firmness of its elements and institutions varies in different regions of the world, depending on the arrangement and dynamics of social and class forces. Different classes, parties, states, public and international organisations have different interpretations of and motivations for detente. An intense ideological war is being waged around detente, its essence and prospects, a war similar to that being waged over peaceful coexistence.

The class approach to detente taken by bourgeois statesmen and politicians has

always been contradictory, ambivalent and inconsistent. Under the cover of detente, many of them desire to stop the revolutionary process, to overthrow the gains of socialism and destroy it from within, to regain for imperialism its former supremacy in world affairs. Yet detente does not alter the dialectics of class struggle, it is incapable of forcing capitalists and their henchmen to abandon their privileges, of forcing Communists to abandon their ideals and goals. Detente is a continuation of the struggle of social progress under new conditions and in different forms. Moreover, in certain cases only organised mass actions are capable of forcing bourgeois governments to honour agreements and treaties that were signed in the spirit of detente.

Influenced by detente, by the mid-seventies people began to shake off their fatalistic views that the problems of war, peace and disarmament could not be regulated by man, for the possibility arose to significantly curb the aggressive nature of imperialism, prevent a world holocaust, and ensure the peaceful development and social progress of nations.

It is for this reason that the most reactionary forces of imperialism, above all in America, try in every way to undermine detente and impede political dialogue. In the early eighties they fired up war hysteria and are now trying to dupe the people into believing that a limited nuclear war against the Soviet Union and other socialist countries is acceptable. These forces are out to tip the military balance in their favour and provide themselves with a first-strike capability by producing essentially new types of weapons.

In order to preserve the fruits of detente and restrain the aggressiveness of imperialism and the forces of reaction, the 26th Congress of the CPSU advanced a number of new proposals on strengthening international security and halting the arms race. One such initiative entails the USSR's preparedness to extend military confidence-building measures to the entire European part of the USSR, provided that the Western powers take corresponding steps. Another such proposal expressed the USSR's preparedness to enter into concrete negotiations on confidence-building measures in the

Far East with all concerned parties. These measures have one purpose in mind — to reduce the level of conflicts, to prevent them from appearing and thereby expand the zone of detente.

In turn, in order to halt the arms race, put a freeze on nuclear weapons and start the process of disarmament, confidence and trust must be strengthened by means of political detente. This is precisely the aim of the new concrete proposals set forth in the Political Declaration of the Warsaw Treaty member-countries (Prague, January 1983). They proposed to NATO countries that a treaty be concluded on the mutual non-use of military force in any form or manner and on the maintenance of peaceful relations.

From the early eighties detente has run into grave obstacles, yet a struggle for preserving and strengthening it is being waged everywhere, practically merging with the struggle for peace and social progress. Detente is a fairly well established feature of the modern world. It is possible and necessary to preserve and multiply its gains. What is important is that, on the whole, detente's advocates prevail over its foes, who lack constructive ideas for the future. By contrast, all those in favour of detente, even in the face of their differences and disagreements, agree that there is no alternative to detente.

Socialist countries are the most consistent defenders of democratic principles in international relations, of the interests and spirit of detente, and of a peaceful future for all nations. The Soviet Union and the other countries of the socialist community, realistically-minded circles in the West, and all peace-loving forces of the world are doing everything they can to give detente a second life, to make it irreversible and comprehensive. The Soviet Union has put forth an entire set of peaceful initiatives and taken joint actions with the other Warsaw Treaty member-countries directed at creating in Europe a political atmosphere conducive to peace and detente. In this spirit, the Soviet Union has unilaterally pledged not to be the first to use nuclear weapons.

The opponents of detente in Europe, especially the United States, are out to

undermine the very basis of detente by deploying new nuclear missiles in Western Europe.

It is the duty of all signatory-states to the Final Act of the Helsinki Conference, their duty before history and future generations, to lift the threat of a nuclear war from Europe, to give detente a new life and turn Europe into a continent of peace completely free of weapons of mass destruction, a continent in which states co-operate on the basis of full equality and mutual respect, in the interests of progress and prosperity for the peoples.

**Developed Socialist Society** is a logical stage within the framework of the first phase of a communist formation, characterised by the advanced, dynamic maturity of socialism as an integral social system, the complete realisation of its objective laws and advantages, and its progress towards the higher phase of communism.

Lenin predicted that the new system would reach the stage of D.S.S. (see V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 42, p. 78; Vol. 30, pp. 330-31). At the time when developed socialism was a matter of distant future, however, it was impossible to provide a detailed plan for building such a society and for describing the laws of its development and improvement. The CPSU and the Communist Parties of other socialist countries contributed to the theory of Marxism-Leninism by working out the conception of a D.S.S.

The experience of the USSR and of a group of other countries that began their advance towards socialism from different social levels has shown that, following the transition period, socialist society in these countries was built in the main: although its foundations were laid in all spheres of social life, it had not completely realised its potentialities. Each country must pass through a more or less prolonged period of consolidation of socialism, leading to the creation of a developed, mature socialist society. Only once this stage has been reached can society proceed to building the higher phase of communism.

The first time ever D.S.S. has been built in the USSR. The 1967 CPSU resolution on the 50th Anniversary of the Great October Socialist Revolution stated that

D.S.S. had been built in the Soviet Union and pointed out that its potentialities had to be realised to the fullest extent possible. The documents of the 24th, 25th and 26th CPSU Congresses, those devoted to the 60th Anniversary of the October Revolution and the new Constitution of the USSR (1977) provided a thorough analysis of D.S.S. in the USSR. D.S.S. is a society in which a single economic complex has been created; social relations have been fully reorganised on the collectivist principles inherent in socialism; economic development is directed towards fulfilling social tasks, providing a substantial rise in the standard of living and creating the conditions for the all-round development of the members of society. Emphasis is laid on the intensive factors of economic growth, on an increase in the efficiency of production and labour productivity and improvement of the quality of work. Scientific and technological progress is gaining momentum, the scientific management of society (q. v.) is being improved and the advantages of socialism are being more intensively combined with the achievements of the scientific and technological revolution (q. v.). The drawing together of all classes and social strata, the overcoming of social and class distinctions and the establishment of complete social homogeneity is proceeding with greater speed. All nations and nationalities are steadily developing and drawing closer together, and the unity of the new historical community of people, the Soviet people, is growing. The state has become a state of the whole people, as has the entire political system, in which socialist democracy (see Democracy, Socialist) is being further developed. In all spheres of social life the influence of the working class and the guiding role of the Communist Party are growing and being strengthened. Being the party of the working class, the CPSU is also the vanguard of the entire people. Educational and cultural levels are rising; further success has been achieved in moulding a new, communist type of individual. The socialist way of life (q. v.) is improving.

In the 1960s and early 1970s, Bulgaria, Hungary, the GDR, Romania and Czechoslovakia, all reached the stage of build-

ing D.S.S. The laws governing the building of mature socialism are common to all countries. At the same time, in different countries this process is characterised by certain traits reflecting the given country's specific features. Thus, the building of D.S.S. in the USSR was severely hampered by the Great Patriotic War (1941-45), the postwar rehabilitation of the war-ravaged economy, and by a lack of experience in the fulfilment of new tasks. The Soviet Union had chiefly to rely on its own resources, while rendering considerable aid to other socialist countries and the national liberation movement, contributing to the defence capability of the socialist community and curbing the imperialist aggressors. Only at this stage of the formation of developed socialism was the Soviet Union able to take advantage of the opportunities provided by the scientific and technological revolution and socialist economic integration (see Integration, Socialist). The other socialist countries are in a more favourable position.

Thus, some features and forms of organisation, methods of economic management, etc., have taken shape in their economies and other spheres of social life at the outset of building developed socialism, while in the USSR this is only possible in D.S.S. or during the last stage of its formation.

As long as the USSR is the only country in which D.S.S. has been built, and while the other socialist countries are only on the way to achieving this goal, it is difficult to determine common criteria of developed socialism. Naturally these criteria do not fully coincide with the actual features of present-day Soviet society. However, the common laws governing the building of D.S.S. in any socialist country are what counts and not its specific features.

Developed socialism is not a special phase in the communist formation but a part, a period of the socialist phase; the same economic and other social laws and principles that apply to the socialist phase in general apply to developed socialism. It functions and develops on its own socialist basis. The economic and other laws of socialism are fully operational in D.S.S., and the advantages of the socialist way of life and its humane nature are realised to



a growing degree. The material and technical base of communism (q. v.) is created precisely during the period of developed socialism, and other problems of the gradual transition of the first phase of communist society to its higher phase are being tackled.

D.S.S. is characterised not only by a highly-developed social system in general and all its aspects — economic, social, political and intellectual, but by the balanced development of these aspects and their optimal interaction. A host of favourable conditions for the harmonious development of the individual are thus created.

The criteria for developed socialism include many aspects and reflect the maturity of the entire social system, as well as the maturity of the material and technical base, economic relations, the social structure, the political system and the intellectual and ideological spheres. It would be wrong to judge socialism's level of development from any single aspect, no matter how important it might be, such as the level of the productive forces or labour productivity. It would also be a mistake to deduce the criteria for socialism's maturity by comparing them with the industrial achievements of the most developed capitalist states, since these criteria stem from the socio-economic essence of socialism itself.

The criteria for D.S.S. are qualitative in nature and often cannot be measured quantitatively with a high degree of precision. It is not likely that fixed rates of labour productivity, per capita national income, the share of the population made up by the working class or the intellectuals can be established to determine whether or not developed socialism has been built. Since D.S.S. is also an evolving society, its criteria are flexible. One should not identify the initial stages of D.S.S. with communism or the immediate eve of the higher phase. The period of D.S.S. is a relatively lengthy period of further improvement, during which socialism's maturity steadily increases and it gradually develops into communism.

Developed socialism is characterised not only by the maturity of the new system in a given country, but also by that of

its relations with other socialist countries. In the USSR, developed socialism was achieved in the context of the existing world socialist community (q. v.). The further improvement of developed socialism is linked to socialist economic integration and the strengthening of political, ideological and cultural relations among the socialist nations. Developed socialism can only emerge in other socialist countries as a result of joint efforts by their peoples with the working people of the socialist community as a whole. D.S.S. is not an inflexible and invariable state, but a dynamic, constantly maturing society, characterised by a steady and rapid growth of the productive forces, a further improvement of the basis and the superstructure and by progress in all spheres of social life. By realising its potentialities to an ever greater extent, it is gradually developing into a communist society.

**Developing Countries** are a group of Asian, African and Latin American states, including former colonies, semi-colonies and formally independent states that have fallen behind in their development, owing to imperialist oppression by developed capitalist states. In 1980 there were close to 120 developing states. D.C. differ in socio-economic structure and social orientation. The relatively low level of their productive forces, their multi-structural economies, with a large share of patriarchal and small-commodity economic structures and an incomplete socio-economic change are common features that make it possible to combine these countries in a single group.

The majority of the D.C. have not yet broken away from the world capitalist economy and remain unequal partners on the world capitalist market, exploited by the imperialist states. Their economic structure is usually oriented on serving the needs of the monopolies of developed capitalist countries. An unequal rate of exchange, the plundering of natural resources, and high interest rates and payments on foreign debts undermine their economies and prevent the D.C. from overcoming their backwardness.

The D.C. provide a considerable share of the world resources: in 1980 they

occupied over 61 per cent of the earth's territory and had close to 49 per cent of the world's population; they also mined 40-45 per cent of the world's discovered minerals. Extended colonial rule and unlimited exploitation of the natural and labour resources on the part of the imperialist powers resulted, however, in the industrial production of D.C. constituting only 7 per cent of the world industrial output and their per capita gross national income being only a twentieth or a tenth (even a fiftieth in the African countries) of that of the developed capitalist states.

Increasing the rate of economic growth, consolidating the national economy, industrialisation (q. v.), the introduction of machinery in agriculture and the elimination of cultural backwardness are all common problems facing the D.C. Economic independence is the chief goal of many D.C.

There are two development courses open to the D.C.: progressive social change leading to a socialist future (see Non-capitalist Path of Development) and the capitalist road. The choice is up to the nations themselves and depends on the balance of class forces. The D.C. that choose a non-capitalist development course implement progressive changes under conditions of struggle against intrigues hatched by imperialists and their own internal reactionaries.

Nowadays, when the national liberation movements are developing into a struggle against all types of oppression and exploitation (q. v.), imperialism is obliged to alter its tactics in order to retain the D.C. within the orbit of the world capitalist economy. The concept of "equal partnership", which provides for a new division of labour between the developed and the developing countries, serves this purpose. The D.C. are to become an integral part of the world capitalist system, catering to its many needs. In these countries, enterprises are being planned that will process mineral and agricultural raw materials and employ unskilled labour. A number of modern industries lacking a complete technological cycle will be put into operation in order to preserve the leading role of the advanced capitalist countries. The

Western powers insist on the removal of investment limits in order to increase the penetration of foreign capital into the D.C. At the same time, these powers continue to apply the old methods of compulsion and pressure, especially with respect to the petroleum exporting countries. The D.C. can withstand this pressure only on the condition that they consolidate their forces and look to the countries of the world socialist community (q. v.) for support.

Under these changing conditions, when the balance of forces in the international arena is tipping in favour of socialism, when the process of decolonisation is successfully developing and the international positions of the D.C. gaining strength, the impossibility of quickly overcoming their economic backwardness by following a capitalist development course is becoming more and more evident to the peoples of these countries. They have intensified their effort to establish equitable international economic relations, a fair correlation of prices for their exports and imports. On the initiative of the D.C., the Sixth and Seventh Special Sessions of the UN General Assembly considered the problems of world economic relations. The D.C. call for a new international economic order based on just and democratic principles. Under these circumstances, the capitalist countries are compelled to make certain concessions.

Relations with socialist countries are becoming more and more important in the D.C.'s struggle for economic independence. Commodity turnover between the Soviet Union and the D.C. increased 9.4 times from 1965 to 1981, reaching in 1981 a sum of 16.4 billion roubles. The D.C. receive machines and equipment for industrial production, the power industry, transport and agriculture. Such forms of co-operation as assistance in developing natural resources and the manufacturing industry have been in operation on a wide scale in recent years. The socialist countries assist the D.C. in the fields of education and in training national personnel; tens of thousands of students and postgraduates from the D.C. study in the USSR and other socialist countries. A number of new

long-term trade and economic co-operation agreements between the developing and the socialist countries have recently been signed, creating favourable conditions for rapid social and economic progress in the D.C.

**Dictatorship of the Bourgeoisie**, political dominance by the capitalist class, the system of political suppression of the working people in capitalist society.

The economic basis of D.B. is private ownership of the implements and means of production and the corresponding relations of production, which secure the exploitation of the great majority of the population by the capitalist class. As distinct from the dictatorship of the classes that had dominated previously (the slaveowners and feudal lords), D.B. is usually camouflaged by various democratic forms that correspond to capitalist relations of production, under which the worker is formally free: there is no personal bondage of the worker to the employer. Under these conditions, D.B. is, in fact, bourgeois democracy (q. v.), under which citizens are declared equal before the law, and freedom of speech, the press and assembly, as well as universal suffrage, are proclaimed. In actual fact, however, the broad popular masses are deprived of any opportunity to take full advantage of the rights and freedoms proclaimed in constitutions because of their actual position and all kinds of legislative and political tricks invented by the ruling class.

The bourgeois state serves as the main instrument of D.B., assuming mostly the form of a bourgeois-democratic republic or parliamentary monarchy. "Bourgeois states are most varied in form," Lenin wrote, "but their essence is the same: all these states, whatever their form, in the final analysis are inevitably the *dictatorship of the bourgeoisie*" (V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 25, p. 418). The state machine does not constitute the entire mechanism of D. B., for the latter also includes bourgeois political parties and the capitalist class's non-party organisations.

As capitalism enters its imperialist stage, and today especially, important changes occur in the entire system of its social base. As Lenin said, "imperialism seeks to

replace democracy generally by oligarchy" (V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 23, p. 44). At present, the oligarchical nature of D.B. is expressed in the tendency of the ruling elite to become less numerous. Monopoly capital, which has seized the key positions in the economies of the developed capitalist countries, is not disposed to share political power with anybody, having established its own dictatorship over society. It uses the opportunities offered by modern production and scientific and technological progress to step up the exploitation of the working people and strengthen the machinery of violence directed against them.

Under state-monopoly capitalism (q. v.) the state turns, in fact, into a "monopoly bourgeoisie's board of directors". The expansion of the bourgeois state's economic functions is accompanied by a consolidation of executive power. At the same time, parliaments, which have always been a very convenient political form used by the bourgeoisie, are slipping more and more out of its hands as the class consciousness and cohesion of the proletariat and other sections of the working people increase. More and more often the people give their support to the genuine champions of their interests, backing them with their votes in elections to representative bodies. The monopoly bourgeoisie is therefore compelled to modify electoral laws, perform various tricks with the voting system and try to restrict the rights vested in parliament, while expanding those of its executive bodies. Formerly, various groupings of the bourgeoisie fought for prevalence in parliament; now they are fighting for domination in the executive apparatus. The influence of the military-industrial complex — an alliance between the biggest monopolies and the military — is growing in the developed capitalist countries.

This process is also seen in the increased influence exerted on the state by non-government organisations (corporations and associations) formed by monopolists; they operate as centres in the system of the monopoly bourgeoisie's dictatorship and are, in fact, "invisible" governments. Now that the working people increasingly often rebuff reactionaries while demanding that

the government bear responsibility for certain of its actions, the ruling class is also drawing on some non-government organisations in its struggle against progressive elements, for they are not law-bound (various fascist and pro-fascist organisations financed by monopolies and operating on their secret orders). These organisations are a useful appendage of the bourgeois state machine and an inalienable part of the system of D. B. Since the government is not legally responsible for their activities, they are exceptionally convenient for the bourgeoisie.

A substantial part of the system of D. B. consists of bourgeois political parties. Marx described their role as follows: "The oligarchy does not perpetuate itself by retaining power permanently *in the same hand*, but by dropping it with one hand in order to catch it again with the other, and so on" (K. Marx, F. Engels, *Collected Works*, Vol. 14, p. 338). Today, too, bourgeois political parties play a similar role. As before, they carry out the bulk of propaganda activities; in some countries they also lead detachments of reactionaries in their struggle against progressive figures, persecuted and castigated both by the government bodies and all kinds of non-government organisations.

D.B. finds concrete expression in a specific political regime, i. e. the sum total of the ways and means the state utilises to implement the bourgeoisie's political domination. It will be reactionary to a greater or lesser extent, depending on the balance of class forces. The specific features of D.B. are determined today by the fact that imperialism has to adapt itself to the new situation characterised by the confrontation with socialism and the new forms of the working people's struggle. This explains the more subtle forms of exploitation and certain concessions to the working people, and the search for new political forms for retaining the omnipotence of the bourgeoisie under the new conditions.

If the monopoly bourgeoisie cannot maintain the "order" that suits it by means of bourgeois democracy, a fascist regime, i. e. a terrorist dictatorship of the most reactionary, chauvinistic and aggressive

circles of finance capital, is established (see Fascism).

**Dictatorship of the Proletariat**, political domination established by the working class in the course of the socialist revolution in order to suppress the resistance put up by the exploiters, and to build and consolidate socialism. It is implemented through the state, the Communist Party, trade unions, the Popular Front and other working people's organisations, which in their totality comprise the system of D. P.

Two aspects should be distinguished in the class content of D. P.: suppression of the exploiting classes and alliance with the non-proletarian working people's masses, the peasantry (q. v.) above all.

The first aspect is dictatorship as such, i. e. the application of coercive measures with respect to all hostile social forces opposing the socialist revolution by direct armed violence (e. g. during a civil war, q. v., or when counter-revolutionary uprisings are suppressed), of actions by punitive and repressive organs of the state, or legislative acts and administrative ordinances restricting the exploiting classes' political and property rights, or of economic coercion. The state of D.P. resorts to diverse means of suppression, depending on the ferocity and form of the resistance put up by the hostile classes, and on the domestic and international situation. As the world proletariat gains in strength and scores ever new successes, as its consciousness and cohesion increase and socialist statehood within the country grows stronger, it becomes possible to apply softer measures to suppress class opponents. But to completely discard violence and D.P., as revisionists and right-wing socialists suggest, during the transition from capitalism to socialism, i. e. during the period of fierce class struggle between the bourgeoisie and the working class, is impossible. Lenin wrote in this connection: "Either a whiteguard reign of terror, or the *dictatorship of the proletariat*, its (relaxing) leadership" (V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 32, p. 325). The experience of the liberation movement shows that the establishment of D.P. is a historical necessity, a general law of the transition from capitalism to socialism.

The alliance of the working class with the non-proletarian working masses is possible and necessary because the fundamental interests of these classes and strata do coincide. "The supreme principle of the dictatorship", Lenin wrote, "is the maintenance of the alliance between the proletariat and the peasantry in order that the proletariat may retain its leading role and its political power" (V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 32, p. 490). Lenin defined D.P. as follows: "The dictatorship of the proletariat is a specific form of class alliance between the proletariat, the vanguard of the working people, and the numerous non-proletarian strata of the working people (petty bourgeoisie, small proprietors, the peasantry, the intelligentsia, etc.), or the majority of these strata ... an alliance for the final establishment and consolidation of socialism" (V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 29, p. 381). The scope of this class alliance can vary, including a greater or lesser part of the non-proletarian working population. Its boundaries delineate the social base of D.P. As socialism's influence grows, this base expands, the counter-revolutionary bourgeoisie becomes more isolated and the possibility of it unleashing a civil war diminishes; in contrast, the possibility increases that capitalists might be induced to compromise.

The nature of the class alliance, its social base and the historical conditions under which it takes shape determine the form of D.P., which reflects certain historical boundaries, the framework of this alliance; in Soviet Russia, it was an alliance of the proletariat and the working peasantry; in the People's Democracies — an alliance of the proletariat, the peasantry and the petty urban bourgeoisie and democratic intelligentsia. The Cuban revolution showed that ever new sections of the petty-bourgeois non-proletarian working masses and their political organisations are joining the anti-imperialist, liberation movement and passing from a neutral position to active participation in the struggle for socialism in alliance with the working class.

The forms of D. P. differ primarily in the political institutions and organisations through which the alliance of the working class with non-proletarian working masses

is realised. Thus, the Soviets (q.v.) of Workers', Peasants' and Soldiers' Deputies directly embodied the alliance of the working class with the working peasantry, while the Communist Party represented the interests of all the toiling classes. It was the Communist Party that indicated how to withdraw from the imperialist war and implemented the social demands of the whole people, both the proletariat and the peasantry. The petty-bourgeois parties lost their moral and political prestige in the eyes of the people, exposed themselves as supporters of the imperialist war, incapable of solving urgent domestic problems, primarily the agrarian question, and as servitors of foreign intervention. Hence the single-party principle as a feature of the Soviet form of the D. P., and hence the acute political struggle against all petty-bourgeois parties that sided with the counter-revolution.

People's Democracy (q.v.) as a form of D.P. is usually characterised by the multi-party principle and collaboration of the proletariat with non-proletarian, petty-bourgeois parties and political groups. Organisations of the Popular Front (q.v.) type, featuring the popular-democratic form of D.P., are a kind of political alliance between the working class and the non-proletarian working masses in the struggle for socialism. In Cuba, D.P. is characterised by a complete fusion of all the revolutionary forces taking part in building socialism, and by the reconstitution, on this basis, of the single-party principle.

In the future, more and more new forms of D.P. are bound to appear, as Lenin pointed out. One of them may be a democratic republic relying on traditional parliamentary bodies modified according to the principles of proletarian democracy. The issue of the break-up of the bourgeois state machine has not been removed from the agenda; it has merely assumed a new form.

With respect to the working people, D.P. is a much more complete type of democracy than bourgeois democracy (see Democracy, Bourgeois). Proletarian, socialist democracy (see Democracy, Socialist) draws into vigorous activities the mas-

ses who were formerly oppressed and debarred from political rule and policy-making. Concerning the involvement of the working people in building socialism, D. P. is the greatest organising and educational force. "It appears before us not only, and not even largely, as the employment of the coercive means of the state apparatus for the suppression of the resistance of the exploiters... Victory may be achieved only if the proletariat wields its dictatorship as a great, organised and organising force, a force of moral influence on all the working people, including the non-proletarian working masses." (V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 30, p. 507.)

The opponents of Marxism, while shouting about violence, usually ignore this aspect of D.P. Yet it is precisely this aspect that retains its relevance even after socialist society has been built, while dictatorship as such — suppression of the exploiters — becomes superfluous as soon as it has fulfilled its historical mission.

**Discipline**, compliance with the social norms and rules accepted in society, social communities, or associations. The principal social function of D. is to maintain social order as an indispensable condition for society to function normally and for the people's activities to be regulated. If a person digresses from the established norms and rules, society or an organisation applies sanctions to him, which may be of a legal, administrative or moral nature.

The exploiting classes in antagonistic socio-economic formations made use of D. to safeguard their own interests and to strengthen their domination. Under modern capitalism, D. is called on to consolidate the system of private-property social relations. The ideologists of capitalism try to mask the class essence of bourgeois D. and its incompatibility with the fundamental interests of the popular masses. They see the working people's struggle for their social and economic rights as a gross violation of D., undermining social law and order. The class, political content of D. tells on the ways and means used to make people comply with its rules. Capitalism maintains D. by implementing a set of punitive measures, physical violence applied by the police and a system of fines occupying prom-

inent places. The fear of losing one's job is an effective means of maintaining D. under capitalism, with its typically unstable economic situation. Manipulation of the masses in ideological terms now plays an increasing role in the consolidation of D.

A new, proletarian D., which is opposite in its essence and goals to bourgeois D., is beginning to take shape under capitalism, as the working class wages the struggle for its rights. Socialist D. is a major condition for the normal functioning of the state, economic and political institutions, and public organisations. Without it, the tasks involved in social development cannot be fulfilled. D. regulates relationships within collectives and determines the rights and duties of their members. The rules of socialist D., hinging on objective laws of social development that coincide with the interests of the working people, provide for the tasks of building communism to be tackled successfully, with public interests accorded pride of place. As these tasks become more complicated, the significance of D. as a regulator of social life, without which organisation and efficient performance by all working people in socialist society is impossible, increases. D. is becoming still more important today, in the setting of the unfolding scientific and technological revolution (q.v.).

Violations of D. are detrimental to the common cause; they disorganise labour and social life, interfere with the work, studies and recreation of the Soviet people. A strengthening of D. is, therefore, a major task in ideological and educational activities and the principal trend is to conscientiously fulfil all the rules of socialist D. relying on the communist view of the world and the norms and principles of communist morality. To attain this objective, material and moral stimuli, public control, as well as coercion through a variety of sanctions are used alongside conviction. The content of the sanctions in socialist society and the way they are applied are determined in a democratic way, by the will of the majority, and are formulated in legislative acts, decrees, rules, ordinances, orders and resolutions. The principal objective of the entire set of disciplinary measures is to pre-

vent violations of D., and this implies broad explanatory work and publicity.

"The feudal organisation of social labour", Lenin wrote, "rested on the discipline of the bludgeon... The capitalist organisation of social labour rested on the discipline of hunger... The communist organisation of social labour, the first step towards which is socialism, rests, and will do so more and more as time goes on, on the free and conscious discipline of the working people themselves" (V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 29, pp. 419, 420). Lenin stressed that, in communist society, "people will *become accustomed* to observing the elementary conditions of social life *without violence* and *without subordination*" (V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 25, p. 461). Socialist D. presupposes broad initiative, foresight into the probable social consequences of activities, and observance of the general rules. To abide passively by social norms and petty regulations, put a brake on initiative and detract from personal responsibility is alien to it. The basic features of socialist D. are the worker's awareness of his duties, his general and professional culture, translating Marxist-Leninist theoretical propositions into convictions and these convictions into the active life position of a staunch champion of communism. All these features characterise man's inner D., or self-discipline. Socialist D., i. e. manifestation of D. in man's activities and an intrinsic need to comply with social norms and rules are important traits of a socialist individual (see *Individual under Socialism*) and of the socialist way of life (q.v.).

D. falls into several types, connected with the subject's sphere of action and the demands made on him by different communities and associations. There are state, production (labour), financial, technological, planning, Party, trade union, Kom-somol, military, and other types of D.

Socialist D. is the subject of an acute ideological struggle. Today bourgeois, reformist and revisionist ideologists are stepping up their attacks on socialist D., trying to weaken the socialist state and undermine the power and authority enjoyed by the Communist Party. Western critics see the strengthening of D. as a violation of de-

mocracy, yet the Communist Parties of the socialist countries, while extending the rights of their citizens, also pay due attention to improving social discipline and all citizens performing their civic duties. Indeed, socialist democracy cannot be realised without D. and law and order.

**Disintegration of the Colonial System** is the deep-running revolutionary process of the elimination of the territorial (political) division of the world between the imperialist powers, a process leading to the liquidation of the world colonial system under conditions of the general crisis of capitalism (q.v.).

The colonial system as a world structure of direct political, economic, social and intellectual oppression of nations was the logical outcome of the capitalist mode of production. It emerged as a result of direct violence (q.v.) during the primitive accumulation of capital and was fully formed by the late 19th and early 20th centuries, when the territorial division of the world was completed. Given the world supremacy of capitalism, many economically backward, but formally independent countries, were absorbed into this system.

The world revolutionary process (q.v.), including the national liberation movement, which dates from the time of the Great October Socialist Revolution (1917), first brought about a deep crisis, then the disintegration and, finally, the collapse of the colonial system.

The intensifying conflict between the objective requirements of the national independent development of the productive forces in the oppressed countries, on the one hand, and the imperialist supremacy which, as a rule, preserved the most backward, traditional social relations, on the other, provided the socio-economic basis for the D.C.S. This contradiction was interwoven with the socio-political and ideological conflicts that existed between the oppressed nations and nationalities and the imperialist bourgeoisie of the metropolitan countries. The way was objectively paved for the D.C.S. by the historical process of national awakening, national consolidation and integration that was taking place throughout the world under the con-

ditions of the intensifying general crisis of capitalism.

The D.C.S. resulted from a combination of internal and international factors. National-liberation revolutions (see Revolution, National-Liberation)—an extreme contradiction between the enslaved countries and the metropolitan countries—unfolded simultaneously with the rapid growth of world socialism and the upsurge of the proletariat (as well as the anti-colonial) struggle in the capitalist countries. This made it possible to contain the military-punitive system to a large degree, and to create a situation in which imperialist powers could not interfere, being paralysed, as Lenin predicted, speaking of the very favourable combinations of conditions required for the success of national-liberation revolutions (V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 22, p. 312). Sweeping anti-imperialist, progressive and democratic movements emerged even in those economically backward countries which hardly had a proletariat or local bourgeoisie and in which the bulk of the population lived under the conditions of prevailing precapitalist or even pre-feudal relations.

The political emancipation of the formerly oppressed peoples is a radical revolutionary step for most of mankind and a powerful incentive to social progress.

As a result of the D. C. S., imperialism lost direct control of the state machinery, the military forces, diplomatic service, the tax system, the mass media and other essential political levers in the former colonies and semi-colonies. It was obliged to adapt to a new historical situation and resort to indirect neo-colonialist (see Neo-colonialism) methods of control, and to overcome the resistance put up by the patriotic forces.

Though the D. C. S. has not yet done away with the economic dependence of many newly-free nations on the world capitalist market, the economic positions of imperialism in these countries are being steadily undermined. The monopolies have been deprived of many important sources of profit that they once had access to through the system of colonial administration. The

newly-independent countries insist on having a free choice of trade partners. They rely on the support of the socialist countries in their efforts to establish equality in international economic relations and a new international economic order. This undermines the role of the metropolitan countries on the markets of the newly-free nations. Elimination of the many-structural system, especially in traditional precapitalist sectors of the economy, the rapid advance of the productive forces, industrialisation (q. v.), the consolidation of positions of the public sector, introduction of elements of planning, co-operation among small-scale commodity producers, and the development of national science and culture, all create the necessary conditions for the former colonies and semicolonies to gain economic independence.

The D. C. S. has dealt a mortal blow to the customary imperialist conception of "Lebensraum". According to this conception, it is necessary to own colonies for the well-being of the metropolitan country, including the well-being of its working population. The ideology of equality and friendship among nations continues to draw the masses to its side in ever-growing numbers.

**Distribution According to Needs** — see Basic Principle of Communism, the

**Distribution According to Work Done** — see Basic Principle of Socialism, the

**Dogmatism**, a way of thinking that is devoid of a historical dialectical approach to facts and events and ignores the specific conditions of place and time, i. e. the concrete situation.

Dogmatic thinking is detrimental to all kinds of theoretical activities, and particularly so if D. penetrates Marxist-Leninist ideology. Indeed, Marxism-Leninism is the theory of a revolutionary transformation of the world, underlying the science-based policy, strategy and tactics of the Communist and Workers' Parties. A dogmatic distortion of theory inevitably produces political errors, strategical blunders and tactical failures. Like revisionism (q.v.), D. is a theoretical postulate of all kinds of opportunist distortions of the communist world outlook (see Communist Ideology) and



politics.

D. ignores historicism and the relative nature of truth. To ignore the specific circumstances is to turn correct propositions into abstract schemas divorced from reality. A dogmatist, who is unable to apply theory in his practical activities, puts all his energy into seeking and combining citations, opinions and maxims by acknowledged authorities, turning them from teachers and mentors into oracles. As a rule, D. is connected with the personality cult (q.v.) and canonisation of statements uttered by a particular theorist. A blind faith in, and worship of, any one authority are substituted for the study of reality and critical assessment of established opinions. Such an approach is alien to the creative spirit of Marxism, for, as Lenin put it, "to accept anything on trust, to preclude critical application and development, is a grievous sin; and in order to apply and develop, 'simple interpretation' is obviously not enough" (V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 3, p. 630). To make use of theoretical heritage does not amount to mechanically committing certain propositions to memory and repeating them endlessly; it is a creative process that should not be reduced to automatically transferring truths born under certain conditions to other situations. In each particular case it should be carefully considered whether the present situation corresponds to that which gave rise to the given opinion or statement. If the situation is different, then a new decision should be sought. Dogmatic thinkers are unable to comprehend complicated and constantly changing reality; they cling to the past and rely on old, usually outdated, notions and views. If D. prevails, theory no longer develops and turns from an instrument of knowledge and action into a conglomeration of dead ideas. While "drying up" Marxist-Leninist theory, D. disarms the Marxist-Leninist party, the working class and all the working people, interferes with the struggle against imperialism and precludes the formation of a broad anti-monopoly front, while trying to turn the revolutionary movement to adventurism (see Revolutionary Adventurism). This is why all Communists, all Marxists-Leninists are duty-bound to fight against D. "For

the present," Lenin wrote, "it is essential to grasp the incontestable truth that a Marxist must take cognisance of real life, of the true facts of *reality*, and not cling to a theory of yesterday, which, like all theories, at best only outlines the main and the general, only *comes near* to embracing life in all its complexity" (V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 24, p. 45).

## E

**Economic Competition Between the Two Systems** is a most important modern form of class struggle between socialism and capitalism (qq.v.) in the course of which socialism is to surpass the level of economic and technological development in the leading capitalist countries. Central to this struggle is the competition between the USSR and the USA, which are the bulwarks of the industrial, military and scientific power of the opposing social systems.

The economic competition between the two social systems started after the Great October Socialist Revolution of 1917 and the Civil War, when the Soviet Union finally won an opportunity to engage in peaceful economic construction. But indeed, the gap was too wide between the starting points from which the competition was launched. For example, in 1913 the industrial output in the USA was 8 times that of Russia, while the productivity of labour in industry was 9 times greater. Though these ratios became much less favourable in the years of the Civil War and foreign intervention, Lenin was quite convinced that "we shall succeed in catching up with these countries faster than they ever dreamed possible... We do believe in real speed, speed compared with the rate of development in any period in history you like to take — especially if progress is guided by a genuinely revolutionary party; and this speed we shall achieve at all costs" (V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 33, p. 392).

With the formation of the world socialist system (q.v.), the economic competi-

tion between the two systems intensified. In 1978, the socialist countries accounted for more than 40 per cent of world industrial output and for over 75 per cent of the amount produced by the developed capitalist countries. A comparison of data on the economic development of the USSR and the USA indicates that the national income of the USSR amounts to 67 per cent and industrial production — to 80 per cent of the American level. In different branches of industry relative development figures present a varied picture. Some two decades ago there were 2 or 3 branches in which the USSR was ahead of the USA. Now the USSR leads the USA in the production of iron ore, steel, coke, coal, pig iron, oil, metal-cutting lathes, tractors (total power), grain combine harvesters, prefabricated reinforced concrete, mineral fertilizer, wool and cotton fabrics, footwear, animal fats, sugar, fish, etc. In some branches, the USSR is still substantially behind the USA. Among these are power production, the chemical industry to include production of plastics and synthetic resins, the production of paper, radios, etc. Even in these industries, however, the USSR has a substantial lead over the USA in terms of growth rates.

At present, the emphasis in the economic competition between the USSR and the USA is shifting from the quantitative to qualitative aspects of production. The Soviet Union is currently ahead of the USA on a number of indices. Manpower utilisation is one example. Absence of unemployment alone is evidence of better utilisation of labour resources in the USSR. Meanwhile, there are many unresolved problems and untapped reserves in the area of improving production efficiency.

Emulation in the field of labour productivity is one problem that arises in this connection. Evaluation of labour productivity data for different branches of industry shows that, while in many branches the gap between the USSR and the USA is minimal, it is still quite appreciable in others (paper, chemical, meat production). Labour productivity growth in the USSR is retarded by the still existing lag in production specialisation, as well as excessive expenses for repairs.

Better production efficiency depends largely on structural improvements in industry. Comparative analysis of industrial production in the USSR and the USA shows that, first, the USSR lags further behind the USA in the development of new, progressive industries than in the improvement of old, traditional branches; second, the lag increases with the transition from extractive industries to branches putting out final products. While leading the USA in the production of the most important raw materials, the USSR lags in products requiring skilled labour: in the production of modern, highly efficient equipment, instrumentation and electronics, plastics, etc. The Soviet industry is structurally biased towards the metallurgical, raw materials, and building materials industries. At the same time, the share of the chemical and power industries in the USSR is below that in the USA. This branch structure of the Soviet industry is essentially a consequence of the fact that the USSR had to industrialise exceptionally rapidly for historical, economic and political reasons.

The laws of modern economic development dictate that victory in the economic competition with capitalism is only possible through speedy and adequate utilisation of the advantages offered by the scientific and technological revolution (q.v.), which now essentially determine the effectiveness of social production.

While on the subject of the USSR's lag behind the USA in labour productivity, economic structure and production technology, it should not be overlooked that destructive wars and subsequent rehabilitation periods deprived the Soviet Union of a chance to pay due attention to these qualitative aspects of social production. Indeed, it is only possible to raise the overall level of production technology in the country through prolonged and careful efforts. It is by far easier, for example, to raise steel output, than to orientate the metallurgical industry on the production of hardened steel, a wider range of rolled products, improve their quality, etc.

Improvement of the qualitative indicators of the production process is quite intimately linked to the general efficiency of production. The problem of improving

the general efficiency of production is also inseparable from that of protecting the economy from the influence of accidental and subjective factors. So, alongside the development of the productive forces and an increase in the number of tons, kilowatt-hours, metres, etc., produced, there is also the task of improving socialist relations of production and the economic situation for production. The 25th Congress of the CPSU set the course for overall improvement of social production efficiency, which is in line with the situation in developed socialist society (q.v.) and the current requirements of building communism. This course towards improved qualitative indices of work performance, for an organic fusion of the achievements of the scientific and technological revolution and the advantages of socialism, the course of improving planning techniques and economic management was confirmed by the decisions of the 26th Congress of the CPSU (1981). Of great importance for improving production performance is the production concentration and specialisation now underway (the organisation of production associations in industry, inter-farm co-operation in agriculture, agro-industrial integration and so on). Participation by the working people in economic management and encouragement of mass socialist emulation (q.v.) are powerful factors of economic development. All that opens up broad prospects for economic and cultural progress, for new achievements in the economic competition with capitalism.

**Economic Struggle of the Working Class** is the class struggle of the workers against the bourgeoisie for better living and working conditions. It differs from the political struggle (q.v.) of the working class, the objective of which is to eliminate the system of capitalist exploitation, in that it confines itself to the task of satisfying the everyday socio-economic needs of the labour force under the existing social system.

The struggle of the working class for its immediate interests starts with the inception of capitalism, appearing in its early stage as the main arena, where labour and capital clash. As the resistance of the working masses to the bourgeoisie mounts, the

exploitation of labour by capital becomes more disguised and is combined with the tactics of temporary concessions. In the epoch of pre-monopoly capital, exploitation was mostly intensified by wage cuts and longer working hours, while today monopoly capital relies mostly on intensification of labour and resorts to cuts in welfare expenses, alongside the constantly growing prices. Today the economic struggle has the following main objectives: higher wages necessitated by the continuously growing cost of living and by the expanding needs of the working class because of labour intensification and higher socio-economic requirements; a shorter working week without wage cuts, and longer paid leave, caused above all by the excessive occupational strain on the work force; more comprehensive guarantees against unemployment and dismissal, necessitated by periodic slumps in production, the restructuring of industries, and automation (q.v.), which cause soaring mass unemployment and create a permanent atmosphere of fear of the morrow; no discrimination in the wages of young and female workers, who constitute about 50 per cent of the labour force; better working conditions to protect workers from sweating systems, from professional injury and industrial disease; expanded professional training for both young workers and those who need a new trade; a better social security system consisting of higher pensions, a lower pensionable age, higher unemployment benefits and sick leave allowances, insurance for all hired personnel, financed by the state or management. Therefore, the struggle for higher wages remains the pivot of the daily struggle of the working class. It is gaining new momentum and frequently goes beyond clashes in isolated industries, assuming the nature of country-wide conflicts between trade unions and governments.

Strikes remain the most common and effective weapon of economic struggle. Lenin called them "a school of war" against capitalist oppression (V.I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 4, p. 317). There is constant improvement in strike tactics. Evidence of this is the growing number of mass strikes. General strikes are becoming

shorter, but more mass in scale; they spread over an entire industry and are repeated if they fail to achieve their aims. Strikes are commonly combined with rallies and demonstrations. There are "days of struggle", "weeks of struggle", etc. The power of labour organisations in a number of capitalist countries is, in fact, so great now that the mere threat of a strike is sometimes enough to force employers to make concessions in order to avoid open confrontation. The so-called peaceful settlement through a system of collective agreements is by no means evidence of muted class contradictions between labour and capital, as bourgeois ideologists and reformists are trying to prove.

The acuteness and scope of the strike movement tend to breed an anarcho-syndicalistic attitude among part of the working class, when the role of that movement and of the economic struggle as a whole are exaggerated. Communist and Workers' Parties in capitalist countries are against opposing the ultimate goals of the working-class movement to its immediate socio-economic objectives, against demagogic scorn of everyday struggle, which doom the working class to passivity. The economic class struggle in the capitalist countries is becoming ever more active and effective. Meanwhile, workers do not confine themselves to economic demands alone; they are fighting for more complete rights for the trade unions (q.v.), for making it their responsibility to participate in the organisation of labour, factory management, financial auditing, personnel hiring and firing, etc. Thus, the economic struggle is tending to grow beyond the limited area of partial improvements. Though far from being successful everywhere in this respect, the scope and nature of the economic struggle testify to a sharpening of the relations between labour and capital. There is increasing evidence of a tendency to politicise the economic struggle. This is due above all to the fact that, under state-monopoly capitalism, labour conflicts in nationalised industries are becoming increasingly acute, strikes in private enterprises spread over entire branches of industry, trade unions come out against the national

"policy of incomes" aimed at freezing wages, which brings about a direct confrontation of the working class with the bourgeois government and monopolies (see also State-Monopoly Capitalism).

While preserving its individual traits in different capitalist countries, the economic struggle demonstrates a number of common features. Among these are: a higher level of demands transcending the material interests of isolated sectors of factory and office workers and concerned with the interests of all the working people; the unprecedented mass character of the movement; a great variety of forms and means of struggle; a deep interlacing of the political and the economic struggle. All this more than merely nullifies the assertions made by opportunists and reformists to the effect that the class struggle subsides under capitalism; it also emphasises the important role of the struggle urged by the working people to improve their working and living conditions on the way to topple the political power of the bourgeoisie.

**Egalitarian Communism** is a form of social utopia visualising an ideal society, based on collective ownership of the means of production (this is where E.C. differs from egalitarianism, seeking to establish a community of equal owners), as well as on complete and absolute equality of all producers, not just economic and socio-political equality, but also in terms of levelling out all individual requirements. E.C. offers a one-sided solution to the problem of the relations between the individual and society; it substantiates the unconditional subjugation of the interests of individuals to some abstract "society of equals", or to certain concrete entities: state, phalanstery, community, etc.

As a form of spontaneous, instinctive protest against social antagonisms and class inequality, the ideas of E.C. are contained in ancient and mediaeval popular ideologies. Some of the heresies that laid the foundations of early Christianity included similar ideas. The bias towards E.C. is typical of the ideology of peasantry in the age of feudalism; it found its way into the theories and traditions of Anabaptist communes, into the ideology and practices of

the Chinese Taiping rebels, into some customs and notions of the Russian communal peasantry, etc.

Early literary social utopias accommodate E. C. ideas: the teaching of Thomas More (compulsory labour, moderation of needs), Tommaso Campanella (strict regulation of relations between sexes), Morrelly (overall standardisation, strict life regulation, compulsory marriage) and others. The early utopias were reflections of the society's economic and intellectual immaturity, the immaturity of social relations. The search for future ideals in mankind's ancient past was not accidental; traditions of primeval "communism", the ancient patriarchal-clan system tended to be idealised.

E. C. maintains a rudimentary existence in the socialist thought proper. Its traits are especially typical of early revolutionary utopian socialism (q.v.), (primitive production in Gerard Winstanley's teachings, strict regulatory trends, utilitarian treatment of art in Babouvism). In the 19th century, alongside socialism proper, an independent school of utopian socialism appears: E. C. proper (uniform distribution of labour and pleasures, compulsory doctoring by Wilhelm Weitling, state-controlled private life by Étienne Cabet). Egalitarian traits are present both in the French revolutionary communism of the 1830-40s and in the "peaceful" socialism of Charles Fourier and his followers.

The coexistence of the two schools in anti-bourgeois utopian thought — egalitarian communist and socialist, their complex interdependence and struggle were the factors that made the development of this entire form of ideology so contradictory. These contradictions were still further enhanced by the efforts of those who opposed socialist ideas to misrepresent the ideas of E. C. as the essence of socialist ideology, the purpose being to distract the masses from the ideas of socialism. Meanwhile, crystallising inside socialist thought was a critical approach to E. C. as a perverted solution of social problems, though outwardly democratic in form (in the sense that it conformed to the immediate requirements of the toiling masses).

Some socialists (A. I. Herzen, D. I. Pisarev and others), especially the founders of scientific communism Marx and Engels, were sharply critical of E. C. as a theory legitimising coercion (see Violence) over individuals. Marx wrote that "this type of communism — since it negates the *personality* of man in every sphere — is but the logical expression of private property, which is this negation... The thought of every piece of private property as such is *at least* turned against *wealthier* private property in the form of envy and the urge to reduce things to a common level, so that this envy and urge even constitute the essence of competition. Crude communism is only the culmination of this envy and of this levelling-down proceeding from the *preconceived* minimum. It has a *definite, limited* standard. How little this annulment of private property is really an appropriation is in fact proved by the abstract negation of the entire world of culture and civilisation, the regression to the *unnatural* simplicity of the *poor* and crude man who has few needs and who has not only failed to go beyond private property, but has not yet even reached it" (K. Marx and F. Engels, *Collected Works*, Vol. 3, p. 295).

Scientific communism (q.v.) counters E. C. with its own conception of harmony between personal and collective interests in the future society, of the unrestrained flowering of all human capabilities, of the satisfaction of all reasonable human needs.

**Egalitarian Distribution** is a form of equal distribution of consumer goods among the community members, regardless of the labour contribution made by each individual.

E. D. was objectively indispensable in a primitive society. With the supply of the means of subsistence being irregular and insufficient, E. D. appeared not only as a natural result of common labour, but also as a means for preserving communal organisation. While material life dictated the necessity of E. D., blood ties made it solidly rooted, turned it into a custom and kept it within the framework of the clan community.

The development of the productive for-

ces, and the appearance of private ownership of the means of production, followed by class inequality, brought about a change in the mode of production and, thereby, in the mode of distribution. Through many subsequent centuries, however, E. D. continued to exist in the form of egalitarian use of land in the rural communities of China, India, Russia, Germany and some other countries.

Being a reflection of primitive notions of equality and justice, the demand for E. D. has been more than once set forth by the toiling masses and their ideological leaders. Thus, Gerard Winstanley, the inspirer of the Diggers and one of the leaders of the English bourgeois revolution of the 17th century wrote in his pamphlet *The Law of Freedom in a Platform, or True Magistracy Restored*, that, in the new society, everyone would receive an equal share of the necessary consumer goods from community warehouses. The French utopian socialists of the 18th century partly subscribed to the idea of E. D. François Babeuf was the most consistent proponent of the E. D. ideology. He believed that neither the amount of work done nor the volume of goods produced could provide grounds for unequal distribution. In preaching their ascetic egalitarian communism (q. v.), the early socialists drew on the relatively low level of development of the productive forces at the time. In Russia, the revolutionary Narodniks of the 1870's supported E. D. (see Populist Socialism). Revealing the social content of their demands, Lenin wrote that in Russia at the time "...this very idea of equality and the many different equalitarian plans" were "the fullest possible expression of the tasks of the bourgeois revolution, *not* the socialist", and that they expressed "the tasks, not of the struggle against capitalism, but of the struggle against the rule of the landlords and bureaucracy" (V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 12, p. 356).

In its substantiation of the principles of distribution under socialism and communism, scientific communism counterposes the scientific conception of equality (q. v.) to E. D. The requirement of E. D. is contradictory to the essence of socialism. Equalisation stands in the way of econo-

mic progress and of an increase in labour productivity. The agricultural communes set up in the early years of building socialism in the USSR and based on the principle of equalisation did not prove viable with their productive livestock, poultry, household utilities, homes, let alone the basic means of production, socialised. Rejection of the principle of personal material interest, petty regulation of everyday life and consumption tended to impair economic incentives to work and had a negative effect on production and other aspects of social life. In the period of mass collectivisation, the communes were transformed into agricultural artels (producer cooperatives).

While rejecting equalisation as a criterion of communist equality, the CPSU and other fraternal Communist Parties pursue a policy aimed at reducing the disparity between the real incomes of workers and peasants, and at raising the wages of the workers in the low income brackets. This disparity minimization is not similar to levelling, however, since it follows modifications in the nature of labour and skills. In this sense, equalisation is a reflection of the gradual elimination of socio-class distinctions, which is going on in socialist society.

**Empirical Social Research** is research conducted by different social sciences to study isolated phenomena and their interrelations. This type of research is carried out within the framework of historical materialism, scientific communism, political economy, law, pedagogics, ethnography, demography, etc. E. S. R. is evidence of a high level of development reached by the given science, the theoretical edifice and generalisations of which rest on a solid foundation of empirical data obtained by methods specifically devised for the purpose.

Marxist social science is characterised by a close fusion of theory and practice and, considering the content of its scientific knowledge, by the unity of theoretical and empirical levels of research. Marx, Engels and Lenin subjected an immense amount of factual material to analytical scrutiny, which became possible owing to extensive use of statistical material, print-

ed matter, official and personal documents, polls, and comparative historical generalisations, all of which were used as the basis for theoretical model building. For example, the theoretical analysis of contradictions between classes in capitalist society offered in the work *The Condition of the Working Class in England* by Engels was entirely built on material obtained by concrete sociological methods; *Capital* by Marx depended on an analysis of a tremendous amount of factual material. *The Civil War in France* by Marx was based on documentary material on the activities of the Paris Commune from its inception to its fall; in his work *The Development of Capitalism in Russia*, besides building his entire analysis on data contained in the statistical surveys of the Zemstvos, Lenin also worked out a series of methods for summing up statistical material.

With the victory of the socialist revolution becoming a reality, and in connection with the task of restructuring the entire system of social relations, there appears the need and the possibility of using social data for the purpose of managing society (see Scientific Management of Society). In the 1920s and 1930s in the USSR, the E. S. R. was mostly conducted in the area of labour relations: problems of the scientific organisation of labour and professional selection were studied, as well as the categories of working and free time. E.S.R. gained new momentum in this country in connection with the construction of developed socialist society (q. v.), the spread of the scientific and technological revolution (q. v.), the changed role of science in society, and the growing scope of the scientific management of society. The major functions of E. S. R. are: informative, i. e., acquisition of information on the status of social objects and processes, ascertaining social problem areas; forecasting, i. e., identifying the trends in social changes for use in social development forecasting (see Futurology; Social Forecasting); social engineering, or managerial functions per se, i. e., working out practical recommendations instrumental in attaining managerial effect; theoretico-humanitarian, i. e., building up knowledge

of man and society. In each sphere of social knowledge, E. S. R. has its own peculiar problem areas, yet its general trend is determined by the major tasks of building communism. In the Soviet Union, concrete sociological studies, i. e., E.S.R. carried out within Marxist sociology, are conducted on a large scale. This research supports the study of social processes and phenomena where the interaction of various aspects of social relations is involved (e. g., attitude to labour, not just as an aspect of economic relations, but as a result of diverse factors acting together, including social and individual consciousness). Concrete sociological studies are employed in the analysis of the problems arising at the junction of different spheres of social life (e. g., the problem of the younger generation). These studies address themselves to the interrelations among various social groups, to the mechanism of intra- and inter-group interaction (problems of social structuring, of forming socialist work collectives, etc.), certain social institutions (family, mass media, etc.). The individual, with all his social connections, is one of the central problems studied by micro-sociology. Important among the problems under study are social and psychological problems of management; added emphasis in this line of research is prompted by the development of social workforce planning in enterprises, cities and regions. Widely studied in the USSR are problems of the socialist way of life, activities during free time (q. v.), problems of culture, and education. The forecasting function of sociology, employing the technique of social modelling are on the upswing. There is both applied and basic E.S.R. The former is designed to provide practical recommendations that help solve tasks of a lesser magnitude. Basic research is meant to solve certain theoretical problems and study undercurrent developmental trends.

E.S.R. requires some specific methods and techniques for the retrieval, processing and analysis of social information. The most important of these methods is analysis of documents (public and personal, official and unofficial, written, printed, etc.). According to the source of infor-

mation used, documents are divided into primary, products of direct observation or polling, and secondary, made up by consolidating the primary data. Statistical and press material is of special value. A scientific survey especially programmed to fit a research programme is an example of a direct event-recording method. Distributing questionnaires and interviewing belong to the basic methods of E. S. R., indispensable in gathering information on the subjective moods of the population, on the views, values, motivations and attitudes of the people. Questionnaires make it possible to carry out studies on a larger scale. Interviewing involves fewer number of people, but it deepens and specifies data obtained by the other method. Psychological procedures: tests and projection techniques are more refined and intricate methods requiring specially trained researchers. Correct judgement of their possibilities and the sphere of their applicability, enhancement of their reliability and mutual complementarity, are important in the practical utilisation of all these methods.

E. S. R. is in wide use in capitalist countries under pressure from a number of factors, such as economic difficulties, aggravated class contradictions, direct social orders from the bourgeoisie to social sciences. A number of E. S. R. methods and techniques were elaborated there, but the research carried out in the capitalist countries is distinguished by an unscientific, highly contradictory methodology, the prevalence of applied research, the main purpose of which does not extend beyond solving isolated problems and conflict situations that do not affect the social system as a whole.

**Equality** is the existence of identical conditions and opportunities for the free development of the individual and the fulfilment of the requirements of all members of society, the equal position of people in society being understood differently in different historical epochs. At the time when feudalism was being replaced by capitalism, E., as understood by the revolutionary bourgeoisie, meant the abolition of the privileges of the nobility and the equality of all citizens before the law. Under capitalism, the concept of legal equality, progressive in its time, conceals the existence of a

growing economic and social inequality. Lenin pointed out that "under the guise of the equality of the individual in general, bourgeois democracy proclaims the formal or legal equality of the property-owner and the proletarian, the exploiter and the exploited, thereby grossly deceiving the oppressed classes" (V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 31, p. 145). Legal equality cannot be fully exercised unless it is based on actual, social E. of people. Socio-political, racial and national discrimination, inequality between men and women, etc., all show that capitalism has failed to provide even formal and legal E. It is typical of modern bourgeois sociology and policy to present social inequality as a permanent category and to reject the possibility of building a society on the basis of social E.

Scientific communism calls for a concrete historical, not abstract approach to this problem, for E. has never existed "in general", outside a given socio-economic and political structure of society. Since the social status of the individual in a class society is determined by his affiliation to a certain class, according to the Marxist-Leninist view E. does not simply mean the liquidation of certain legal privileges of particular classes, but also the abolition of these classes, the complete elimination of all social and class distinctions, the creation of a classless, socially homogeneous communist society. Lenin wrote: "...equality is an empty phrase if it does not imply the abolition of classes. We want to abolish classes, and in this sense we are for equality. But the claim that we want all men to be alike is just nonsense..." (V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 29, p. 358).

The Marxist-Leninist understanding of E. has nothing in common with the petty-bourgeois principle of equalisation, whereby E. is regarded as the automatic and absolute equalisation of all members of society in relation to property, as egalitarian distribution (q. v.). The historical and social roots of the petty-bourgeois views on E. give rise to such pernicious illusions, as, for instance, the idea that social E. can be achieved independently of private-ownership relations, by merely introducing reforms in the sphere of distribution. The founders of scientific communism criticised Proudhon for ignoring the need to create mate-

rial and technical prerequisites for liquidating all private ownership and to establish social E. Petty-bourgeois egalitarian communism (q. v.) is in its way a philosophy of the "poor", calls for a purification of capitalism and commodity production from abuse and inequality. It fails to take account of the objective conditions, and the level of production, and, while exaggerating the significance of establishing E. through administrative and political means, calls for the regulation of all spheres of life and ignores the fact that actual social E. is possible only on the basis of the liquidation of all forms of social oppression and the provision of an abundance of material and intellectual wealth for all members of society. Scientific communism proceeds from the possibility and inevitability of establishing social E. for all people. Such E. is not reached, however, by means of good intentions, administrative decisions, and subjective plans for equalising personal requirements and the opportunities offered by every-day life, but through the development of a socialist economy and culture. Socialism is a decisive step towards overcoming social inequality. It abolishes inequality in means of production, liquidates private ownership and frees all members of society from exploitation (q. v.). Socialist E. implies that it is the duty of all citizens to work according to their abilities and that they have the equal right to be rewarded for their labour. But this equal right does not eliminate an element of actual inequality (see Basic Principle of Socialism, the). In the process of socialism's development and transition to communism, a gradual evening out of the material and cultural levels of the working people takes place, accompanied by the obliteration of socio-class distinctions (q. v.), of the differences in development between nations and nationalities and by the elimination of the survivals of actual inequality between men and women.

The Programme of the CPSU notes that communist E. means that all people will occupy an equal place in society, will be equal in relation to the means of production, will enjoy equal conditions of labour and distribution, and will take an active

part in managing the affairs of society. Harmonious relations between the individual and society, based on a unity of social and personal interests, will take shape, and the basic principle of communism (q. v.): "From each according to his abilities, to each according to his needs" will be put into practice. Since the abilities, tastes and needs of various individuals cannot be identical, E. under communism will not mean an equalisation and levelling of all people. The social homogeneity of a communist society and the resulting complete social E. will not lead to suppression of the individual or to the levelling of the abilities and requirements of all people, as the anti-communist ideologists predict, but these will be the chief prerequisites for and guarantee of the improvement of the individual's capabilities (see Harmonious Development of the Individual) as well as of the real and all-embracing development of the individual. Under communism, individual distinctions, as well as a difference in occupation and in social functions, will cease to result in different social positions of members of society and different opportunities for developing their abilities and satisfying their needs. Marx and Engels defined E. under communism and noted that "...a different form of activity, of labour, does not justify *inequality*, confers no *privileges* in respect of possession and enjoyment" (K. Marx, F. Engels, *Collected Works*, Vol. 5, p. 537).

Exploitation is appropriation by some social classes or groups of the product of the labour of other classes, without compensation. E. is engendered by the appearance of private ownership of the means of production, which brings about a division of society into antagonistic classes. The material prerequisite for E. is a certain level of development of the productive forces, making it possible for the worker to produce not just enough output to meet his own minimum requirements, or to maintain his working capability (the necessary product), but also a surplus (the surplus product), which is appropriated by the owners of the means of production. Under slave-owning system — historically the first form of society based

on exploitation — the exploited (the slaves) were deprived of the means of production and, moreover, they were themselves the property of the exploiting slave-owners. Under feudalism, the exploited serfs were held in personal bondage by the feudal lords. Unlike slaves, however, they possessed some means of production and were allowed by the serf-owner to work a plot of land.

Peculiar to the capitalist form of exploitation is personal independence of the exploited worker. All the means of production are concentrated in the hands of capitalists. Being deprived of the means for sustaining their existence, the workers have to be hired by the capitalists, that is, to sell their labour to them. Under slavery and feudalism, E. was carried out within the subsistence economy, while under capitalism it is carried out on the basis of commodity-money relations. Capitalists exploit workers not by extra-economic coercion, but by buying a special type of commodity, labour power, the utilisation of which, or the work process, creates greater value than the cost of the labour power. The new value created by the workers' labour incorporates both the amount required by the workers in order to live (it is paid out to the workers in the form of wages) and surplus value, which is appropriated by the capitalists. The ratio of surplus value to variable capital (equivalent to the cost of labour power), or the ratio of the surplus labour that creates surplus value to the necessary labour that creates the value required to support the worker, constitutes the measure of E. of the working class, which Marx termed the rate of surplus value. Since the purpose of capitalist production is to reap maximum profits, capitalists do all in their power to heighten the rate of E. of the workers. Among the methods of capitalist E. are longer working hours with a constant necessary working time (absolute surplus value), or reduced necessary working time with a constant duration of the working day (relative surplus value). The increasingly organised labour movement forced capitalists to limit the length of the working day or the working week. Though

capitalists resort to overtime work, which is longer working hours in excess of the limits established by collective agreements with trade unions or by legislation, yet a longer working day has ceased to be the basic method for increasing the rate of E. In order to intensify E., capitalists liberally resort to labour intensification, which is equivalent to prolonging working hours, or increasing the actual amount of labour spent. A major source for intensifying E. is higher labour productivity, which makes it possible to cut down the labour spent on the production of the means vitally needed by the worker, thus creating the conditions for reducing the cost of labour power and the necessary working time.

The rate of E. becomes especially high under monopoly capitalism (see Imperialism; State-Monopoly Capitalism). In enterprises owned by monopolies it is normally higher than with non-monopolised employers. Besides, through a system of monopoly prices, the monopolies appropriate the surplus value created by the workers in the non-monopolised sector, as well as by the workers of the economically dependent countries. Growing taxes are a major source for increasing E. of the working people under state-monopoly capitalism. Under modern conditions, monopolies are actively employing scientific and technological breakthroughs to step up the rate of E. The latest technology serves as an instrument for intensifying the workers' labour. One very important result of scientific and technological progress, greater labour productivity, makes it possible for the monopolies to reduce the share of the cost of labour power. Simultaneously under modern conditions there is a tendency for the cost of labour power to grow (the cost of training is increasing owing to rising skills; the intensification of labour requires greater spending for labour power rehabilitation: meals, rest, etc.). The most important factor opposing greater E. is the intensified struggle of the working class for improved living standards, for higher wages, for better social services, etc. Faced with the general



crisis of capitalism (q.v.) and with the growing prestige of the world socialist community, capitalists have to make concessions to the working class. Nevertheless, the growing rate of exploitation remains a reality.

Though the main form of exploitation under capitalism remains E. of wage labour, there are still some other forms of exploitation. For quite a time, some semi-feudal forms of E. of peasants persisted in a number of capitalist countries (share-cropping and half-cropping). At present, monopolies are exploiting peasants and petty craftsmen by means of non-equivalent exchange. By dominating the market, the monopolies buy up their products at monopoly-low prices and sell monopoly-produced products to them at monopoly-high prices.

This arrangement was used by the monopolies in colonial and dependent countries. Nourished by the export of capital and non-equivalent exchange on the world market, an international system of E. has crystallised under capitalism, with the imperialist countries importing from economically underdeveloped countries a major portion of their national income, at no cost to themselves. The disintegration of the colonial system (q.v.) of capitalism and the struggle of the developing countries for their economic liberation are eroding the system of international E. The growing exploitation of the working people in the capitalist countries belies the assertions by capitalist apologists concerning a "revolution" (or "equalisation") of incomes, the emergence of a "general welfare state", and so on, meant to disguise the exploitative nature of capitalist society. Capitalism is the last social system based on E. In socialist countries, as socialist relations of production assert themselves, E. of man by man is totally eliminated.

**Export of Counter-revolution** is an activity of reactionary circles of the imperialist bourgeoisie aimed at the forcible restoration of the outlived capitalist (or colonial) orders in the countries that have embarked on the path of profound social transformation.

The idea of the E.C. is substantiated in

the writings of bourgeois ideologists of militant anti-communism (q.v.) and is eventually rooted in the socio-economic (essentially aggressive) nature of imperialism (q.v.). In essence, the E.C. is an attempt by the militaristic, aggressive circles in the imperialist countries to check, by force, the on-going process of social development, to establish an obsolescent, reactionary socio-political system in particular countries, to interfere in the internal affairs of other countries and to impose war methods on them as a way of settling international issues. Preventing the E.C. is a high priority task, a must, if peace is to be preserved on earth. The CMEA countries, including the Soviet Union (see World Socialist Community), have repeatedly helped prevent or hold back the E.C. (in Cuba in the early 1960s, in Czechoslovakia in 1968, etc.). "Together with the other Marxist-Leninist parties, the Communist Party of the Soviet Union regards it as its internationalist duty," says the Programme of the CPSU, "to call on the peoples of all countries to rally, muster all internal forces, take vigorous action, and drawing on the might of the world socialist system, forestall or firmly repel imperialist interference in the affairs of the people of any country risen in revolt and thereby prevent imperialist export of counter-revolution." (*The Road to Communism*, 1962, p. 484.)

The aid extended by countries where socialism has triumphed to the revolutionary people of another country has nothing, however, to do with the export of revolution. The latter is advocated by all sorts of leftist movements, which maintain that a revolution needs "pushing", and that socialism can be imposed on the working masses of other countries by force of arms. In rendering practical assistance to the working people of other countries in their struggle for socialism, democracy and national independence, socialist states proceed from the concept of scientific communism, formulated by Engels to the effect that the victorious proletariat cannot dispense "bliss" to any nation without jeopardising its own victory. A socialist revolution materialises from a

revolutionary situation that emerges in any given country, and it must be carried out by the people of that very country. The idea of the export of revolution contradicts proletarian internationalism. It also contradicts scientific communism, with its notion of the correlation of objective conditions and subjective factors. It is through the attraction of its own revolutionary example that victorious socialism influences the course of world history: by accomplishing its own tasks, by organising social life in keeping with socialist principles.

## F

### **Family under Socialism and Communism.**

The F. is a form of community of people connected by marital and blood relations. Having specifically biological functions of reproducing the human race, the F. is, at the same time, a form of people's social community and, as such, has important economic and intellectual functions.

The F. changes under different social and economic conditions. In the early stages of its development (the primitive-communal system, slavery and feudalism), it was a productive and economic cell of society. Under the dominance of private property, one of its most important functions is accumulation and preservation of property. That is why priority is often given in concluding marriages to the accumulation of property, rather than to any spiritual and physiological affinity between the partners or the upbringing of children. The inordinate lust for multiplying property by any means breeds economic dependence and strife among the members of the F.

Socialism radically changes the economic foundations of the F. and the relations between its members. The source of a F.'s economic life is the earned income of its members, which is redistributed among them according to requirements, some being earmarked for maintaining members unable to work themselves. Equality of women and their in-

volvement in social production, the social maintenance of old people and the growing participation of society in the maintenance of children lead to the economic independence of family members and the democratisation of intra-family relations. The gradual abolition of social, estate, national and religious prejudices and economic equality make the F. a free union of equal people.

Under socialism, the F. retains economic functions, but these tend to reduce. Economic and productive activities remain only in families that manage personal subsidiary holdings. At the same time, the F. is instrumental in organising housework, for society is not yet able to fully meet the relevant requirements through social production. Housework diverts considerable labour resources and reduces time needed for rest (see Free Time), for participation in public life, and for the development and satisfaction of the working people's cultural requirements, especially those of women. For thousands of years it has been the tradition for women to shoulder the bulk of the housework. This makes it more difficult for them to combine professional activities with being a wife and mother and often gives rise to family conflict. The building of communism implies a gradual transfer of household functions to large-scale social production. The conversion of everyday services into large-scale mechanised production will guarantee actual equality of men and women and minimise the economic function of the F., creating more favourable conditions for the intellectual development of and communication between its members. Under developed socialism, the F.'s intellectual functions grow, such as communication within the family, leisure entertainment, and mutual assistance. The moral and psychological factors increase and family members become more exacting towards one another and have a keener sense of duty.

A most important social function of the F. is to bring up the younger generation. The specific forms of the F.'s impact on the younger generation make essential education within the family. Under advanced socialism, the tasks and conditions of fam-

ily education become more complex. The number of children in the average family diminishes to one or two. Remaining social distinctions and the parents' unequal culture result in family education not always corresponding in quality to the growing social requirements. Hence the need for a proper combination of social and family education, their interconnection and society's increased influence on the F.

In the USSR the F. is protected by the state (Constitution of the USSR, Arts. 53 and 66). The state safeguards the equal rights of family members, renders its assistance to the F. in upbringing children and in organising family life, and obliges parents to educate their children and children to help their parents.

Bourgeois sociologists maintain that communism tends to abolish the F. Already the founders of Marxism emphasised that communism raises the question of abolishing the old F. alone, since it is based on private property, economic interest and economic dependence. In the future, the legal regulation of the F. will gradually disappear. Rid of material considerations, the F. will become a genuine community of loving people to promote the intellectual perfection of the individual.

**Fascism** is a blood-thirsty, terrorist dictatorship of the most reactionary, chauvinistic and aggressive factions of the exploiting classes, engendered by the general crisis of capitalism (q. v.). F. differs from other forms of reactionary dictatorship in its vast contacts with a rather numerous part of the population, not identified with the ruling classes, by its ability to mobilise these segments of the population and arouse their political activity in the interests of the exploiting class.

F. depends on the support of such social groups as the urban and rural petty bourgeoisie, whose material foundations are undermined by growing capitalism. F. also finds support among the declassed strata of the population. Riding on the social dissatisfaction of these population brackets, F. employs them to tighten the grip of state-monopoly capitalism (q. v.).

The ideology of F. consists of an assemblage of the most reactionary ideas, borrow-

ed from conservative movements of the past and demagogically larded with social slogans. It is characterised by extreme anti-communism (q. v.), rejection of humanism, chauvinism, vindication of overall regulation of social life and state paternalism. Fascist ideology is a racist ideology in its extreme (the idea of the supremacy of one race over others, vindication of genocide — extermination of entire ethnic groups on the pretext of their "inferiority").

F. appeared in the early 1920s as a reaction to the world economic and political crisis, the most important outcome of which was the Great October Socialist Revolution of 1917. Soon after, F. turned into a vehement and dangerous enemy of all progressive mankind, above all, of the international workers' movement. Even in the first years of its existence F. drowned in blood proletarian uprisings in Italy, Bulgaria and a number of other European countries. In whatever countries F. failed to come to power, armed fascist detachments became unofficial counter-revolutionary task forces terrorising left parties and their supporters and creating an atmosphere of civil war. When F. came to power in Germany, it became a mortal threat to the democratic forces not only in European countries, but of the whole world. The threat of aggression by the fascist powers hovered over the independence, even the very existence of many European and other peoples, and for that matter, over the existence of all human civilisation.

The defeat of the fascist powers in the course of the Second World War meant the collapse of F. In some capitalist countries, however, the ruling classes managed to preserve fascist regimes. The cold war period with its inalienable anti-communist trend revitalised fascist elements. In many capitalist countries, at present there exist extreme rightist organisations and movements with a fascist or semi-fascist orientation.

To be able to operate under modern conditions, fascist forces naturally have to erect new façades. This is why modern F. is mostly termed "neo-fascism". Two major trends can be distinguished in neo-fascism. The first is merely a slightly mo-

dified fascist movement, which is trying to preserve whatever is possible from the ideology and methods of German National-Socialism and Italian F. of the 1930-40s. Fascist groups in different countries, rallying around international neo-fascist centres, come within this trend. The majority of this type of organisation prefer to avoid publicity and mostly employ clandestine or semi-clandestine modes of operation. Their too intimate association with their notorious past, however, prevents these organisations from expanding the narrow circle of traditional followers and attracting any substantial sections of the population. The rapid ageing of their membership further narrows down the political prospects for such organisations, reducing them to the status of second- or third-rate agents. Far more dangerous is the other neo-fascist trend, which is trying to take advantage of the weaknesses of the decaying modern capitalist society in its own interests. The neo-fascist parties and organisations identified with this trend are known to combine illegal or semi-legal techniques with a show of outward loyalty to law and parliamentary institutions. They capitalise on modern problems and pose as self-advertised present-day arrivals. By constant manoeuvring they are trying to speculate on the crumbling of traditional social structures as a result of the scientific and technological revolution (q. v.) and on the true ulcers of the capitalist system. Among such parties and organisations are, for example, a variety of ultra-right movements in the United States, the Movimento sociale Italiano and such like. These tactics have helped some of these organisations to evolve into influential forces that largely determine the political atmosphere in their countries. Neo-fascism relies on the extremely reactionary bourgeois factions and is used by them to counterbalance the growing democratic movements and the proletarian revolutionary organisations or is viewed as an emergency firebrigade for handling socio-political crises. As a consequence, neo-fascist parties and organisations, even relatively small ones, command large financial resources and are patronised by certain sectors of the state administration. In spite of losing

some ground in the 1960s-70s, neo-fascism still remains a potential threat to the political development of a number of countries. Combating neofascism still remains a major task for both the workers' revolutionary movement and the general democratic movement.

**First International** (1864-76), the world's first association of workers, which played a major part in spreading the ideas of scientific communism and organising national workers' parties (see Parties, Workers'), and which laid "the foundation of an international organisation of the workers for the preparation of their revolutionary attack on capital" (V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 29, p. 306). The establishment and activities of F.I. are closely connected with the names of Marx and Engels.

F.I. was organised when the development of capitalism caused an upsurge in the class struggle of the proletariat and awakened a sense of international solidarity among its national contingents. The first proletarian organisations appeared in the mid-19th century — the Fraternal Democrats (1845-48), the League of the Just (1836-47), and the Communist League (1847-52); they included representatives from Britain, France, Germany, Belgium, Switzerland, Italy, Russia and other countries and prepared the ground for a broader and more stable association of the international working class. On the instructions of the Second Congress of the Communist League, Marx and Engels wrote the *Manifesto of the Communist Party*, which became the programme of the world communist movement.

After a lively exchange of opinion among the British, French and German workers at a meeting in the St. Martin's Hall in London on 28 September 1864, a Provisional Committee of F.I. was elected; it decided to call the new organisation the International Working Men's Association. The Provisional Committee unanimously adopted the Inaugural Address of the Working Men's Association, written by Marx, and the Provisional Rules, and assumed upon itself the duties of the Central Council (from 1866 on — the General Council). The Manifesto and the Rules laid the

programmatic and organisational foundations for the international solidarity of the proletariat. "The emancipation of labour is neither a local nor a national, but a social problem, embracing all countries in which modern society exists" (*The General Council of the First International. Minutes. 1864-1866.*) The Manifesto set the working class the task of winning political power.

From its very inception, F.I. met with great difficulties. There was no nation-wide workers' party in any country at that time (except for the General Association of German Workers, organised by Lassalle in 1863). Apart from a small group of Marxists, F.I. was made up by representatives of motley ideological and political trends (Trade Unionists, Blanquists, Proudhonists, Lassalleans, Bakuninists, et al.); it was, in fact, faced with the task of overcoming this ideological variance and consolidating the mass base of the movement.

The First Congress, held in Geneva in September 1866, renounced the platform suggested by the Proudhonists and approved the Inaugural Address, thus openly proclaiming F.I. to be the political organisation of the international working class. The main resolutions adopted at the Congress were written by Marx and Engels and expressed the principles of scientific communism. After the Geneva Congress, F.I. stepped up its activities in economics and politics. Though, at the Second Congress in Lausanne in September 1867, the Proudhonists managed to drag in a resolution disapproving strikes, its several other resolutions expressed Marxist views, among them a resolution on the struggle for political freedoms as a necessary condition for the social liberation of the proletariat. The Congress also considered the question of the danger of war. At the Third Congress (Brussels, September 1868), the largest of all congresses (99 delegates from seven countries were present), this question was made the central one. The Congress renounced the resolution on strikes adopted at the Lausanne Congress and recognised strikes as the workers' main weapon. After the Brussels Congress, the influence of the Proudhonists rapidly dwindled. By that time, European governments had real-

ised that F.I. presented a real danger to the bourgeois sway. The press started a slander campaign; repressions were launched against F.I. members and, some time later, it was banned all over Europe. Nothing, however, could stop the growth of its influence. In September 1869, the Fourth Congress took place in Basle, with the newly-emerged German Social-Democratic Workers' Party (Eisenachers) represented for the first time. The Congress became an arena of struggle between Marxists and Bakuninists; the latter soon became the centre rallying the forces opposed to Marxism.

The fate of F.I. was greatly influenced by the Franco-Prussian War and the defeat of the Paris Commune (q. v.). Police reprisals against it were stepped up. A crisis was ripening within its own ranks, too, as a result of the fierce attacks launched by the Bakuninists against the General Council. They thought that the Paris uprising had deposed Marx's concept and confirmed their own thesis on a spontaneous revolutionary explosion. On the other hand, the British trade union leaders were dissatisfied with the policy of supporting the Paris Commune and withdrew from the General Council. The working-class movement in Germany was disorganised by the debates between the Lassalleans and the Eisenachers. In this setting, the F.I. Fifth Congress met in The Hague in September 1872; Marx and Engels were present there for the first time. Every issue caused heated debates between the Marxists and the Bakuninists. The Congress expelled Bakunin from the International. The Bakuninists refused to obey the Congress's decision and began to build up their own organisation. For several years after the Congress, two Internationals, the Marxist and the Anarchist, conducted their activities under the same name.

In October 1872, in accordance with the decision of the Hague Congress, the leading body of F.I. moved to New York. Its ties with the European sections gradually weakened, and a fierce struggle began among various trends in the American section. At the Philadelphia Conference (15 July 1876), the decision was made to dissolve F. I.

F.I. laid the theoretical and organisa-

tional foundations for the international working-class movement. It took an active part in organising the proletariat's economic and political actions and did much to establish national Marxist parties. It exposed the illusions of pre-Marxian utopian socialism and demonstrated the ideological inconsistency of petty-bourgeois socialism. "The First International", wrote Lenin, "had played its historical part, and now made way for a period of a far greater development of the labour movement in all countries in the world, a period in which the movement grew in *scope*, and *mass* socialist working-class parties in individual national states were formed" (V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 21, p. 49).

Free Time is time that remains when the necessary time (i.e. time for work, commuting time, time spent on housework, and on physiological needs) is subtracted and which a person uses at his discretion, depending on his cultural level, income, and health. F.T. available for at least a portion of society's members is an important condition for social development. The more F.T. the members of society have and the greater part of it is used for the development of production and culture, the higher is the rate of social progress. According to Marx, under communism, "it is not working time, but free time which will be a measure of wealth" (Karl Marx, *Grundrisse der Kritik der Politischen Ökonomie*, Moscow, 1939, p. 596).

The problem of F.T. is closely linked with that of improving the individual (see Harmonious Development of the Individual). F.T. is necessary to a person for his participation in social and cultural life, for additional creative work in the fields of technology, science and art, for the development of his intellectual and physical abilities, and also for rest and recreation. "Free time," wrote Marx, "which is both leisure time and time for lofty activity, naturally turns its owner into another subject..." (*ibid.*, p. 599).

The F.T. of people belonging to different social groups varies in both volume and structure at different stages of society's development. In the slave and feudal societies, the slaves and serfs

practically had no F.T. It was a privilege of the ruling classes because of the unjust, uneven distribution of labour. This situation is also typical of bourgeois society, though, owing to the colossal growth of the productive forces, the possibility arises in it for making F.T. available to working people, too. This possibility becomes a reality as a result of a long struggle waged by the working class for a reduction in working hours. F.T. is the greatest gain of the working people.

Provision of ever growing F.T. to all members of society is an objective of the communist socio-economic formation. F.T. grows, first, because working time is being reduced thanks to growing labour productivity and the more even distribution of labour among all members of society; second, because the time spent on commuting, housework, child-care, etc., is being reduced. The greatest increase in F.T., the growing rate of production being retained, is today ensured by measures to reduce this second part of the necessary time outside work.

The social significance of F.T. is determined by its structure, by the extent to which it is filled with socially significant activities, such as creative work, socio-political engagements, improvement of qualifications, educational and cultural level, education of children, art and sport, or by the inclusion of passive rest. The way F.T. is spent largely determines a person's cultural level and qualification, physical state and mood, thereby influencing the efficiency with which he uses his working hours.

Under socialism, both the size and structure of the working people's F.T. have changed. A greater part of it is spent on pursuits that promote the development of the worker's personality. This, in turn, makes it possible to make fuller use of the technological potential and increase labour productivity. In this sense, Marx called F.T. "the most powerful productive force". Showing the interconnection between working time, labour productivity and F.T., Marx wrote: "The saving of working time is equal to the increase in free time, i.e. time

needed for the full development of the individual, which itself, in its turn, affects the productive force of labour as the most powerful productive force." (*Ibid.*, p. 599.) The increasingly complex tasks facing society presuppose greater participation by citizens in socio-political life and managerial activities, and the opportunities for this are provided by the growing F. T.

The profound changes in the structure of F. T. must not overshadow the fact that some people use it far from effectively, spending a considerable portion of it on entertainments and passive rest. The inability to make constructive use of F. T., its "emptiness" and boredom encourage drunkenness, hooliganism and crime.

The improvement of the people's well-being and culture during the building of communism, the increase in the facilities available for rest and leisure (theatres, concert-halls, libraries and clubs, sports centers, etc.), the further development of the forms and content of communist education (q. v.), the development of the various forms of public participation in running the local economy and cultural institutions and services (see Local Community Organisations), as well as the step-up in the activities of social institutions that organise the working people's F. T. and develop their tastes, will certainly improve the structure of F. T. and ensure its most constructive use.

**Friendship among Peoples**, comprehensive fraternal co-operation and mutual political, economic, military and cultural assistance among nations and nationalities that have opted for a socialist way of development. In multinational states it is a motive force behind the evolution of socialist society, and in the relations between socialist countries it is the foundation of unity in the struggle for peace, for the upholding and multiplying socialist gains and for the triumph of communism.

It is already under capitalism that the similarity of the class positions of the proletarians of all nations, and the community of their class destinies and goals engender international solidarity among the workers, and an awareness of the commu-

nity of the working people's interests the world over (see Proletarian Internationalism). Capitalism, however, with its specific socio-economic nature, upsets the equality between peoples and sows national discord.

F. P. takes shape in the course of the building of socialism. Lenin wrote in this connection: "Socialism, by organising production *without* class oppression, by ensuring the well-being of *all* members of the state, gives *full play* to the 'sympathies' of the population, thereby promoting and greatly accelerating the drawing together and fusion of the nations" (V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 22, p. 324).

For the first time in history, the Great October Socialist Revolution did away with national oppression and proclaimed the principles of F. P. The prerequisites for its full implementation were formed during the building of socialism. A voluntary formation by the peoples of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics was a graphic embodiment of F. P. As socialism was being built, the exploiting classes and the fundamental differences in the levels of peoples' economic, political and cultural development were eliminated, so the causes of national strife were uprooted. The Soviet political system and socialist democracy (see Democracy, Socialist) made up the political base of F. P., while public ownership of the means of production and the socialist economic system became its economic base. As socialism triumphed, a single type of class structure of all the peoples of the USSR was established, age-old national and ethnic prejudices and the estrangement and hostility among the nations overcome, and a single Marxist-Leninist internationalist ideology triumphed to form the ideological and theoretical base of F. P. The Soviet nations have been fused together by the great force of socialist patriotism and internationalism (see Patriotism, Socialist; Socialist Internationalism). F. P. is the genuine key to resolving the national question; it is internationalism in action.

The close association of the Soviet Republics, which was dictated by the common goals of building socialist society, assumed

forms that did not infringe on their national sovereignty — that was ensured by Lenin's plan for Soviet Federation and autonomy. The Soviet Republics, each of them having its own established traditions of independent statehood, united on a federal principle, and the peoples that did not formerly have their own national statehood were granted autonomy within the framework of one of the Soviet Republics. The borders of the self-governed and autonomous regions were demarcated taking into account the economic and living conditions, and the ethnical composition and affiliations of the population.

F.P. was consolidated during the building of socialism, in the struggle against the domestic and foreign counter-revolution (q. v.) and against great-power chauvinism and local nationalism (q. v.), and brilliantly stood the test of the Great Patriotic War of 1941-45. The fraternal assistance rendered by advanced nations to backward ones and, later, the mutual assistance between all nations and nationalities ensured the victory of socialism in all the national republics, regions and territories.

F.P. has become a major source of the success gained in the building of socialism and communism, and a motive force in the evolution of the new society. As a result, the economic and cultural backwardness of many peoples was overcome in the USSR in a historically short period of time. The Soviet Union has become a great commonwealth of equal, and economically and culturally developed socialist nations and nationalities.

F.P. in the country of victorious socialism is characterised not only by equal rights enjoyed by all the nations and by their voluntary co-operation and mutual assistance. It also reflects the socio-political and ideological unity of the Soviet peoples (see Social-Political and Ideological Unity of Society) and the community of their interests and objectives in building communism, which is a dependable guarantee of consolidating and further multiplying socialist gains.

Developed socialism promotes all-round co-operation between the peoples on the

basis of their common economic potential and the shared ideology and psychological make-up of the working people of all nations; it raises F.P. to a qualitatively higher level and establishes genuine international unity and fraternity among the peoples, reflecting their social kinship. F.P. in the USSR has become one of the cornerstones of a new historical entity — the Soviet people (q. v.), and a feature of the socialist way of life (see Socialist Way of Life).

The material and technical base of communism serves, at the same time, as the economic foundation of F.P. in the USSR, which is instrumental in consolidating the political and economic community of the socialist nations and nationalities, and in developing internationalist features in their intellectual make-up.

The ideas of F.P. became, in the USSR, the prevailing ideology. Friendship and fraternity among all the nations of the Soviet Union and intolerance towards national and racial enmity are major ethical norms inherent in socialist society. According to the Constitution of the USSR, "it is the duty of every citizen of the USSR to respect the national dignity of other citizens, and to strengthen friendship of the nations and nationalities of the multinational Soviet state" (Art. 64) as well as "to promote friendship and co-operation with peoples of other lands and help maintain and strengthen world peace" (Art. 69).

The formation of the world socialist system as a community of nations and nationalities caused a further extension and deepening of the all-round rapprochement among the peoples. The political and military alliance of the peoples of the socialist countries and their economic and cultural co-operation have consolidated in the face of aggressive imperialist aspirations. F.P. in the world socialist system ensures the integrity and sovereign development of all the nations and is an earnest of each socialist country's most successful development in all spheres of economy and culture. The tangible results of the economic integration of the socialist countries are graphic proof of the strength of F.P. and provide a solid material



foundation for strengthening the international brotherhood of peoples (see World Socialist Community). F.P. organically combines patriotism and internationalism, thus making for the rapprochement and unity of the socialist countries, which results in the formation and development of new international communities of the people. Though F.P. is an objective historical necessity, it does not emerge and gain in strength spontaneously. The socialist countries' fundamental interests require the all-out strengthening of their community, and the Marxist-Leninist parties are therefore educating the working people in a spirit of international solidarity, intolerance towards national and racial enmity, and F.P.

**Futurology** is a field of knowledge dealing with the prospects for social processes. O. Flechthelm, a German sociologist, offered the term F. in 1943 to denote a "philosophy of the future" independent of any class and contrasted with the terms "ideology" (teachings apologetic of bourgeois realities) and "utopia" (teachings, rejecting bourgeois realities). The new "philosophy", like its many predecessors, was abortive, however, and the term dropped into oblivion. It was circulated in the West in the early 1960s in connection with the "forecasting boom" (see Social Forecasting) and with the attempts to provide a theoretical basis for modern forecasting practices. This time the term denoted a "science of the future" or "history of the future" and called for a monopoly of the prognostic (forecasting) functions of sciences. Since the prospects for social processes are studied by many sciences, however, the term F. could not be definitive enough. So, from the late 1960s onwards the term was replaced by the concept of study of the future, which encompasses the entire complex of theories and practices involved in making forecasts, including prognostics, the science of forecasting and the laws governing it.

Currently, the term F. is used in the socialist and capitalist countries mostly in publicistic writings as a figurative synonym for prognostication and prognostics and denotes all "future-oriented literature" combined. In Soviet literature, it

implies modern non-Marxist conceptions of the future of mankind (bourgeois F.).

The prehistory of F. stems from religious, eschatological, utopian and idealistic notions of the future in the history of philosophy. Marxism-Leninism made a revolution in these notions and started the history of scientific prevision proper. Amidst the struggle carried on by Marxism-Leninism against idealistic conceptions of the future, as well as against positivism, which denied any possibility of scientific forecasting, some authors and scientists (C. Richet, G. Tard, M. Berthelot, H. Wells, I. I. Mechnikov, D. I. Mendeleev, K. E. Tsiolkovsky and others) produced works of futurological nature in the second half of the 19th and early 20th centuries (the so-called early F.). The number of such writings grew in the 1920s-early 1930s in connection with the long-term plans for economic and cultural development in the USSR, which triggered a discussion in the West on the possibility of scientific foresight (works by J. B. S. Haldane and others). From the mid-1930s and especially during the Second World War, this literature subsided, but in the late 1940s it again expanded in numbers. This time its growth was spurred by the inception of the scientific and technological revolution conception, by its observable, expected and desirable socio-economic consequences (works by J. Bernal, N. Wiener, R. Jungk, G. Thomson, A. Clark and others). The "forecasting boom" of the early 1960s was responsible for the unprecedented scope of the "literature on the future".

Three basic schools of bourgeois F. took shape in the 1960s: the then prevailing, openly apologetic school, riding on conceptions of the viability of state-monopoly capitalism, the feasibility of its modernisation, sticking to the banner of the "post-industrial society", in contrast to scientific communism (W. Rostow, J. Galbraith, D. Bell, and H. Khan of the USA; J. Fourastié, R. Aron, A. Touraine, and B. de Jouvenel of France, and others); a much weaker reformist school preaching "convergence" of socialism and capitalism (F. Baade of the FRG, R. Jungk of Austria, F. Polak of the Netherlands, J. Gal-

tung of Norway, and others); and finally an even weaker "apocalyptic" school resting on the philosophy of existentialism, Teilhardism, neo-positivism and trying to lengthen the life of the conceptions that were current in the first half of the 20th century (O. Spengler, P. Sorokin, A. Toynbee) of the inevitable downfall of "Western civilisation" in the wake of the social consequences of the scientific and technological revolution (P. Teilhard de Chardin, J. Sartre of France, K. Jaspers of the FRG and others). Since the end of the 1960s the first two schools have come under sharp criticism not only from Marxists, as before, but also from bourgeois ideologists, as well as from leftist radical quarters (A. Waskow, J. Platt, A. Toffler and others), since the optimistic forecasts in the light of the social consequences of the scientific and technological revolution had proved invalid for capitalism. Bourgeois F. found itself in a state of profound crisis.

In this situation, the leading role in bourgeois F. was taken over by the Club of Rome, an international non-government organisation that included a few dozen prominent Western scientists, political figures, and businessmen, headed by the Italian economist A. Peccei. The organisation initiated research into the global problems facing mankind by modelling social processes. The Club of Rome has sponsored a number of such studies: *World Dynamics*, directed by J. Forrester (USA), 1971; *The Limits to Growth*, directed by D. Meadows (USA), 1972; *Mankind at the Turning Point*, directed by M. Mesarovic (USA) and E. Pestel (FRG), 1974; *Reshaping the International Order*, directed by J. Tinbergen (the Netherlands), 1976; *Beyond the Age of Waste*, directed by D. Gabor (Great Britain) and U. Colombo (Italy), 1976; *Goals for Mankind*, directed by E. Laszlo (USA), 1977; *No Limits to Learning: Bridging the Human Gap*, directed by J. Botkin (USA), M. Malitza (Romania) and M. Elmandjra (Morocco), 1980 and others. The first two reports caused a sensation in the West by attempts to prove that a number of global disasters were unavoidable as

early as the first half of the 21st century, if the current trends in population growth, industrial and agricultural production, depletion of mineral resources and environmental pollution were allowed to continue. Since then, bourgeois F. has continued to focus on discussion of the probability and ways of getting over future crises. During this discussion, Western futurologists have split into two new groups: "ecological pessimists" of a neo-Malthusian bent (J. Forrester, D. Meadows, R. Heilbroner of the USA and others), proving the impossibility of overcoming the imminent critical situations without checking the population and industrial production growth (the "zero growth" conceptions), and "technological optimists" (C. Freeman of Britain, H. Kahn and V. Ferkiss of the USA and others) relying in this area on the huge potential of scientific and technological progress (the conceptions of "organic" or "balanced" growth in various parts of the world and different branches of industry).

The prolonged crisis of F. in the West is a token of the general crisis of capitalism (q. v.) which includes bourgeois ideology. In an atmosphere of growing internal contradictions and the resulting uncertainty, nobody can say in the West what is in store for the economy of the capitalist world. Anyway, no optimism can be sighted even in most of the official forecasts.

The conceptions of bourgeois F. lend themselves to extensive criticism from the Marxist standpoint. The varied and contradictory conceptions of bourgeois F. are countered by genuinely scientific foresight, the foundations of which were laid in the works of Marx, Engels and Lenin. Marxist-Leninist scientific foresight relies on the tenets of dialectical and historical materialism, is closely linked with the theory of scientific communism, with all Marxist-Leninist teaching. The methods and techniques of forecasting under socialism and capitalism have some features in common, but the methodology and nature of forecasts made from the standpoint of bourgeois F. or of Marxism-Leninism differ in principle.

## G

**General Crisis of Capitalism** is the period of the revolutionary downfall of capitalism (q.v.) as a social system and disintegration of the world capitalist system (q.v.), the breaking away of more and more links from it, and the world-wide struggle between socialism (q.v.) and capitalism. The crisis started with World War I (1914-1918) and the Great October Socialist Revolution, which toppled the capitalist system on a sixth of the globe's surface. Capitalism ceased to be a universal system; a more progressive social system, socialism, took root and started growing. The crisis of capitalism became general, for it encompassed all kinds of capitalist relations: the economy, the state system, the social structure, politics and ideology. The intensification of the G.C.C. is accelerated by the shift in the balance of power in the world towards socialism. The radical changes and qualitative steps in this process result in further stages of the deepening crisis. Not only does entrenchment of socialism reduce the sphere of domination of the capitalist monopolies; it also contributes to a sharpening of the internal contradictions of capitalism and to an upsurge of the class and national liberation struggles. In its evolution, the G.C.C. has gone through three stages. Whereas, at the first stage, a single socialist state, the Soviet Union, confronted capitalism, at the second stage socialist revolutions in a large group of East European and Asian countries, which were facilitated by the victories of the Soviet Union in the Great Patriotic War of 1941-1945, resulted in the formation of a world socialist system (q.v.). In the post-war period, the achievements of the socialist countries in the development of the productive forces, in improving the living and cultural standards of the people have strengthened the positions of socialism. Cuba became the site of the first victorious socialist revolution in America. Tremendous successes were scored by the national liberation movements in Asia, Africa, and Latin America. The colonial system of capitalism came apart (see

Disintegration of the Colonial System). The internal conflicts in capitalist countries became more acute. The late 1950's saw the beginning of the third stage of the G.C.C.

The strengthening of world socialism (see World Socialist Community) has led to a new balance of power on the political scene. In the 1970's certain success was achieved by policies aimed at overcoming the cold war and at accomplishing a transition to normal, tranquil relations between states, even though the reactionary circles of the imperialist powers, especially the USA, tried to hinder this process (see Detente). The acceptance of the principle of peaceful coexistence by the ruling circles of the imperialist powers signifies that they recognise the might of the socialist countries, which account for a growing share of world production, establish new forms of international economic relations (see Peaceful Coexistence of States with Different Social Systems). Under the effect of these forms, the imperialist diktat in economic relations is being ousted from the international scene; the domination of the monopolies on the world market is being significantly reduced. The achievements of the socialist countries make a strong impact on the class struggle in the capitalist countries. The demands of the working people are becoming increasingly better formulated and justified; the monopolies have, in many cases, to accept them by increasing wages, improving social security, etc. The partial reforms carried out by the monopoly bourgeoisie are evidence of the crisis of capitalism and of a desire on the part of the ruling circles to adapt to the times, when the general line of development is dictated by socialism rather than capitalism. A major feature of the G.C.C. is the crisis, followed by the disintegration, of the colonial system. In recent years, the national liberation movements have scored new successes in the struggle against exploitation, capitalist as well as feudal. A group of states has emerged that have chosen the non-capitalist path of development (q.v.). All this results in a reduction of the sphere of capitalist exploitation. The impotence

of capitalism to solve the vital problems facing the liberated countries (see Developing Countries) becomes increasingly obvious. True, imperialist monopolies still dominate the economies of many developing countries, resorting to the methods of neocolonialism (q. v.). The gap between the economic standards of the imperialist and developing countries remains impressive. Nevertheless, these are new trends leading to a weakening of imperialism's foothold in the developing countries. This is seen, in particular, in the successes achieved by the oil-producing countries in their struggle against the international monopolies and the desire of the developing countries to introduce a new international economic order.

In the period of general crisis, the economies of the developed capitalist countries are torn by deep contradictions. These are made especially acute by the scientific and technological revolution (q. v.) which opens up the broadest vistas for development of the productive forces, but is used by the monopolies for consolidating their positions and increasing the exploitation of the working people. Intensified labour results in an increase in professional disease and neurotic and psychological stress. The army of the unemployed has grown significantly. The capitalist misuse of technology results in environmental pollution. The capitalist world is engulfed by an ecological crisis (see Natural Environment and Man). The capitalist monopolies do not wish to give up their profits in order to maintain the normal state of the environment. Recently, an energy crisis set in in the capitalist countries, provoked by the monopolies. The arms race, an inherent feature of the G.C.C., leads to the plunder of natural, material, and human resources.

While trying to adapt to the new international situation and developing various forms of state-monopoly capitalism (q. v.), capitalist society is incapable of overcoming its economic instability. In the post-war years, the economies of all capitalist countries have been repeatedly plagued by crises of overproduction. One salient feature of the economic situation in the capitalist world in the 1970's was una-

bated inflation and concurrent mass unemployment. Capitalism underwent three economic recessions during the decade. This testifies to a serious crisis of the state-monopoly mechanism for economic regulation and failure of the bourgeois conceptions of "planned capitalism". Events themselves have refuted one of the most important myths, the brain-child of reformists and bourgeois ideologists, to the effect that capitalism today can get rid of crises. The instability of capitalism is becoming increasingly evident.

The most aggressive circles of imperialism have repeatedly tried to impede the growth of socialism and restore capitalist regimes in some countries by military means. In the post-war period this was the case in Korea, Cuba, and Vietnam. All these attempts failed. The increasing strength of socialism and the national liberation movement is a formidable obstacle to military intervention by imperialists. The sharpening of contradictions has resulted in a crisis of the political system of the capitalist world, particularly of the system of military blocs created by the USA in the first post-war years. Thus, CENTO came apart once Iran and Pakistan left it.

Economic instability, inflation, tax rises, and poverty of millions of families at a time, when progress of science and technology offers tremendous potential for improving living standards, lead to increasingly acute class battles in the capitalist countries. Millions take part in strikes, which often become political and directed against the very system of state-monopoly domination. In the ever more fierce class struggle, the working people are becoming increasingly aware of the need for profound changes in the social system. In many countries, the positions of Communists and the left are gaining strength. Bourgeois ideology is in crisis. The various theories that have professed the transformation of capitalism into "people's" or "planned" capitalism, or a "welfare society", do not stand comparison with the facts of capitalist reality. The intensification of the general crisis does not, however, lead to the automatic downfall of capitalism. It is only through

a consistent revolutionary struggle that the working people can bring about socialist changes in the countries that belong to the capitalist system.

**General Laws and Specifics of the Transition to Socialism.** The basic ways and means for creating the new, socialist society are dictated by the general laws that inevitably operate in any country following the takeover of political power by the Proletariat (see Period of Transition from Capitalism to Socialism). The existence of these laws, discovered by the theory of scientific communism, has been confirmed by the practice of building socialism in the USSR and other socialist countries (see World Socialist System); it follows from the objective historical fact that, in all countries, replacement of capitalism by socialism is one revolutionary process.

The general laws of the transition from capitalism to socialism are:

- guidance of the working people by the working class, centred on the Marxist-Leninist party, in a socialist revolution (see Revolution, Socialist) of some form and in the establishment of a dictatorship of the proletariat (q. v.) in some form; the alliance of the working class (q. v.) with the bulk of the peasantry (q. v.) and other strata of the working people; elimination of capitalist property and the establishment of social socialist property of the basic means of production; a gradual socialist transformation of agriculture; planned development of the national economy for building socialism and communism and improvement of the living standards of the working people; a socialist revolution in ideology and culture and the formation of a numerous intelligentsia (q. v.) loyal to the working class, working people, and the socialist cause; elimination of national oppression and establishment of equality and friendship between peoples; defence of socialist gains from attacks by external and internal enemies; solidarity of the country's working class with the working class of other countries (see Proletarian Internationalism).

While being inevitable, the general laws of the transition from capitalism to socia-

lism manifest themselves differently under the specific conditions in different countries. Countries differ in their economic and social development, historical and national features and traditions, and in the balance of class forces; international conditions under which different countries build socialism are never identical. All this is expressed in the specific forms and duration, rate, and intensity of socialist changes. Lenin wrote: "All nations will arrive at socialism — this is inevitable, but all will do so in not exactly the same way, each will contribute something of its own to some form of democracy, to some variety of the dictatorship of the proletariat, to the varying rate of socialist transformations in the different aspects of social life" (V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 23, pp. 69-70). Neither the general laws nor the specific features of socialist transformations in different countries should be considered absolute. The Marxist-Leninist parties are to be guided by the general laws of governing the building of socialism, apply them skilfully in the context of the national specifics of their countries, and determine the specific forms and methods of transition to socialism.

Modern revisionists usually deny general laws, forms, and methods of socialist transformations and elevate into an absolute the specific national conditions. They devise "models of socialism" that envisage abdication of the leading role by the working class and Communist Party (see "Democratic Socialism"). Neglect of the general laws and absolutisation of the specific conditions under which socialism is being built mean that internationalist principles are abandoned in favour of a draft towards nationalism (q. v.) and separatism.

**Global Problems,** problems that are vitally important for the interests of all mankind and require co-ordinated international actions of the world community for their solution. Two large sets of problems stand out among them: those involved in the transformation of international relations, and those connected with optimising man's relationship with nature.

The former set falls into two groups of problems. The first reflects contra-

dictions in international relations in the military-political sphere and includes the following: prevention of the threat of a nuclear war, international detente and reduction of armaments and armed forces (see also *Struggle for Peace; Detente*). These are today's most urgent and vital problems, and the efforts to solve them have been rallying the broad populations of all continents. The other group of problems reflects contradictions in international relations in the economic sphere and involves overcoming economic backwardness of the developing countries in Asia, Africa and Latin America, the struggle of the socialist and newly liberated countries to establish an international economic order which would be based on the sovereignty and equality of all peoples, on the principles of justice and mutual benefit in the relations between partners; these efforts are closely connected with the work towards peace and detente.

The second set of global problems reflects dangerous imbalances in man's interaction with nature (see *Natural Environment and Man*), the need to ensure a rational, balanced utilisation of the natural conditions essential for the life and activity of man and all mankind. Today some problems have become particularly urgent, e. g. the population explosion; the need to provide the increasing population with food; health protection against particularly dangerous diseases and the negative effects of scientific and technological progress; meeting the world economy's increasing demand for energy and natural resources; protection of the environment from destructive anthropogenic influences, etc. Mankind may face other global problems.

The emergence of such problems shows, first, that diverse worldwide links have developed (economic, political, social, cultural, and scientific and technological), which are turning mankind into an integral whole, a rather contradictory one at its present stage of development; second, that during the scientific and technological revolution (q. v.), man's impact on nature through energy and other means became comparable with that of natural forces, so a threat of energy, raw-material, eco-

logical and other crises has appeared; and third, that certain global processes are spontaneous and cannot be firmly controlled. All this requires peoples and governments, and also international, political and scientific organisations to pay greater attention to global problems.

A scientific investigation of the nature of global problems and ways to solve them is a sophisticated, complex task implying a synthesis of theoretical and methodological approaches and involving many sciences and broad use of systems analysis. Global modelling, or computerised mathematical models created for studying these problems, constitutes a promising line of scientific research, most suited to the complexity of the goal set. Several models now in wide use were developed in the 1970s by the Club of Rome, a non-governmental international organisation studying the global problems involved in mankind's development on the basis of the trends manifest in the capitalist world (models of J. Forrester, D. Meadows, M. Mesarovic, E. Pestel, et al.), of the UN (Wassily Leontieff's model) and some other organisations. The models were instrumental in revealing certain new crisis trends in world development and drawing public attention to them (sometimes creating yet another sensation in the West). All Western models and projects of world development underestimate, however, the social aspects involved, for they are all based on the bourgeois-apologetic concept of the invariability of the socio-economic relations that now predominate in the world and the existence of the capitalist mode of production in the foreseeable future.

In co-operation with Marxists in other socialist and some other countries, Soviet experts are elaborating a system for building models of the development of the world and its separate regions, relying on Marxism-Leninism (q. v.) as an integral teaching, in the sum total of its component parts. Apart from natural, demographic and economic factors, this system also incorporates social, political and cultural ones, and makes it possible to consider probable changes in the nature of the socio-economic and political relations that

exist in various parts of the world. The first experiments modelled by Soviet experts show that a regular reduction of military expenditures the world over would help solve a number of acute global problems and that the general introduction of a planned socialist economy would prevent the emergence of such problems in the future. In other words, the most reliable way to solve the current and prevent the emergence of new global problems would be for all mankind to embark on the socialist road of development.

Great October Socialist Revolution — see Revolution, Socialist

## H

**Harmonious Development of the Individual**, perfection of all man's endowments, his harmonious evolution, and moulding into an individual "to whom the different social functions he performs, are but so many modes of giving free scope to his own natural and acquired powers" (K. Marx, *Capital*, Vol. I, p. 458).

The material conditions required to turn everybody into a comprehensively developed person are provided by establishment of the material and technical base of communism and communist social relations relying on uniform communist property, and of a new system of social division of labour, differing in principle from the former system, devoid of the limitations inherent in capitalism, developing according to plan and aimed at raising the effectiveness of social production (see Material and Technical Base of Communism). When speaking about the partial individual typical of the society in which private property held sway turning into an integral person, Marx did not mean that specialisation would disappear: on the contrary, only in developed communist society will the individual features flourish and abilities and needs emerge by which one man will be distinguished from another through a specific type of activity. Specialisation in this so-

ciety, however, will differ in principle from that under capitalism. In capitalist society, only those gifts are developed that serve to raise labour productivity, while all the rest are suppressed; the result is the professional narrow-mindedness and one-sidedness of a worker. This narrow-mindedness is partially eliminated after a socialist revolution is accomplished (it is completely eliminated under communism). Socialist society is concerned with the H.D.I. making every effort to accelerate scientific and technological progress, as a result of which labour becomes increasingly effective and interesting, and the working people have more free time (q. v.); it thus becomes possible for them to raise their cultural standard and professional skills, to go in for sports, etc. Moral education assumes particular importance. As the 25th CPSU Congress noted, "nothing adds so much to the stature of the individual as a constructive attitude to life and a conscious approach to one's duty to society, when matching words and deeds becomes a rule of daily behaviour. It is the task of moral education to help people develop such an attitude" (*Report of the CPSU Central Committee and the Immediate Tasks of the Party in Home and Foreign Policy. 25th Congress of the CPSU*, p. 137). Questions of ideological education and the problems involved in shaping the new man, a worthy builder of communism, still occupy a major place in ideological and educational work. The groundwork for the H.D.I. is already being laid under socialism.

Though the types and objects of activity will be different under communism, too, the activity itself will no longer involve creators and executors. The opportunity to create will be available to everybody, for everybody will be free from non-creative functions, which will be entrusted in their entirety to automatic machine systems (see Automation), both in the material and cultural spheres.

A universal, comprehensive mastering of human culture will help develop creative gifts in the communist individual. Lenin wrote that only he who had enriched his memory with all the treasures created by mankind could become a Communist. To

master culture does not mean merely to commit names, dates and events to memory. It requires turning the culture of the past into that of the present day, with man becoming not only the subject of mastering it, but its object, too. The more achievements of science, art, technology, etc. man has mastered, the richer is his inner world, and the more developed are the abilities he can apply in the activities in which he is interested. Marx saw the free transition from one type of activity to another not as taking turns in producing objects in all spheres of production, but as the comprehensive, all-round development of man's creativity. Though, of course, an individual cannot be an expert in all fields, development of his ability to create will enable him to choose from among them, while formerly his choice was either preordained by belonging to a certain social group, or entirely accidental.

Under communism, everybody can become a creator in any type of activity, inasmuch as he is versed in the achievements of human culture (see Aesthetic Education; Physical Education). An increase in the amount of free time is vitally important for H.D.I. "A saving of working time equals to an increase of free time, i.e. the time needed for a complete development of an individual, which in its turn has a feedback effect on the productivity of labour" (K. Marx, *Grundrisse der Kritik der politischen Ökonomie / Rohentwurf / 1857-1858*, p. 599).

The harmoniously developed individual is a man who combines intellectual wealth, high moral principles and physical fitness. "He does not reproduce himself in a certainty, but does so in his integrity, does not strive to become something final but is in absolute motion of becoming" (*ibid.*, p. 387). A harmoniously developed individual is a result of and at the same time a requisite for communist social relations.

**Hegemony of the Proletariat**, guidance by the working class (q.v.) of the broad working-people masses in the struggle to transform society in a revolutionary way; a major law of the transition from capitalism to socialism (see Historic Mission of the Proletariat).

The social structure of capitalist society

is heterogeneous. Apart from the working class and the bourgeoisie, it has other classes and social strata (peasantry, q.v., farmers, petty bourgeoisie and semi-proletarian urban elements, office workers, q.v., and various groups of the intelligentsia, q.v.). The vast majority of them are oppressed by big capital, so the abolition of capitalism and the establishment of socialism are objectively consonant with their interests. These classes and social groups are not, however, always aware of their class interests, or are only vaguely and partially so. As a rule, they are isolated from one another by their working and living conditions, and many of them are easy prey for philistine notions and views, are enslaved intellectually by the bourgeoisie (q.v.), and are unstable and inconsistent in their class struggle (see Class Struggle under Capitalism). Due to its position in the system of social production, its revolutionary spirit and high level of organisation and consciousness, the working class is the natural ally and upholder of the interests of all society's strata that are oppressed, downtrodden and exploited by the bourgeoisie. It rallies them around itself while fighting for both its immediate and final goals, and directs the working people's isolated and often spontaneous actions, which set only limited goals, into the common channel of struggle against imperialism and reaction.

Realisation of the possibilities inherent in H.P. depends on the development level and political maturity of the working class. In countries where the proletariat has become a class and an independent political force, it is also capable of leading mass movements that do not set themselves socialist goals — national liberation and bourgeois-democratic revolutions, peace movements, the struggle for democratic changes, etc. General democratic movements assume much greater scope, they become considerably more radical in nature and the conditions are created for democratic and national liberation revolutions to grow into socialist ones. The working class is drawing other sections of the working people into the revolutionary movement, inspiring them by its own example and actively supporting their



demands. It initiates mass organisations of the working people that turn into organs of revolutionary struggle (Soviets, organisations of Popular Front, q. v., the Patriotic Front, National Front, of popular unity, peace supporters, democratic women's and youth organisations, etc.). The democratic sections of the population that join the revolutionary movement adopt proletarian methods of struggle (strikes, for example).

Lenin stressed that politics was the most important sphere of struggle for H.P. The withdrawal from politics preached by the Economists, anarcho-sindicalists and neo-anarchists, undermines the foundations of H.P. As it fights for a radical restructuring of the state, the working class, which represents the whole people, raises general national issues. Only by staging vigorous political actions and defending the interests of the whole people can it attract to its side the vacillating, unstable petty-bourgeois masses and wrest them from under the influence of the bourgeoisie. The main political force in the struggle for H.P. and its consistent realisation is a revolutionary Marxist-Leninist party. This represents the working class and its basic interests in its relationships with other classes and social strata, and, on a scientific basis, elaborates the strategy and tactics of the class struggle; it educates the masses politically, teaches them lessons from its own practice, and organises and co-ordinates the political struggle waged by the working class and its allies.

With respect to the working masses H.P. continues after the working class has won political power, too, when it assumes the form of state, political leadership of society by the working class in building socialism (see Dictatorship of the Proletariat).

Currently, the scope and opportunities of H.P. in the revolutionary liberation movement have been considerably extended. This is the result of the growth in the numbers, political might and respect enjoyed by the working class, of the constantly increasing influence the international working class and real socialism, which is its principal achievement, exert

over the course of events, over all forces in the liberation movement. The living example of socialism, the change in the balance of power in the international arena in favour of the international working class and socialism, and the assistance and support rendered by the socialist countries tell on the political position and behaviour of the petty-bourgeois democrats who lead national liberation revolutions in many countries. This is why revolutionary democrats prove capable of effecting progressive socio-economic changes of a transitional nature that lay the groundwork for their development along a socialist-oriented road.

Expansion of the mass left forces, which are taking an active part in the struggle for democracy and socialism, is one consequence of the historical achievements of the international working class. This finds its expression in mass anti-capitalist actions staged by young people, students, urban middle sections, and various groups of progressive intellectuals. The ideologists of reformism and "left" extremism use these phenomena as the basis for alleging that hegemony in the revolutionary movement is now passing from the working class to these strata and groups, that the working class is losing its revolutionary spirit and is being dissolved in the so-called middle class. The struggle waged during the 1970s, however, graphically proved the political and organisational amorphousness, instability and ideological vagueness of the actions staged by radically-minded groups of the petty bourgeoisie, young people, students and intellectuals that are divorced from the working-class movement. Only in alliance with the working class do non-proletarian left forces become an important factor in the revolutionary movement, for it is the working class that gives the movement its stability and mass character, and provides it with a consistent and realistic political course. The greater share and influence of employees, scientists, engineers, technicians, and students in the social structure of capitalist society expands the class base of H.P., for these strata and sections of modern bourgeoisie society are drawing increasingly closer

to the working class in their position, interests and views. In this situation the alliance between the working class and the non-proletarian sections of the working people, formed to implement fundamental democratic changes, becomes an important condition for realising H.P. in the struggle for socialism.

**Historic Mission of the Proletariat**, the proletariat's special role in world history during the transition from a class society to a classless one; it consists in the proletariat, as the most advanced and consistent fighter against capitalism, leading the revolutionary struggle of all working and exploited people, carrying out, in alliance with them, a socialist revolution (see *Revolution, Socialist*) and establishing its own dictatorship (see *Dictatorship of the Proletariat*), and governing society during the building of socialism and communism. To accomplish these tasks, the working class forms a Communist Party, which works out a scientific world outlook and a science-based policy and leads the proletariat's entire activities.

The teaching on H.M.P. constitutes the core of both scientific communism (q.v.) and Marxism-Leninism (q.v.) as a whole. "The chief thing in the doctrine of Marx is that it brings out the historic role of the proletariat as the builder of socialist society" (V.I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 18, p. 582).

As distinct from utopian socialism (q.v.), whose representatives did not see any real social force capable of accomplishing the transition from capitalism to socialism, Marxism revealed such a force in the proletariat. Marx and Engels showed that the working class is not only the most oppressed, but also the most revolutionary section of society. Owing to its decisive role in industrial production, in the development of modern productive forces, the working class is the most conscientious and organised class, creating the bulk of society's output and directly improving production technology. This necessitates its constant cultural growth while, at the same time, creating the prerequisites for raising its consciousness. Work in large enterprises, where sophisticated technology is used, requires discipline (q.v.), a high organi-

sational level, and an ability to subjugate one's own interests to those of the common cause. As production develops, the number of workers increases. But the "numbers weigh only in the balance", as Marx put it; this is only one element of success. Only "if united by combination and led by knowledge" do the numbers become decisively important for the cause (see *The General Council of the First International. 1864-1866. Minutes*, p. 286).

The proletariat is a consistently revolutionary class that fights stubbornly to overthrow capitalism, insofar as, in capitalist society, it opposes the entire world of private property as a class that is deprived of ownership of the means of production. The proletariat, which is exploited and removed from the government of society, suffers greatly from inflation, unemployment and economic crises. Deliberations by the ideologists of capitalism and reformists to the effect that the contemporary working class "integrated" into the capitalist system and that it is losing its revolutionary role therefore lack any grounds.

After the victory of the socialist revolution, the working class emerges as the leading force to implement a radical transformation of society; it is connected with the dominant, state form of ownership and takes an active part in managing production, society and the state.

Thus, the working class's special role both in the liberation movement and in the establishment of new social relations is determined by the objective position it occupies in society.

H.M.P. takes on a concrete form corresponding to the stage of society's progress from capitalism to socialism. First and foremost, it requires a merger of socialism with the working-class movement, and the creation of a party that would express, in a scientific way, the proletariat's class interests and its world-historical tasks, and would guide its class struggle against the bourgeoisie (see *Parties, Workers'; Communist Party of the Soviet Union*). It also implies the rallying of all the working and exploited people around the proletariat as an advanced fighter, its hegemony in the liberation movement, and a

firm alliance of the working class with the non-proletarian working masses, primarily with the peasantry (see Alliance of the Working Class and the Peasantry). In the course of the socialist revolution and the proletariat's immediate struggle for power, its historical mission involves establishing the dictatorship of the proletariat as the principal condition for the proletariat's victory over the bourgeoisie and the building of socialism. Once socialist society has been built, H.M.P. is seen in the working class's leading role in creating communist society. The working class continues to lead society for objective reasons: it plays the decisive role in material production, is connected with the advanced forms of labour organisation, sets an example of a communist attitude towards labour, and is the most organised and conscientious class (see Labour, Communist). The building of communism proceeds on the basis of a scientific proletarian ideology; it is guided by the Communist Party and the socialist state, which work to implement the proletariat's social ideals. H.M.P. will become outdated once a classless communist society has been built.

**Homeland** is the political, social, and cultural environment where a people lives and works. It is a complicated social phenomenon encompassing a totality of various aspects of the life and activities of society: social relations, the system of political relations and organisations, forms and types of culture prevalent in society, and spiritual values shared by the people. H. is described in terms of "eternal" elements such as a people's territory and language (see V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 41, p. 339). The socio-political nature of H. is largely dictated by the social relations dominant in society and the class that embodies them. Consequently H. can be capitalist or socialist.

The roots of H. can be traced back to the ancient times of primitive societies, when men first united into relatively stable, isolated communities (tribes, clans) with communal ownership of the means of production, blood relations between members, and joint living on the same area. H. takes its final form with the

division of labour, formation of classes, and appearance of the state. The concept of H. was found to be closely associated with the concepts of "statchood" and then of the "nation". Today's Hh. are, as a rule, national. Simultaneously there are Hh. that embody pre-national or multi-national forms of human community (see Soviet People, the).

The salient feature of the modern capitalist H. is a contradictory political, social and cultural environment; class antagonisms, sharp struggles between political forces; "two cultures" within the national culture. Consequently, different classes view the capitalist H. in different lights and imply different things by it. To the bourgeoisie H. is inseparable from the exploiting establishment, which ensures its privileged position, while a class-conscious proletarian feels that the socio-state aspect of H. is alien to him. The bourgeois state which perpetuates exploitation is a force hostile to the working class and other working people. In this sense, "the working men have no country" of their own (K. Marx, F. Engels, *Selected Works* in three volumes, Vol. 1, p. 124). The opponents of scientific communism misinterpret this formula as implying that the working class and its Marxist parties do not feel any national pride or responsibility for the fate of the people or H. This is not true, for Communists have repeatedly proved their profound patriotism and feel deep concern for their native lands. The formula "the working men have no country of their own" contains the basic principle of the international proletariat: class solidarity in the struggle for liberation from exploitation and thus for changing the bourgeois H. into a socialist one (see Proletarian Internationalism). The strongest incentive in this struggle is hatred of oppressors, a desire to see the H. free, pride in membership of the nation with its revolutionary past.

When H. becomes socialist, the attitude of the working class acquires new aspects. For the working people, H. means socialism (q. v.) as a socio-political system and a form of organising social life. Socialism as H. was defended by the working class and other working people in the Civil War

(1918-1920) and the Great Patriotic War (1941-1945). The object of patriotism becomes broader and common to all nations and nationalities. Soviet patriotism has nothing in common with the morality and mentality of individualism. It is an eternal source of heroism of the working people, which becomes an everyday, mass, and nation-wide phenomenon.

H. as a socio-political phenomenon is historically transient. "In the way that the idea of a *tribe* was replaced by that of the *homeland* ... the idea of the *homeland* should give way to the incomparably broader idea of *humanity*. *The strength of economic development* ... vouches for this", wrote G. V. Plekhanov. But this will happen only in the distant future. In this historical age, H. will continue to exist and develop as a powerful factor both in the class struggle of the proletariat and in the building of socialism and communism (see also Defence of the Socialist Homeland).

"Human Relations", the Doctrine of, is an apologetic bourgeois theory shaped to conform with the so-called industrial sociology, or sociology of labour, which seeks to increase labour productivity along with capitalist profits by streamlining the organisation of labour, but mainly by influencing the workers' consciousness and psychics. The H.R. doctrine tries to prove the possibility of attaining a psychological and moral unity of the entire staff in a capitalist enterprise, starting from the owner and manager and down to unskilled workers, of setting up a system of "human relations", which sways the worker to consider the interests of the enterprise to be in his own interests, to take care of its profits, to work for increasing labour productivity, etc.

Industrial sociology and the H.R. doctrine are believed to have been created by E. Mayo, an American sociologist, who was the first to conduct socio-psychological experiments aimed at instilling in the workers a "constructive attitude towards labour". While discarding the historical inevitability of class struggle in capitalist society, Mayo qualified social conflicts as symptoms of an "ailing society" (he saw their cause in unwholesome psycholo-

gical complexes, which were to be removed by applying "social therapy") and peaceful collaboration between workers and employers as a sign of sound "social health". He attempted to change the workers' attitude towards labour by affecting a small "non-formal" group of them. Since the workers of each stable production team split (consciously or unconsciously) into groups, bound together by their own traditions, behaviour patterns, responsibilities, procedures and even rites, the management may, in his opinion, by properly handling those groups, make the workers do whatever it wishes them to, while also making them feel like partners in decision-making. The applied character of industrial sociology and the H.R. doctrine is clear from the way many capitalist enterprises have sociologists and psychologists on their staff to study the workers' morale, relations within groups (moods and views of employees, their attitudes towards the management and technological innovations, behaviour outside the enterprise, etc.). In an attempt to affect the socio-psychological climate within the group directly, they work out proper recommendations for the management, carry out a variety of "psycho-therapeutic" measures to avert, or at least, cushion social conflicts. All-along they liberally apply the techniques of so-called microsociology devised by the American social psychologist and psychiatrist J. Moreno.

The task of microsociology, in the opinion of its adherents, is to find conformity between a group's "macrostructure" (the observed spatial positioning of individuals — at their work place, in their residential area, etc.) and its group's "microstructure" (not immediately apparent sentiments, affections or antipathies, attractions and aversions and so forth, that an individual feels towards the other members of the group). To put it simply, the positioning of the individuals at their place of work, in the classroom, in their living quarters, in the mess, etc., should be such as to ensure attractive human surroundings for every individual. The efficiency of group performance is dependent on this. Moreno developed a complex technique for studying "microstructures", devised spe-

cial sociometric graphs to establish the required spacing of the group members. This technique, which produces certain positive results in psychological experiments, was presented by him as a universal tool for solving all conflicts and contradictions generated by the bourgeois system. In this interpretation, however, microsociology acquires a reactionary utopian content. The root of its deficiency is the establishment of the priority of the "microstructure", that is, psychological relations between people, over the "macrostructure" of society. In fact, such a "macroscopic" feature as the division of bourgeois society into antagonistic classes cannot be removed by any adjustment in the "microstructure". The H.R. doctrine fails to resolve the contradictions between labour and capital, to eliminate class struggle in bourgeois society, to alter the nature of capitalist relations of production — relations of exploitation (q.v.) and oppression. The interest of the worker in the performance of the entire enterprise, the spirit of emulation and comradely mutual assistance, a desire to innovate and invent, a proprietary attitude towards the enterprise and a feeling of self-esteem — all that can only be achieved on the basis of socialist relations of production, and never within the framework of capitalism.

It would be a gross mistake to underestimate the danger posed by the H.R. doctrine and other conceptions capable of confusing the class consciousness of the proletariat to some extent. Such conceptions, elaborated by bourgeois ideologists and zealously spread by the bourgeois propaganda machine can, in certain cases, serve their purpose. Less self-conscious segments of the working class and other exploited classes and social groups may sometimes be hooked by bourgeois propaganda. Their illusions are especially dangerous, as these people's motivations are sincere; they act out of conviction. In so doing, they willy-nilly tend to "recruit" additional contingents of capital's true servants among the ranks of the working class.

Meanwhile, the vanguard of the exploited masses, especially when equipped with a truly scientific world outlook,

realizes that the "human relations" system is intended to intensify labour, increase exploitation, to split the ranks of the working class by inventing new ways of bribing certain elements of the labour force. All these methods are employed not only in the interests of social demagoguery, but also as a weapon to fight trade unions (see Trade Unions and the Trade Union Movement) and political organisations of the working class.

The H.R. doctrine is qualified by bourgeois ideologists as an important component of the theory of management. Its principles cover the non-productive social spheres, including politics, education, and armed forces. The purpose of the doctrine is to establish control over people's thoughts and feelings in the interests of state-monopoly capital. That is why Communist and Workers' Parties in capitalist countries are closely watching and critically analysing the theory and practice of "human relations" and revealing their real class content.

**Humanism**, an approach to society, in which man's dignity and great value as an individual are upheld, as well as his right to free development, while the principles of equality, justice and kind treatment of one another are recognised as the norm in relations among people.

H. emerged in Italy and spread all over Western Europe in the 13th and 14th centuries. The capitalist relations that were taking shape at that time in Italy required that feudalism and the hierarchical dependence of one social stratum on another be eliminated. Bourgeois ideologists had, therefore, to interpret the issue of man's nature and of the principles underlying human relations in a way differing radically from the religious-scholastic approach.

During that early period of capitalist development, the bourgeoisie still represented the interests of all society and of its progressive thinkers, who opposed the feudal order and the church ideology that justified it from the general democratic positions: they upheld the principle of men's equality before the law and their individual freedom, which to them meant substantiating the "natural" equality of all the people. The living man attracted all

their attention. Fiction, sculpture and painting are all devoted to man, with his needs and worries, his thirst for life and happiness, love and friendship. Fine examples provided by ancient art are widely imitated; hence the name given to the period — Renaissance.

Religion saw man primarily as a spiritual being, with religious beliefs occupying a central place in him; the new approach, on the contrary, emphasised man's sensual needs and demanded their satisfaction in this world, and affirmed the superiority of reason over faith. The great humanists — Dante, Petrarch, Boccaccio, Pisano, Leonardo da Vinci, Rafael, Michelangelo, Erasmus of Rotterdam, Ulrich von Hutten, Cervantes, Thomas More, Tomasso Campanella and many others — refused to see man's nature as sinful. Man's needs and his striving for sensual joys were declared natural and essential, so absolutely necessary and normal. From these positions, the theism, mortification of the flesh and renunciation of sensuality preached by the church were seen as abnormal and unnatural. Man's sensual needs are decreed by Nature itself; they are the same in all men and are the basis for equality in relations among people. All men are born equal and should be equal in their actual life on earth. The recognition of each man's personal dignity, irrespective of his birth and social position, was directed against feudal-estate inequality.

The Enlighteners, Jean-Jacques Rousseau and the French and English materialists developed the humanistic ideas of the Renaissance and prepared European bourgeois revolutions in ideological terms; Francis Bacon, Holbach, Hobbes, Helvétius and Diderot elaborated the bourgeois ideals of freedom, equality and brotherhood. But as capitalism advanced, these ideals were discredited and it became more and more clear that equality before the law was not enough to make humanity really equal in the future. Early in the 19th century, humanistic views developed along two basic lines: the first was associated with the principle of man's moral self-improvement, stemming from the theory of the German materialist Ludwig Feuerbach; the second

was embodied in the doctrines of the Utopian socialists, who saw society's transformation as a *sine qua non* for establishing genuinely human relations among people (see Utopian Socialism). The means suggested for effecting such a transformation were, however, idealistic and amounted to no more than enlightenment and propagandistic activities.

The representatives of the Renaissance put forward the slogan of H. in opposition to Christian ideology. Yet, up to the present time, certain church ideologists draw on some humanistic tendencies found in early Christianity in an attempt to identify it with H. The futility of such attempts was revealed by Marx, who showed that Christianity, with its promise of equality in the world to come, was essentially anti-humanistic.

As capitalism advances, it is becoming increasingly clear that formal equality before the law is not enough to establish men's genuine equality and genuinely human relations, and that man cannot be really free if the right to property is recognised as his intrinsic (natural) right, as was done by bourgeois humanists, and if man's individual, egoistic interests are regarded as fundamental ones. Marxism substantiated a qualitatively new, higher form of H.

According to the materialist view of history, man's needs are the outcome of society's historical development. Marx explained why, at certain periods, men enter relations with one another under which the needs of some are satisfied at the expense of others, while considering the succession of various forms of material production.

The existence of antagonistic classes, the alienation of labour and the estrangement of one person from another (the dehumanisation of society) are interconnected. Marxism came out against all forms of the alienation of man, against the distortion of man's essence.

To make relations among people really humane, social relations must be transformed and a level of production development achieved that would make it possible to eliminate the social division of labour prevailing under capitalism, which crip-

ples man, and would turn man from the means into the objective of social development. Socialist revolution is the first step in that direction. Socialism lays the foundations for tackling the great humanistic tasks facing mankind. It eliminates exploitation of man by man, liberates the working people from political and national inequality, abolishes the opposition between mental and physical labour, between town and countryside, does away with poverty and unemployment among the broad population and places the treasures of world art at their disposal. Socialism consistently works to ban war from the life of society, and to prevent a world nuclear war. Its motto is "Everything for man, for the benefit of man". Under socialism, the groundwork is laid down for the future civilisation of communist society, which is the highest embodiment of H. and under which "the rich man profoundly endowed with all the senses" (K. Marx, F. Engels, *Collected Works*, Vol. 3, p. 302) will become a reality (see Harmonious Development of the Individual; Individual under Socialism).

Today a fierce ideological struggle is being waged over the issues involved in H. Even overt anti-communists who oppose the principles of H. as Marxists understand it and renounce the achievements of the socialist community declare themselves "humanists". Communists are fighting to implement genuine social justice in opposition to the anti-humane essence of capitalism. While they approach humanistic ideals from class positions and consider them not in an abstract way, but in concrete historical terms, Communists also favour an alliance with those representatives of non-Marxist H. who participate in the struggle for peace and democratic freedoms, and against the oppression of the working people.

## I

**Ideological Struggle**, a form of the class struggle between the working class and the bourgeoisie, between socialism and capitalism. Essentially, I.S., waged world-wide

by the forces of socialism, involves disseminating scientific knowledge about society's development, exposing capitalism's exploitative nature, proving its historical doom, revealing the working class's historical mission (see Historic Mission of the Proletariat) and establishing its ideology and view of the world, Marxism-Leninism, as the summit of social science. The immediate aim of I.S. is to isolate, in ideological terms, the most aggressive top monopoly echelons of the imperialist states, which would help effect progressive social transformations in certain countries, and settle the most urgent international problems, first and foremost the problem of war and peace. The principal objective of I.S. as waged by the forces of socialism is to give the people a notion of society's communist future, and map out the shortest and smoothest road to it. These forces have taken up an offensive against the capitalist world.

The objectives set by the bourgeois ideologists in I.S. are diametrically opposite: to prove the permanent character of private ownership of the means and implements of production, to distract the masses from acute social problems, implant individualism and spread chauvinistic, racist ideas and militarism, distort and discredit Marxism-Leninism, the ideology of the working class, and obstruct the policy pursued by the socialist countries.

A turn begun in the 1970s in the attitude of states towards detente, renouncing the power policy and establishing the principle of peaceful coexistence between states with different social systems (see Detente) does not cancel out the principal contradiction of our age — that between socialism and capitalism — and hence does not eliminate I.S. On the contrary, the latter is becoming still more acute. The social and class nature of the two world systems is unchangeable; hence the intense struggle of ideas reflecting the nature of each system. If the two opposing systems do coexist peacefully, however, there is no place in this struggle for Cold War attitudes (subversive activities, blackmail, interference in other countries' internal affairs, etc.), which the reactionary circles of the imperialist countries are trying to

impose on people. The early 1980s have been marked by an unprecedentedly intense struggle between the two diametrically opposed world outlooks, between the two political courses — socialism and imperialism. A struggle is being waged for the hearts and minds of billions of people. The future of mankind largely hinges on the outcome of this ideological struggle.

The Communists' ideological weapon is Marxism-Leninism. The strength of Marxist-Leninist theory consists in its explanation of the objective process of social evolution, its opening up of the historical prospective and the help it provides in finding one's bearings among the complicated phenomena of contemporary life; it teaches the revolutionary classes what to do to achieve social progress more quickly and less painfully. The development of the theory of Marxism-Leninism is, therefore, a major condition for socialism to gain success in I.S. The fact that, today, I.S. is becoming more sophisticated and is being stepped up necessitates comprehensive, precise and carefully thought-out arguments in support of the fundamental propositions of Marxist-Leninist theory, a thoroughly elaborated system to activate all intellectual forces in Communist Parties, and regular clarification of their own ideological stand, alongside careful analysis and criticism of the enemy's ideology.

The imperialists, too, are aware of the great significance of the struggle to win over world public opinion, the people's minds; they see it as the priority task in their class state policy; at the same time, they are searching frantically for "new ideas" to oppose communist ones and justify and embellish capitalism. But no matter what "theories" are concocted by bourgeois ideologists, no matter how diligently they try to adjust them to new political realities in the world, anti-communism (q.v.) remains imperialism's main ideological weapon. Not only falsification of Marxist theory and of the practice of the building of socialism and communism is used to disarm the supporters of socialism ideologically, but also dissemination of the ideas of peaceful coexistence in the sphere of ideo-

logy and the discarding of I.S., which would serve as a prerequisite for genuine detente. Suggestions that a "universal ideology" acceptable to all should be elaborated, and "a free exchange of information and ideas" organised are used by imperialists as a cover for their claims to the right to interfere into other countries' internal affairs.

The methods of I.S. hinge on the nature of the ideological weapon applied. While the forces of socialism and progress develop and disseminate social science, the bourgeoisie tries to manipulate the masses' minds. The monopolies expend huge sums on both studying and searching for the most suitable means of mass propaganda, and on implementing it in their own countries and elsewhere. The activities of US monopolies have assumed especially broad scope: periodicals, radio, television and cinema, i.e. all the mass media at their disposal serve to promote anti-communist propaganda. The US Information Agency, which broadcasts in dozens of languages, shoots and broadcasts television programmes and films, publishes newspapers and distributes books, is its main international instrument. Its activities abroad are augmented by the work of US government agencies involved in various "aid" programmes, and by numerous private organisations.

Bourgeois propaganda often resorts to such well-tested means as selecting certain issues politically vital for a given country, and deliberately manipulating public opinion there by falsification, sophistry and a careful mixture of real and invented facts. Ideological campaigns against the socialist countries are often launched under the false slogan of defending human rights. While artificially fanning the problem and misrepresenting the facts with respect to the socialist countries, Western ideologists and politicians try to distract the working people from the struggle for their rights in their own countries. This situation compels the socialist countries to be on the constant alert against the intrigues of reactionary imperialist circles and vigorously rebuff all their attempts to launch ideologically subversive actions in the socialist countries.



**Imperialism**, monopoly capitalism, the highest and last stage of capitalism, the eve of socialist revolution (see Revolution, Socialist). Capitalism developed into imperialism at the beginning of the 20th century. Lenin defined it as follows: "Imperialism is capitalism at that stage of development at which the dominance of monopolies and finance capital is established; in which the export of capital has acquired pronounced importance; in which the division of the world among the international trusts has begun, in which the division of all territories of the globe among the biggest capitalist powers has been completed" (V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 22, pp. 266-67).

The inception of monopolies was objectively prepared for by changes in capitalist production. The development of machine industry, the increase in the scale of production and the emergence of new industries bring a concentration of production in large enterprises employing a considerable share of the workers occupied in the relevant branch and turning out the major part of its produce. Joint-stock companies, which promoted the centralisation of capital, also enhanced the appearance of large companies. The concentration of production and the concentration and centralisation of capital reach a level at which a single company (trust) or a group of companies which conclude an agreement (syndicate or cartel) can establish its own rules on the market and fix monopoly prices, since they turn out a considerable part of the total output of a certain product. Thus, the capitalism of free competition is replaced by monopoly capitalism. Monopolisation is accompanied by a concentration and centralisation of banking capital, and a small group of banks and other financial institutions come to the fore; they concentrate credits, insurance, payments and settlement and other financial operations in their own hands. The emergence of monopolies in industry and of large banks inevitably results in a merging of industrial and banking capital and the formation of finance capital, which is the highest form of concentration and centralisation of capital; the richest owners of capital establish their domination over the economies

of the main capitalist countries. Finance capital is embodied in the financial oligarchy, the upper crust of the bourgeoisie, controlling industry, trade, the banks, etc.

Monopolies are formed to obtain monopoly profits, which are higher than the average profit and which are procured not only through greater exploitation of the working people, but also through a redistribution of the entire mass of profit to the benefit of the monopolies.

The formation of monopolies is accompanied by increased international expansion of the highly-developed capitalist countries. "The surplus of capital", which cannot be applied or yield adequate profit (from the monopoly point of view), at home, is exported, first and foremost to backward countries where "the price of land is relatively low, wages are low, raw materials are cheap" (V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 22, p. 241). The export of capital becomes a factor in the economic subjugation of the countries that have lagged behind in their development.

As monopolies grow and strengthen their positions by exporting capital, the largest of them come to agreements about dividing up the world market, and the monopolisation process begins on the world arena. The formation of international monopolies exacerbates the struggle waged among imperialist countries. The world's economic division, effected on the basis of international cartel agreements, can never be considered as final, for uneven development and changes in the balance of forces of the monopolies of different countries inevitably cause a redivision of markets. The trend toward monopolising markets, sources of raw materials and spheres of capital investment brings about a territorial division of the world, which is a major feature of I. The colonial system of I. had formed by the beginning of the 20th century. The mechanism of the economic domination of the developed capitalist countries is supplemented, as a result of the export of capital and the activities of international monopolies, by a mechanism of non-economic coercion. At the stage of I., capitalism turns into a world-wide system of oppression.

The emergence of monopolies caused

fundamental changes in the way the capitalist economy operates. The free flow of capital that, under free competition, ensured the development of various branches of the economy, has been seriously impeded. State intervention in the economy becomes inevitable, for its typical contradictions are aggravated at the stage of I. (see State-Monopoly Capitalism).

I. is parasitic and decaying capitalism. The monopoly, which is the deepest economic base of this system, and the related possibility of obtaining high profits by establishing monopoly prices, inevitably generate a tendency to stagnate. Monopoly does not eliminate competition, so the conditions are created for capitalists to strive to raise their profits by lowering the cost of production as well. The tendency towards stagnation can, nevertheless, gain the upper hand in the economies of individual countries or industries for certain periods of time. The parasitism of the top bourgeoisie, the financial oligarchy, which more often than not does not take any part in economic activities but pockets huge revenues in the form of dividends on shares and bonds, increases under I. The receipt of revenues from external sources, particularly from the export of capital, which is, as Lenin aptly put it, "parasitism raised to a high pitch" (V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 23, p. 106), enhances chances for the emergence of a large group of individuals and states living on interest. I. is characterised by a strengthening of militarism and is fraught with the danger of wars waged by the imperialist powers for the division and re-division of the world. One manifestation of parasitism is the growth of non-productive expenditures, the expansion of the financial sphere and the bureaucratic government machine, as well as that of bourgeois political parties, and the spending of huge sums to befuddle the population ideologically. In political terms, I. is characterised by an overall strengthening of reactionary trends. I. gave rise to fascism (q. v.). The financial oligarchy strives to establish reactionary regimes that would suppress the workers' and the national liberation movements.

I. is a special stage of capitalism — the highest. The substitution of capitalist mo-

nopolies for capitalist free competition signifies that certain basic features of capitalism turn into their opposites. The exacerbation of capitalism's basic contradiction — that between the social nature of production and the private form of appropriation — leads, under I., to an aggravation of all the contradictions inherent in capitalist society. The contradiction between the monopoly bourgeoisie and the working class reaches an unprecedented pitch. The contradictions between the imperialist monopolies and the peoples of the colonial and dependent countries are also exacerbated. I. is moribund capitalism. In the age of I., the creation of the objective and subjective prerequisites for socialism to replace capitalism is completed; these prerequisites do not emerge simultaneously in all countries, however. The uneven economic and political development of countries typical of I. results in these prerequisites ripening first in a single country, or in several countries. The collapse of capitalism as a result of the Great October Socialist Revolution in Russia, which was the weakest link of the imperialist system, signified the beginning of the collapse of the entire imperialist system (see General Crisis of Capitalism). The victorious socialist revolutions that took place after World War II in several European and Asian countries, and somewhat later in Cuba, narrowed the sphere of I. still further. The collapse of its colonial system was a major blow to I. (see Disintegration of the Colonial System).

Contemporary I., which is no longer a world-wide system and has to coexist with socialism (q. v.), the new advanced, progressive social system, has acquired some new characteristics. The scientific and technological revolution (q. v.) has made further socialisation of production objectively necessary. The process takes on capitalist forms and is manifest in the unprecedented concentration and centralisation of capital and the monopolisation of the capitalist economy which overlaps the boundaries of national states as it gives birth to mammoth multinational corporations, concentrating the greater part of the capitalist world's production. Monopoly domination is spreading to all sectors of

the capitalist economy, including agriculture, trade, and other spheres in which petty-commodity and small-capitalist production persist. The state-monopoly nature of contemporary capitalism is becoming more pronounced. There appear international forms of state-monopoly capitalism, such as capitalist integration (q. v.). State intervention in the economy does not, however, eliminate its fundamental contradictions, particularly the cyclic nature of reproduction, fraught with economic crises. Social antagonisms assume broader scope and become still more acute. Immense property is concentrated in the hands of the small financial oligarchy, this resulting in an aggravation of the contradictions not only between the monopoly bourgeoisie and the working class, but also between the monopoly bourgeoisie and the broad population — peasants, intellectuals and small proprietors, who are increasingly pressurised by monopolies. Hence the exacerbation of the class struggle in the capitalist countries, which undermines the sway of the monopolies and enhances the instability and contradictions inherent in I.

**Individual under Socialism**, a member of socialist society, viewed primarily from the angle of his specific social qualities that are modified under the impact of his individual intellectual and physical features.

The Marxist concept of the individual, rooted in the materialist view of history, which considers material production relations as the definitive ones among the entire set of social relations, consists in seeing man as the carrier, the subject of social relations. It organically combines both the view of man as a product of his social environment and recognition of his active role in cognising and transforming this environment. Here is what Marx wrote on this score: "*Just as society itself produces man as man, so is society produced by him*" (K. Marx, F. Engels, *Collected Works*, Vol. 3, p. 298).

Marxism has proved and practice confirmed that I. becomes the subject of social life only if he acts as part of his class and his actions correspond to the objective laws governing social development. Public activities determine such of

man's features as his ability to think, comprehend and aesthetically assess reality, etc. Lenin wrote: "By what criteria are we to judge the *real* 'thoughts and feelings' of *real* individuals? Naturally, there can be only one such criterion — the *actions* of these individuals. And since we are dealing only with social 'thoughts and feelings', one should add: the *social actions* of individuals, i. e., *social facts*" (V.I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 1, p. 405). The source and outcome of individuals' public activities is society, the particular type of social relationships in which they are involved. As the individual is always a product of his times and is involved in relations with other people, he is characterised by belonging to a definite socio-historical type; that type changes from age to age and, in a class society, inevitably assumes class features. Thus, bourgeois society creates two main types of individual, which are opposite in their characteristics and strivings — the capitalist and the worker.

The social role of the individual under capitalism is characterised by the concept of "alienation", which is a direct consequence of the domination of private property and exploitation (q. v.) of man by man; it is typified by a transformation of the results of man's activities, talents and abilities into something alien to him, and prevailing over him. The phenomenon of the alienation of labour is abolished as private property and social antagonisms are liquidated; the basis is thus created for turning the individual into a genuine subject of social development, who actively influences the conditions of his own existence.

Under socialism, a new relationship emerges between the individual and society, which is based on the growing unity of social and personal interests (see Collectivism). The absence of antagonistic class interests serves as the grounds for the appearance of a single social type of individual. The emergent socialist type of individual is characterised by such features as fidelity to communist ideology, which is manifested in collectivism, internationalism, a high sense of social responsibility, a creative attitude to work,

a striving for self-improvement, humanness, high standard of behaviour and intolerance towards shortcomings. All these features are naturally manifested in different ways and with varying intensity in the minds and behaviour of individuals, the individual being a unity of the typical and the specific.

Social equality (q. v.) is the most important source of the individual's development under socialism. "All-round development of the individual," the CPSU Programme reads, "has been made possible by historic social gains — freedom from exploitation, unemployment and poverty, from discrimination on account of sex, origin, nationality or race. Every member of society is provided with equal opportunities for education and creative labour" (*The Road to Communism*, p. 567). Socialism creates all the conditions the individual needs to enhance his social role in all spheres of the life of society. Extension of the individual's social functions is promoted not only by the evolution of social relationships, but also by the introduction into production of the most recent discoveries of science and technology, by the scientific organisation of labour, the involvement of all working people in the management of production, and by the development of creative initiative and the masses' independent activities (see Socialist Emulation). Of fundamental importance here is an improvement in the working people's material standards and a rise in their educational and cultural level.

The growth of the individual's social role is seen not only in labour but also in those spheres of social life where a person's functions as citizen, public and political figure are realised. The role of socialist democracy (q. v.) assumes a special significance here, for it ensures a person's genuine civic rights and freedoms, creates vast opportunities for drawing him into decision-making on the most important social issues and supervision of the implementation of these decisions. The socialist individual carries out his growing social functions not as an autonomous, isolated unit, but together with other people, included into social communities and

collectives. The enhanced role the individual plays in society stems, therefore, from a better functioning of the political system and is a direct consequence of the increased leading role of the Communist Party. Resolutions adopted by the 25th and the 26th congresses of the CPSU, and the Constitution of the USSR (1977) conform that, under developed socialism, the value of the individual is placed very high.

The concept of social or public activity (q. v.) characterises the individual's functions as the subject of social relations. In conformity with these, two basic forms of social activeness in production and in civic and political life stand out — labour activity, and public and political activity.

To build communism it is necessary to resolve the task of moulding the new man, comprehensively and harmoniously developed and characterised by an intellectual wealth and moral and physical perfection. The building of communism cannot be advanced without the harmonious development of man himself.

The place and role of the individual in socialist society belies the allegations made by bourgeois ideologists that socialism as a system has failed to overcome the individual's alienation and that capitalism is a "society of equal opportunities", in which only a person's talent determines his place in society as a whole. In actual fact, however, only in socialist society does the social fate of the individual depend on his gifts and abilities, on his level of consciousness and his attitude towards labour.

**Industrialisation**, the development of a country's productive forces, characterised by the appearance of large-scale industry capable of equipping the national economy with machines. I. is a major condition for social, scientific and economic progress. Its character, methods and rates, as well as its social and economic consequences, are determined by the sum-total of the country's internal and external conditions, first and foremost by the mode of production and the economic laws it is governed by. Capitalist I. usually occurs spontaneously, as the capitalists compete with one another for profit.

It usually begins with light industry because this requires less capital investment and because capital circulates more quickly here and brings more profit immediately. As light industry develops, the demand for the means of production it requires increases, and capital is gradually accumulated; in time, an opportunity is thus created for developing heavy industry, too. It is clear that capitalist I. is a prolonged process, that cannot take place in all countries, or in all the regions or industries of a single country simultaneously. Capitalist I. aggravates the main contradiction of capitalism — that between the social nature of production and the private-capitalist form of appropriation, and deepens antagonism in the relations between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie.

Under socialism, the nature and social consequences of I. are fundamentally different. The balanced development of large-scale socialist industry, heavy industry above all, ensures the establishment of the material and technical base of socialism and the victory of the socialist relations of production throughout the economy. The former problem can be solved relatively quickly in the industrially developed countries. In countries where there is no developed industry, I. is the principal means for creating the material and technical base of socialism and tackling, on its basis, the most important social problems. "Only when the country has been electrified, and industry, agriculture and transport have been placed on the technical basis of modern large-scale industry, only then shall we be fully victorious" (V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 31, p. 516). Socialist I. is called on to ensure, in a historically short time, a country's economic independence, establish the most up-to-date technical base for its economy, and raise the working people's material and cultural standards. While, under capitalism, the evolution of large-scale machine production inevitably leads to a relative surplus of labour, socialist I. results in the elimination of unemployment. Socialist relations of production remove the obstacles in the way of I. raised by the antagonistic

contradictions inherent in capitalism, ensure high growth rates of production and open up internal sources for the accumulation of resources (a rapid growth of labour productivity, a policy of stringent economy, a rise in the working people's production activity, the distribution and redistribution of the national income for rapidly developing the economy and for raising the working people's welfare and cultural standards, the absence of parasitic consumption, greater revenues from monopolised foreign trade, etc.).

The Soviet Union has accumulated rich experience of socialist I. The Soviet people, who could not avail themselves of any outside economic assistance, quickly built a modern large-scale industry through their own selfless labour. They created the key branches of heavy industry, with engineering developing particularly fast. Of great importance was the upsurge of the working people's initiative and creativity in science and technology, and socialist emulation (q. v.). After completing the first two five-year plans (1929-37), the Soviet Union was no longer an industrially backward country, but a developed industrial power, economically independent of the capitalist countries. Socialist industry provided agriculture with modern equipment and laid firm foundations for improving the people's standard of living. I. was exceptionally important for the Soviet people's victory in the Great Patriotic War (1941-45) and the postwar rehabilitation and development of the economy. A powerful up-to-date industry also ensured the Soviet Union's success in the economic competition with the most developed capitalist countries (see Economic Competition Between the Two Systems).

In the other socialist countries, I. met with difficulties caused by the war and the sabotage carried out by reactionaries; besides, many of these countries had inherited backward and mostly agrarian economies. Still, they had more favourable conditions for effecting I. than the USSR had had, owing to the existence of the world socialist system (q. v.), close fraternal co-operation among the socialist countries and the international socia-

list division of labour. High rates of I. were typical of these countries. It should be pointed out, however, that the rates were not as essential for them as for the Soviet Union, since they could take advantage of the international socialist division of labour and socialist economic integration (see *Integration, Socialist*), and develop only those branches of heavy industry, for which the most favourable natural and historical conditions existed. Some of them initially developed the light and food industries, and agriculture.

The socialist countries render all-out assistance to the peoples of the developing countries (q.v.) as they built their own industries, carry out I. and work to achieve economic independence. Having shed colonial bondage, these countries have to overcome many difficulties impeding their industrial development, such as dependence on foreign capital, a narrow domestic market, a low level of accumulation, a lack of trained national personnel, the existence of multi-structured economies, and feudal and semi-feudal survivals. Many of them retain an economic structure oriented on developing the extractive industries, which turns them into raw-material appendages of industrially developed imperialist states. As the developing countries extend their ties with socialist countries, great importance attaches to their borrowing the historical experience of industrialisation gained by the Soviet Union (in particular by its Central Asian Republics, which had been tsarist colonies), by Mongolia which had been dominated by feudal relations, and by other socialist countries, which have overcome their centuries-old economic backwardness in a historically short time.

**Integration, Capitalist**, the most developed international form of state-monopoly capitalism (q.v.), which implies joint activities by several states with the aim of uniting their economies, establishing more or less similar conditions for the operation of monopolies within this single economic organism, and isolating it from the rest of the world economy.

I.C. relies on the objective base of the internationalisation of economic life and the growing socialisation of capitalist

production on a global scale. The scientific and technological revolution (q.v.) has engendered a tendency towards the development of mass production that exceeds by far the limits of the home market and requires broad international specialisation and co-operation. The international capitalist division of labour and dependence of the economies of most capitalist countries on exports and imports are increasing. As the internationalisation of economic life in the contemporary capitalist world grows, the contradiction between this process and the narrow framework of national states becomes more acute. In spite of sharp inter-imperialist contradictions, objective processes involved in the internationalisation of production and capital bring about a certain community of interests of the monopoly bourgeoisie in different countries on a number of issues and hence a striving to co-ordinate the imperialist states' activities in some economic spheres; the conditions are thus created for developing state-monopoly regulation on a global scale. Faced with the growing might of the world socialist system (q.v.), the imperialist countries try to co-ordinate their policies with respect to the socialist countries in the economic field, too. Another factor that brings the interests of the capitalist countries closer is the upsurge of the national liberation movement and the disintegration of the colonial system (q.v.), for imperialist circles are compelled to combine forces to fight against this movement and preserve the system of exploitation of former colonies by the monopolies, in all its diverse forms.

The establishment of a Free Trade zone may be considered the primary form of I.C. It implies that the countries lift all restrictions in mutual economic relations, while retaining full independence in their domestic and foreign policies. A customs alliance implies both the mutual abolition of foreign trade restrictions and the establishment of a single foreign trade tariff and the pursuance of a joint foreign trade policy. The regulation, both in the case of a Free Trade zone and a customs alliance is largely reduced to lifting various customs barriers and in practice concerns

only the sphere of exchange. The most developed form of economic integration, the economic alliance, implies carrying out a joint domestic economic policy and the activities of supranational economic bodies that involve not only exchange, but production, too. The levers applied may be: a joint tax policy, the subsidising of certain types of production or regions from a common fund, the compiling of joint economic development programmes, etc. The ideologists of I.C. maintain that its highest form should be political integration, i.e. an actual merger of states into a single one.

Inter-state activities under I.C. are aimed at creating stable economic links among enterprises, associations and sectors of the national economies; the latter are adjusted to one another, and international economic complexes are established; a certain economic effect is achieved, but under capitalism this is inevitably used in the interests of the monopolies. The strategic goal of I.C. consists, first, in consolidating capitalism's positions by creating relatively more favourable conditions for the development of the productive forces, and, second, in recarving the capitalist market "by peaceful means" in the interests of the monopolies of the countries participating in the integration, for these monopolies find themselves in a privileged position on the integrated market compared with those of non-participant countries.

Western Europe has made practical steps towards the integration of developed capitalist countries. Here the contradiction between the markedly increased level of the internationalisation of production and capital, and the existence of a large number of competing states is particularly sharp. I.C. was here initiated by the largest groups of monopolies, whose activities overlapped the borders of national states. As a result, at the end of the 1950s, two economic groups emerged in Western Europe: the European Economic Community (EEC, or the Common Market) and the European Free Trade Association (EFTA). The EEC set its goal as establishing a common market for commodities, services, capital and labour power;

that implied the lifting of the customs duties and quantitative and other restrictions in mutual economic relations, as well as a gradual rapprochement of the economic policies pursued by the EEC member-states, and first and foremost, the introduction of a uniform customs-tariff and a common course in trade with non-members. Today, the customs alliance has been completed in the main, and the formulation of a common economic and social policy has been placed on the agenda. Certain measures have already been taken in this direction (in particular, a common agricultural market with a ramified network of price regulation has been created, and tax systems are being unified); the European Currency System is being formed, contemplating the introduction of a European unit of payment, etc.; the transition to an economic and currency alliance, however, meets with serious objections. Certain circles in the EEC are trying to speed up political integration, as is evidenced by the transition to direct balloting in the European Parliament elections, which were held for the first time in June 1979. In this sphere, too, acute clashes of interest occur among the member-countries. Even today, EEC activities infringe to a greater or lesser degree upon its members' sovereignty and equal rights. The functions of some EEC bodies are of a supra-national type; moreover, in certain bodies different countries do not have equal numbers of votes.

The second economic group was EFTA. It was set up by Britain to oppose the Common Market, its purpose being a mutual lifting of customs duties and quantitative restrictions on the sale of industrial goods. As Britain (1973) and then the other countries joined the EEC, EFTA in fact disintegrated; even so, it made the development of the EEC into an economic, currency and political alliance much more difficult.

Today I.C. exerts a marked influence on the development of the world economy. It has raised the level of concentration and centralisation of capital in some countries, increased the volume of mutual capital exports and of the commodity turnover among the developed countries,

and enhanced the intertwining of the interests of the finance capitals of various countries. Yet it cannot eliminate the contradictions typical of the capitalist market or the cyclical fluctuations in the reproduction process. The soaring inflation and unemployment in all the EEC countries, and the energy crisis again demonstrate that the radical contradictions inherent in capitalist economy cannot be solved through I.C.; neither can it eliminate the contradictions among the countries within economic groupings. National economies are not dissolved within the framework of the EEC, and the unevenness of their economic development creates an objective foundation for a further aggravation of the contradictions that exist among them. As a result of integration, the economic centres of the capitalist world that are at loggerheads with one another become more and more isolated. West European integration has intensified the contradictions between Western Europe and the USA and Japan, as well as those between the EEC and the developing countries. The international state-monopoly associations are striving to ensure their members' advantages in the struggle for markets and against their imperialist rivals. If the boundaries of the integration are substantially extended by the inclusion of new countries, such advantages would be reduced to naught. This consideration sets the limit to the growth of I.C. at the present stage.

**Integration, Socialist,** the internationalisation of economic life, which is effected by the socialist states according to a plan and is objectively rooted in the development of the productive forces and in the socialist type of the relations of production.

The planned development of S.I. is directed and stimulated by the Communist and Workers' Parties of the socialist states. Close political co-operation among the fraternal parties enables the socialist countries to work out and implement the ways and means for their further, all-round rapprochement.

The internationalisation of production, i.e. the spread of productive forces beyond national borders and the establishment of world-wide international

production complexes that began under capitalism and was accelerated by the scientific and technological revolution (q.v.), is provided with the most favourable opportunities for development in the world socialist economic system. Marx wrote that the working class is bound to achieve a "harmonious national and international co-ordination" of the "social forms of production" (K. Marx, F. Engels, *On the Paris Commune*, p. 157).

The socialist relations of production generate a new type of international ties — relations of equality, comradely mutual assistance and mutually beneficial co-operation among sovereign socialist states. These relations call for a wider and deeper internationalisation of material and cultural life in the socialist countries as an important factor in their economic and social progress.

Socialism, Lenin wrote, will create "new and superior forms of human society, in which the legitimate needs and progressive aspirations of the working masses of *each* nationality will, for the first time, be met through international unity" (V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 21, pp. 38-39). This forecast began to materialise after the formation of the world socialist system (q.v.). The setting up of the Council for Mutual Economic Assistance (CMEA) in 1949 was largely instrumental in promoting this process. The countries of the world socialist community (q.v.) first concluded agreements on mutual deliveries of goods and gradually passed over to higher, more complex forms of economic co-operation, embracing entire sectors of production, science and technology. By the end of the 1960s, the all-round co-operation among the socialist community countries had become an important factor in the process of reproduction in each of the CMEA countries.

The goals set for the further socio-economic development of the CMEA member-states called insistently for the socialist states to elaborate a long-term joint action programme. The objective need for further development of the community's member-states was spelled out in the Comprehensive Programme for the Further Extension and Improvement of Co-opera-



tion and the Development of Socialist Economic Integration by the CMEA Member-Countries, which was jointly elaborated and adopted at the 25th CMEA session (1971). This programme regulates the all-round rapprochement, mutual adjustment and enhancement of links among the socialist countries' national economies, which are implemented in a planned way, and the gradual formation of an international economic complex relying on the growing balanced international socialist division of labour.

S.I. radically differs from capitalist integration (see *Integration, Capitalist*) in its objectives, forms, economic and legislative mechanisms and social and political consequences. It sets the following objectives: to raise the material and cultural standard of the peoples of socialist countries by making fuller use of scientific and technological progress, and achieve the highest possible effectiveness of social production, to consolidate still further the monolithic community of the sovereign socialist states, to strengthen their defence capability and to consolidate the socialist community's positions in the world economy and in the competition with capitalism in all spheres of social life. The principal method used to organise economic co-operation and enhance the international socialist division of labour is the planned activities of the CMEA member-countries; in the context of integration its role increases. The main component of their activities is the co-ordination of national economic development plans, in which special sections on socialist economic integration have been included since 1974.

To specify and implement the Comprehensive Programme, the Concerted Plan of the Multilateral Integration Measures for 1976 to 1980 was drawn up; this is a new form of joint planning activity by the socialist community countries. It has served as the basis on which the CMEA countries have combined their material, financial and labour resources to build several major projects for providing their economies with raw materials, fuel and energy.

Vitally important for the integration of the CMEA countries' economies are

international specialisation and co-operation of production, which make it possible to prevent economically unfeasible duplication in the production of certain goods and to economise on capital investment, channelling it into the sectors that will yield the greatest economic effect. The growth of the specialisation and co-operation of the CMEA countries' production is accompanied by a comprehensive standardisation of output and a typification and unification of the most important types of machine and spare part involved in mutual deliveries. A ramified system of international co-operation has taken shape within the socialist community in science and technology; it serves as the base for a broad exchange of modern technology and know-how, and for the joint tackling of sophisticated scientific and technical problems.

To achieve a further major upsurge in the economy and make it function more efficiently, at the present stage, in order to increase fundamentally the people's well-being in the CMEA countries, it is necessary to enhance the international specialisation and co-operation of production. The long-term target programmes of co-operation that set forth the joint co-operation strategy for the period up to 1990 are instrumental in this respect. They are aimed at satisfying, through the CMEA countries' joint efforts, their rational requirements for fuel, raw materials, energy, transport and farm produce and foodstuffs, machines and industrial consumer goods. The long-term target programmes are an effective means for regulating the process of S.I., which ensures continued extension and intensification of the international socialist division of labour.

International economic organisations like Intermetal, Interkhim, Agromash and others play an important part in deepening the integrational processes now underway in the socialist community, for they help develop international specialisation and co-operation of production in the corresponding sectors of the national economies. As the links among the CMEA member-countries in material production, science and technology grow stronger,

their monetary and foreign-trade activities improve. The International Bank for Economic Co-operation, set up in 1963, effects multilateral payments for the CMEA countries in transferable roubles, an international collective currency, and the short-term crediting of countries in need. The stability of the socialist countries' international currency is rooted in the balanced development of their foreign-trade turnover, which is carried out in co-ordinated and stable prices. In the future, the collective currency of the CMEA member-countries will also be used in settlements with other countries. The International Investment Bank, set up in 1970, provides long-term credits for building major projects in the CMEA states. The intensification of the integrational processes is also seen in the rapidly growing exchange of commodities among socialist countries, as well as in its improved structure.

The dynamic development of the socialist community is also reflected in the more rapid growth rates of the CMEA countries' national incomes compared with those of the developed capitalist countries. As S.I. expands and deepens, the levels of economic development of individual socialist countries are gradually evened out. The people's living standards in these countries are rising rapidly as a result of a stable dynamic increase in social production; their real incomes are growing, housing conditions improved, and educational and cultural levels raised. The further drawing together of living standards in the socialist community countries gains impetus as S.I. intensifies; it is manifested in an evening out of the volume and structure of their populations' consumption, the supply of services in the sphere of education and health protection, and in the emergence and improvement of the socialist way of life (q.v.).

As the socialist community is consolidated, the socialist countries get an opportunity to develop equitable and mutually beneficial relations with the capitalist countries and to assist the developing countries (q.v.) in achieving economic independence.

The fact that the Council for Mutual Economic Assistance has been granted the status of UN observer is evidence of the general recognition of the high respect the socialist community enjoys worldwide, and of its great and positive impact on economic relations and the process of detente (q.v.) in the world.

**Intelligentsia**, a social group consisting of persons professionally engaged in mental work and having the knowledge required for it. The existence of I. as a special social group is connected with the social division of labour by brain and by hand (see Physical and Mental Labour). I. becomes a numerous social group only under capitalism, or, in those countries which have bypassed the stage of capitalism, during the building of socialism.

I. is not a class, for it is not characterized by its own, specific relationship to the means of production. Yet, since it is closely connected with the classes existing in society whose requirements it caters for, I. plays an important socio-political role. Under capitalism, I. is an intermediate stratum between the principal classes. It is constantly replenished by representatives of the exploiting classes, middle sections, and, as it becomes a massive group, also by representatives of the proletariat and other working people. In the 19th century, I. was relatively small and consisted largely of lawyers, doctors, writers, artists, actors and other free lancers. As capitalism develops into its monopoly and then state-monopoly varieties, however, marked changes occur in the numbers and professional structure of I., and social differentiation within its ranks intensifies. In the 1970s, I., taken together with office workers (q.v.), constituted up to and over a third of the gainfully employed population in the developed capitalist countries. The scientific and technological revolution (q.v.) furthers the increase in the number of scientists, engineers and technicians. More experts are employed in the swelling military-bureaucratic machine, in the state-monopoly administration and in the machinery used to ideologically manipulate the masses, while the proportion of free lancers diminishes. The top executives at state and

private enterprises and higher government officials, most lawyers, some highly-paid scientists and prominent figures in the propaganda machine, who faithfully serve capital, are often themselves shareholders and participate in the exploitation of wage labour; in fact, they have become a highly-educated stratum of the bourgeoisie. At the same time, the bulk of the rank-and-file representatives of I. have become wage labourers, who are drawing closer to the working class in their social position, income and way of life, while retaining their social characteristics. This lays an imprint on I.'s political positions. In the 19th and the early 20th centuries, only the most progressive elements of the bourgeois I. broke with the dominant class and sided with the proletariat, becoming its ideologists and defending its interests, whereas now the proletariat's goals and methods of struggle are assumed by the broad sections of I. Many of its representatives join the ranks of the Communist and Workers' Parties and young communist leagues. I.'s protest is gaining strength against the sway of the monopolies, the aggressive, anti-democratic policy pursued by reactionary circles, against the stifling intellectual and moral atmosphere typical of bourgeois society, against cuts in the share of public expenditure on education and health protection, and on the development of culture and science. I. has also been pushed onto the road of the anti-imperialist struggle by the crisis that has set in in bourgeois ideology and by the great attraction of socialist ideas. In elaborating their strategy and tactics, Communists in the capitalist countries focus considerable attention on I. and the alliance between workers by hand and by brain. In those countries where the share of the peasantry (q. v.) in the social structure has considerably decreased, I. and office workers comprise the proletariat's most numerous ally in the struggle for peace, democracy and social progress. The Communist and Workers' Parties must, at the same time, take into account a certain political instability characteristic of part of I., its petty-bourgeois illusions and vacillations, and its inclination towards reformism (q. v.) and "left" adventurism. Communists work per-

sistently to increase their influence over I.

In the developing countries (q. v.), a considerable part of I. occupies revolutionary-democratic and anti-imperialist positions. If the proletariat is weak and does not yet play the leading role in social life, I. often leads progressive social development, reflecting the interests of the peasantry, the urban petty bourgeoisie and other working people.

The social composition of I. changes radically after the victorious socialist revolution (see Period of Transition from Capitalism to Socialism). The formation of a new, socialist I., closely connected with the working class and working peasantry and faithfully serving the interests of the people, is a task shared by all countries that have opted for the socialist way of development, and an important component of the cultural revolution (q. v.) The broad involvement of the old I. into the building of socialism and employment of bourgeois experts was regarded by Lenin as a form of class struggle in the epoch of the dictatorship of the proletariat (q. v.), the struggle to free I. from bourgeois and petty-bourgeois views, traditions and customs, and to re-educate it in the spirit of socialism. In the multinational countries, the problem of creating their own, national I. has to be specially solved for those peoples which had been in the lower stages of economic and cultural development prior to the socialist revolution. As socialism wins, the exploiting classes are eliminated and society becomes a single whole in socio-political and ideological terms, I. becomes a social stratum catering to the needs of all working people, and its interests become indivisible from those of the workers and peasants. The substantial distinctions that still persist between I. and the other social groups pertain to the place in the system of the social division of labour, the role played in the social organisation of labour, the nature and content of labour activities, and the cultural and technical level. I. has certain internal distinctions, too. Apart from the division according to profession, into scientific, technical, artistic and other sections, I. has also distinctions of a social nature, e.g. between urban and rural I., between groups

characterised by various degrees of complexity of the work done, and by different qualification levels. A specific position is occupied by a comparatively small group of free lancers — writers, artists, painters, sculptors, composers, lawyers, et al., who are not employed by the state and live on their fees. Under developed socialism, I. continues to grow in numbers, particularly scientific and technical I. The role of I. in all spheres of social life, as well as its socio-political involvement increase as the scientific and technological revolution gains momentum and the scope of mental labour is expanded. The union of workers by hand and by brain, i.e. the union of the workers, peasants and I., is taking its final shape. The constitution of the USSR (1977) defines it as the social base of the Soviet Union. As the building of communism goes on, the drawing together of the working class, the peasantry and I. becomes more and more noticeable, and the social and group distinctions within I. are also overcome. Under communism, when essential distinctions between mental and physical workers disappear, I. will no longer comprise a special social layer.

Communists have always fought against attempts to underrate the role played by I. and to sow disrespect and distrust of it. On the other hand, Marx and Lenin both debunked the subjectivist-idealist theories that depicted I. as a "supra-class force" and counterposed "heroes" from among I. to the passive "crowd". Today Communists unmask the inconsistency of the technocratic concepts spread by bourgeois sociologists and right revisionists, who give the leading role in society not to the working class, but to I., a "thinking elite". The Communist Parties resolutely rebuff attempts by individual politically unstable "intellectuals", who have fallen prey to alien ideology, to disseminate anti-communist views under cover of "free creativity", "democratisation", etc., for such phenomena are hostile to the very nature of the socialist I. The growing role of I. in society and the acute ideological struggle under way in the world make it especially important for I. to acquire such features as dedication to communist

ideas, responsibility to the people, awareness of the cohesion with the working class and other sections of society, patriotism and internationalism, creative vigour and courage, fidelity to principles and a self-critical spirit.

**International Communist Movement**, an advanced contingent of the world working-class and liberation movement, with the following distinguishing features: (1) a consistently revolutionary nature, i.e. setting the aim of abolishing all forms of exploitation and oppression, and struggling steadfastly to achieve that goal; (2) internationalism, i.e. reflection and defence of the community of interests of all workers, irrespective of their nationality, and implementation of the solidarity of the working class in different countries as they fight for their immediate and final goals, and for the freedom and independence of all oppressed peoples; (3) application of the theory of scientific communism (q. v.) as a guide in action, that helps to understand the conditions, the process and general results of the working-class movement.

The emergence of the communist movement is caused, on the one hand, by the objective requirements of the proletariat's class struggle and, on the other, by the transformation of socialism from a utopia into a science, that was formulated by Marx and Engels and enriched by Lenin with new conclusions and discoveries reflecting the specific features of the modern epoch (q. v.). The teachings of Marx, Engels and Lenin reveal the meaning of the proletariat's class struggle and point out the conditions necessary for achieving victory. The Communist Parties combine scientific Marxist-Leninist theory with the workers' movement; through their activities they liberate the proletariat from the influence of bourgeois ideology and actively assist it in shaping its own class awareness; they represent the proletariat's interests as a whole in social terms and internationally, and lead it to the fulfilment of its world-historical mission (see *Historic Mission of the Proletariat*).

The emergence and development of I.C.M. is caused by the development of the world working-class movement. The subjective factor plays a special role in its evolu-

tion, this being in many respects a result of the goal-oriented and conscientious activities of the vanguard of the working-class movement, which has always determined and modified the forms of its organisation and methods of work in compliance with the political interests of that movement as a whole, the specific features of the concrete historical situation and the tasks stemming from it.

The emergence of I.C.M. is connected with the establishment by Marx and Engels of the Communist League (1847-52). The First International (q. v.) — the International Working Men's Association — was the first mass organisation of Communists (1864-76); in fact, it initiated the world communist movement. Its cause was upheld by the Marxist revolutionary forces within the framework of the Second International (q. v.) (1889-1914), which was an international association of the socialist parties that emerged on the basis of national states and collapsed during World War I as a result of its leaders' opportunism (q. v.) and chauvinism.

Contemporary I.C.M., the appearance of which was marked by the establishment of the Third, Communist International (q. v.) — Comintern — (1919-43), emerged under the direct impact of the Great October Socialist Revolution. The Comintern defended Marxist teachings from distortions by opportunist elements, helped form genuinely revolutionary parties of the working class in many countries, and fused Leninism, which is Marxism of our age, with the working-class movement on a global scale.

The Comintern was a form in which Communist Parties were united within the bounds of a single organisation, as was required in the initial stages of the contemporary communist movement. However, as was noted in the resolution of the Presidium of the Comintern Executive Committee adopted on 15 May 1943, when the internal situation in certain countries and the worldwide situation became aggravated, it became difficult to tackle the tasks facing the working-class movement in all the countries from a single centre. This and certain other considerations, as well as the numerical growth and po-

litical maturity of the Communist Parties and their leadership, prompted the decision to dissolve the Comintern "as the leading centre of the international communist movement".

Since the time the leading centre of I.C.M. had ceased to exist, a voluntary co-ordination of activities by the parties making up the movement assumed special importance for the successful tackling of the tasks facing them. Today, co-operation between Communist Parties is largely effected through bilateral consultations, regional meetings and international conferences. Contacts of this and some other types constitute a sort of mechanism for co-ordinating their international actions and dealing with current differences of opinion.

To effect voluntary comradesly co-operation, in their mutual relations Communist Parties should be true to the principles of solidarity and mutual assistance; they should respect each party's equality and independence, and should not interfere in one another's internal affairs. Each party formulates its own political line independently and has the right to map out its own road freely as it fights to introduce progressive social changes and build socialism. At the same time, Communist Parties proceed from the belief that the struggle for socialism in each particular country is connected with the mutual solidarity of the working people in all countries, of all progressive movements and peoples as they fight for freedom, the strengthening of their independence, democracy, socialism and peace the world over. This reflects the inseparable unity of each party's national responsibility and its internationalist stand. All the past and present experience gained by I.C.M. confirms the correctness of a truly creative, Marxist-Leninist approach by each party to its political tasks, and this presupposes taking into account both the general laws of the class struggle and socialist transformations, and the concrete historical situation, the specific national conditions obtaining in each country and the features typical of each particular region, consisting of countries with socio-economic characteristics of one type.

The current forms of inter-party links and the principles that have been collectively elaborated and now prevail in mutual relations between the Communist Parties throughout the movement, create the necessary opportunities for them to join their efforts in the struggle to achieve their common goals (see World Revolutionary Process). The common stand taken by various parties belonging to the communist movement on the fundamental issues of world development and international politics is reflected in their evaluations and conclusions made on a collective and equitable basis during their bilateral and multilateral meetings. The International Meetings of 1957, 1960 and 1969 stand out for their historical significance to the contemporary communist movement.

Regular meetings of Communist party leaders and sessions of the Political Consultative Committee of the member-states of the Warsaw Treaty Organisation are of definitive importance for the elaboration by the Communist and Workers' Parties of the socialist countries of common foreign policy principles. Meetings of the Central Committee Secretaries of the Communist and Workers' Parties of the socialist countries on international and ideological issues and those of party organisational work are a major form of exchange of experience.

The Karlovy Vary (1967) and Berlin (1976) Conferences of European Communist and Workers' Parties and the Havana Conferences (1964 and 1975) of Communist Parties of Latin America and the Caribbean played a major role in the elaboration of a programme of joint action for the respective continents. Regular meetings of the Communist Parties of Western Europe, Northern Europe, Central America, Mexico and Panama, of the Arab countries and those of other regions of the world are a dynamic and flexible form for comparing positions on current problems and working out concerted approaches to them. Thus I.C.M. is not just a conglomerate of the Communist Parties of individual countries, but is, for all the differences in the conditions under which these parties operate and in

their strategy and tactics, an international force based on the community of the fundamental interests and goals of the world working class and the basic coincidence of their tasks on key international policy issues.

Contemporary I.C.M. is a voluntary alliance of independent and equal parties, their unity welded by the joint struggle against the common enemy — imperialism, and for achieving the common goals — socialism (q. v.) and communism (q. v.); by a ramified system of international ties; by commitment to the great ideas of Marx, Engels and Lenin and consistent development of the theory of scientific communism; and by co-operation in summing up the parties' international experience and theoretical work.

The steadfast struggle I.C.M. is waging against both imperialism and reaction — its overt class adversary, and against the right- and left-opportunist distortions of Marxist-Leninist theory and policies, against revisionism (q. v.), dogmatism (q. v.) and left-sectarian adventurism within its own ranks, is a law inherent in its development. Its very unity is both a result of and condition for this dual struggle, while the disagreements that sometimes arise among parties are successfully overcome in the course of consultations and exchanges of opinion.

The parties participating in I.C.M. are, at the present time, operative in all major regions of the world. The main factors determining the socio-political role of the communist movement in the contemporary world are the following: the emergence and consolidation of the socialist system in a number of countries (see World Socialist System; World Socialist Community) and its growing impact on the overall international situation; the strengthening and extension of the alliance between the communist and the national liberation movements; the formation of a group of socialist-oriented states; the transformation of some Communist Parties in capitalist countries into mass organisations representing a large national force; the development of various forms of alliance and co-operation between Communist Parties and other anti-imperialist, democratic

and progressive parties and organisations; and a qualitative growth of the impact of the communist movement's ideas on the formation of the social consciousness among the broad population. These factors, taken in their aggregate, bring about the transformation of I.C.M. into the most influential political force of our time and are typical of the most important stage in the advance of the international working class towards accomplishing its world-historical mission.

**International Division of Labour** — see Integration, Capitalist; Integration, Socialist

**Internationalism** — see Proletarian Internationalism; Socialist Internationalism

## L

**Labour, Communist** is in the narrow and stricter sense of the term "labour performed gratis for the benefit of society, ... voluntary labour, irrespective of quotas; ... labour performed ... without reward as a condition, labour performed because it has become a habit to work for the common good, and because of a conscious realisation (that has become a habit) of the necessity of working for the common good — labour as the requirement of a healthy organism" (V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 30, p. 517). Communist society will overcome social differences between the workers of mental and physical, agricultural and industrial, managerial and executive kinds of labour. Working activity will become genuine creativity, a source of inspiration and enjoyment. The inner attraction of such labour will make it the main and most essential manifestation of a person's life. For everyone labour will become a free play of his physical and intellectual forces, a pleasure, the fullest and most desirable expression of a person's vital activity. Social incentives to labour will coincide with the natural need for every member of society to satisfy his primary vital need — the need for labour. The necessity of compulsion and of outside

control from above will end as soon as organisation becomes self-organisation and discipline — self-discipline.

The formation of L.C. passes through a number of consecutive phases — from its first "shoots" to L.C. proper. Of the symptoms and tendencies leading to L.C. Lenin wrote the following: "We must carefully study the feeble new shoots, we must devote the greatest attention to them, do everything to promote their growth and 'nurse' them" (V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 29, p. 425). Under socialism, L.C. can be seen as a tendency for labour to become creativity. It is revealed, in particular, in the growing likeness between labour in working time and in free time, when, on the one hand, more and more responsible functions are carried out by way of voluntary activity and, on the other, labour in working hours acquires the characteristics of voluntary activity, with self-organisation and self-government.

The "nurturing" of the "shoots" of L.C. calls for extensive implementation of organisational, economic, social, ideological and educational measures to promote the development of the productive forces and improvement of the social relations that will alter the very essence of labour. The main conditions for the formation of L.C. are the following: achievement of the highest possible labour productivity on the basis of scientific and technological progress; the overcoming of social differences between different kinds of labour; the merging of science with productive labour; the fostering of a communist attitude to labour.

The communist attitude to labour is an inner urge to work for the good of society according to one's abilities, making full use of one's physical and mental powers, a conscientious attitude to labour (which has become a habit) as to the primary need in life.

L.C. is a socio-economic phenomenon, whereas the communist attitude to labour is a fact of social consciousness engendered by new social conditions, an indication of the moral maturity of people in socialist society, the most important feature of their intellectual make-up.

The embryos and elements of conscientious and voluntary labour first appear within antagonistic formations, this being explained by man's natural need for labour. This urge is so great that even forced labour can inspire people somewhat and make them feel the joy of work. A conscientious attitude to labour for the good of society occurs here only sporadically, in certain situations, however, while on the whole, under the conditions of exploitation (q. v.) of man by man, labour is just a means of subsistence.

The Great October Socialist Revolution of 1917 marked a turning-point in people's attitude to labour. This is evidenced first by communist subbotniks, which, in Lenin's words, presented "something quite new ... something that is much more lofty than the socialist society that is conquering capitalism ... something that is communist and not merely socialist" (V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 30, pp. 287, 288). Once the psychological revulsion towards labour engendered under capitalism were overcome, personal and collective material interest began to merge with a selfless intellectual interest, with moral public stimuli and the labour enthusiasm of the masses of the people. This is manifested in socialist emulation (q. v.), in the movement for a communist attitude to labour. The new attitude to labour under socialism has the following characteristics: recognition of labour as the most important social and moral duty, cognisance of the social significance of one's own labour, concern by the working people for the interests of the whole of society; display of initiative and a creative approach to labour; collectivism (q. v.), comradesly co-operation and mutual assistance in labour; intolerance towards parasites and violators of labour discipline (q. v.); conscientious self-discipline in labour. The communist attitude to labour is expressed by the conscientious and voluntary initiatives of working people aimed at raising labour productivity, strengthening labour discipline, developing labour on voluntary principles, merging labour and creativity, harmoniously combining personal, collective and public interests in labour.

The development of a communist attitude to labour in all members of society is a primary task of communist education (q. v.). "The Party sees the development of a communist attitude to labour in all members of society as its chief educational task," says the CPSU Programme.

During the gradual transition from socialism to communism, the realisation of the necessity of work for the common good will more and more become a habit of all citizens, will become a norm of their everyday behaviour, and then "...labour may be made, what it is intended to be, an enjoyment, leaving every one to follow his own inclinations" (K. Marx, F. Engels, *Collected Works*, Vol. 3, p. 395).

**Local Community Organisations** — are a form of public participation in running the local economy and carrying out cultural and communal work, which is typical of socialist democracy. These organisations are set up, as a rule, on the initiative of citizens who have common interests and requirements, since they live in the same building or street, and who carry out their activities without pay, on a voluntary basis, being guided by social welfare considerations. As distinct from mass social organisations (trade unions, youth organisations, voluntary sports societies, etc.), the L.C.O. members make no material contribution (in the form of membership dues, shares, etc.) and their organisations are decentralised. The Soviet working people have set up L.C.O. that differ widely in character and purpose. Many of them are branch in nature. For instance, in the housing and municipal economy there are apartment block and street committees, in public education — parents' committees at schools, in culture — councils of clubs and libraries, in the protection of public order — voluntary public order squads and comrades' courts, etc. At the same time, some L.C.O. are formed according to other principles and their activities are multi-branch in nature; such as women's councils, pensioners' councils, etc. Apart from organisations set up directly by the population, there are those formed by state bodies from among members of the public, such as non-staff departments of the



executive committees of Soviets, voluntary councils under executive committee departments, voluntary public order squads. As the number of various L.C.O. grows, their work has to be co-ordinated. This is done, in particular, by councils for work among the population, which have been set up in recent years in towns and incorporate workers of housing management offices, schools and enterprises that exercise patronage over them. The councils are headed by Communists of the organisations that exercise this patronage and campaign for an exemplary order, the creative use of leisure time, above all that of young people, organise sports and cultural work in the neighbourhood, set up interest clubs, summer sports-and-work camps, etc., thus helping to develop close ties among the people in a neighbourhood. L.C.O. are also set up in other socialist countries. For instance, apartment block committees are organised in Hungary, Poland, and Czechoslovakia; authorised representatives from apartment blocks and streets are elected in the GDR. In most socialist countries there are comrades' courts, which in some of them function in neighbourhoods and at places of work, and in others only at work.

L.C.O. are a powerful way of drawing the broadest population into administration and management. They work to eliminate the separation between people inherited from capitalism and to build close co-operation among them, to develop collective forms of everyday life and establish a communist morality (q. v.). Their constantly growing membership and increased involvement in L.C.O. shows that socialist democracy (see Democracy, Socialist) is developing apace and that free labour for the good of society and not within official working hours is becoming a requirement for millions of people.

## M

**Marxism-Leninism**, a scientifically-based system of philosophical, economic and socio-political views; the doctrine of the cognition and transformation of the world;

of the laws according to which society, nature and human thinking develop, of the ways of the revolutionary overthrow of the exploiting system and the building of communism; the world outlook of the working class and its vanguard, Communist and Workers' Parties.

Marxism emerged in the 1840s. The needs of social development, which revealed the fundamental vices inherent in the capitalist system and the entire system of exploitation, the awakening of the proletariat to political struggle, the great discoveries in the natural sciences and advances in historical and social studies confronted social thought with the task of elaborating a new, genuinely scientific theory. This historic task was fulfilled by Marx and Engels. Lenin started on his scientific and revolutionary activities at the end of the 19th and the beginning of the 20th centuries, when capitalism which has entered its last stage, imperialism (q. v.), had begun to collapse and socialist society had emerged. He defended Marxism from attacks by its enemies, analysed the latest achievements in science from a theoretical point of view, and summed up the new experience gained in the class struggles. He enriched the theory of Marxism and raised it to a qualitatively new level.

The emergence of M.-L. was a genuine revolution in the history of social thought. It is a direct continuation and development of the achievements of social thinking in philosophy, political economy and socialism. It is a consistent, integral scientific doctrine, made up of three basic component parts: (a) philosophy — dialectical and historical materialism; (b) political economy; and (c) scientific communism (q. v.). M.-L. imparted new ideas to other social sciences, too. Each of its component parts falls, in turn, into several independent sections, or disciplines. As people accumulate knowledge in the corresponding sphere, they gradually develop into independent sciences (for example, the political economy of socialism).

All the component parts of M.-L. are permeated with principal, fundamental ideas, such as consistent materialism, i. e. a materialist approach to all real phenomena (society included), and the dialectical

method of cognising these phenomena. All the component parts of M.-L. are characterised by a critical, active, revolutionary spirit and a creative nature.

An important place in M.-L. is occupied by the theory of scientific communism; it reveals socio-political patterns, ways of transforming society along communist lines, and is a graphic embodiment of the active, transformative principle that is typical of M.-L. The central place in scientific communism, as well as in the whole of M.-L., is occupied by the teaching on the historic mission of the proletariat (q. v.) as the force called on to crush the power of capital and lead the building of a new, communist society.

M.-L. is a partisan, militant doctrine; it is the ideology of the proletariat and expresses the vital needs of all working people. Its proponents do not refuse to collaborate with those who adhere to other progressive theories in the name of democracy and peace; they are prepared to ally themselves with people who hold anti-scientific, backward views in order to achieve these vital goals. But they absolutely reject reconciliation with hostile ideologies. As a revolutionary doctrine, M.-L. is opposed to reformism (q. v.). While recognising the need for a struggle to effect reforms under capitalism, it has never refuted its revolutionary programme and tactics. M.-L. won its positions and evolved in the struggle against opportunism (q. v.), which camouflaged its deviation from M.-L. by recognising it in word only and calling for its "development" in such a way as to discard its fundamental propositions as "obsolete".

Marxism has traversed a long road, almost a century and a half. Its first stage was that of the formation and growth of the working class in advanced countries and the initial combination of scientific socialism with the workers' movement, and the emergence and consolidation of Marxist working-class parties. Its second stage is connected with the working class passing to a new and higher stage of development as the era of the revolutionary overthrow of capitalism and socialist transformations sets in. The Great October Socialist Revolution in Russia was a genuine triumph

for M.-L.; it has passed the decisive historical test in the fire of revolutionary practice.

Under contemporary conditions, special importance in the socialist countries attaches to further creative development of the Marxist-Leninist economic theory, investigation of socio-political, ideological and theoretical problems that face the scientific management of society, and the theory of ideological work.

Marxist-Leninist ideas were formulated and developed under capitalism, when education and scientific activities were the prerogative of the ruling, exploiting classes. Today M.-L. is the prevailing ideology in the USSR and the other socialist countries; it is the banner that rallies hundreds of millions of people the world over. The truth and irrevocability of the fundamental propositions of Marxist-Leninist theory have been proved by the possibility of successfully applying it under the diverse and constantly changing conditions obtaining in different countries and by its use by millions upon millions of people. This in no way signifies that every tenet put forward by Marxists is an absolute truth in its final form. To ensure the further development of M.-L. and its existence as a science, which predicts the future and paves the road to it, certain propositions should be modified to conform to changing conditions. Marxist-Leninist parties diligently work to develop, in a collective way, the theory of M.-L. and creatively apply it in their practical activities. M.-L. is the only reliable basis for elaborating a correct strategy and tactics. It arms the people with an understanding of the historical perspective, helps them determine the direction of socio-economic and political development for many years ahead, and guides them through the complicated tangle of international events. The strength of M.-L. lies in its constant creative evolution.

M.-L. reflects the loftiness of communist ideals. It is fiercely attacked by all enemies from the imperialist camp and by the revisionists who have joined ranks with them. But its great, invincible strength helps it to come out on top in all clashes with its adversaries, for it is consonant with the historical truth.

M.-L. is internationalist by nature. The preaching of "national communism" and attempts to establish some kind of "national Marxism" are incompatible with it. It has now spread throughout the world, and its propositions are omnipotent; yet they cannot be applied automatically in any country: for that, the national, historical and other specific features should be scrupulously studied and an in-depth analysis be made of the concrete situation. M.-L. is not a collection of ready-made formulae and dogmas that should be committed to memory and then applied in policy-making; on the contrary, it is hostile to all kinds of dogmatism (q. v.).

M.-L. is not only a genuine lodestar in the practical activities to transform society. It provides the method for a profound study of the world and is a prerequisite for fruitful scientific research, and the life-spring of artistic creativity. As a scientific world outlook, M.-L. correctly orientates people in life, helps them realise their place in the world and their relationships with others, and choose a line of behaviour distinguished by its ideological steadfastness, political staunchness, firm principles and genuine humaneness.

"Mass Culture", a specific type of bourgeois culture, which is used by the bourgeoisie to manipulate the masses' consciousness; it was engendered by the bourgeois way of life and system of relations between people; it is an industry for producing cultural and ideological stereotypes, aimed at man's intellectual standardisation.

A deep crisis has set in in the intellectual life of contemporary bourgeois society; it is evident in the acute contradictions dominating various spheres of culture: in public opinion, morals and art.

Capitalism is essentially utilitarian. Not only the overall spread of the laws of alienation in all the spheres of social life and activities is inherent in it, but also an openly mercantile prevalence of the economic goals set by the dominant capitalist class over the individual's intrinsic human needs. That is why, as Marx put it, intellectual activity finds itself in the grip of civilisation contained *within* the crude barbarism of need (K. Marx, F. Engels, *Collected Works*, Vol. 3, p. 311) that has been

created by the bourgeoisie. This is why, in bourgeois society, the evolution of intellectual culture is slowing down and often even regressing, since the domination of utilitarianism implants a consumer ideology. By saying that the bourgeois system is concerned with raising the intellectual level of the "mass man", adherents of utilitarianism are trying to plunge the people into the quagmire of the commercial "culture of consumption".

M.C. is aimed at moulding a definite stereotype of the "mass man", a politically passive, inert individual, subservient to and guided by the elite, and devoid of any ability to argue or think independently; such an individual is incapable of critically assessing the social processes going on around him; he dully absorbs the "intellectual standards" of bourgeois society and loses all individual characteristics of a humane and integral person.

M.C. started out as Kitsch (the German for hack-work and bad taste), i.e. as a kind of alloy of cheap newspapers, books, pictures, etc. filled with criminal and sexual trash; later it was augmented by stereotyped comics, "erotic art" and other products of the entertainment industry. Kitsch deifies the "superman" and popular "stars" in a person's mind, and thus distracts him from realities. To this day, the Kitsch-culture preaches sex and violence, being generally aimed at arousing man's basest, most primitive instincts.

M.C. of the newest kind forces on its audience an allegedly unbiased, objective attitude, which is, in the final analysis, a moral censure of society's "rebellious" sections. For example, by relying on public opinion, it tries to "render harmless" all movements of protest. For capitalist ideologists it is natural to regard as the most suitable that "perfect" (read: embodying all kinds of intellectual garbage) form of M.C. in which the destructive power of distorted reality in people's perception is the greatest. The forms of progressive political activity that are the most dangerous to bourgeois society are artfully and unassumingly turned into a sort of game or pop art performance and are intentionally hyperbolised, while the problems involved in the bourgeois system as a society in which

people are isolated from one another and are doomed to social solitude, are inordinately magnified. The person is led into an ideological impasse; he is deprived of all social outbursts, and is lulled politically; he is devalued socially and ideologically deformed. All types of spiritual oppression, and M. C. above all, are utilised by the ruling circles to achieve this goal.

Thus M. C. is anti-humane in its very essence. In ideological terms it is aimed at enslaving people intellectually, depriving him of his civic and national self-consciousness and blunting the edge of his struggle for social rights. Man's intellectual world is intruded upon and his mind manipulated in the most sophisticated manner. M. C. is meant for the unpretentious consumer with no creative spirit, who is easily satisfied with inferior imitations of genuine art. It is the culture of the dominant class, tailored to suit the undersized needs of those to whom it denies the right to independent intellectual development.

Bourgeois intellectual culture, with its cynicism and cult of force, base cupidity, sadism and infatuation with sex, with its contempt for everything genuinely humane and hatred of progress, with its militant anti-communism (q.v.) and chauvinism, strives to deprive the individual of all his genuinely human features, distort his intellectual make-up and warp his morality. The harm inflicted on people by M. C. also consists in the way it detracts greatly from the national development of its own country, throwing its intellectual potential to the winds and systematically depleting society's intellectual resources.

Bourgeois ideologists see M. C. as a general human phenomenon, not conditioned by, or linked to, society's social structure; they assert that it is rooted in certain trends in modern technology as a universal phenomenon, independent of the social nature of society and typical of both capitalist and socialist society. Such views are a far cry from the truth, however. M. C. is not confined to comics and Westerns; it is an expression and a way of intellectual life, a pattern of intellectual consumption under capitalism, forcing bourgeois stereotyped values upon the individual. Its social function is to adapt the individual to bourgeois

society. It would be a grave error to see M. C. as a general-social concept, typical of both the opposing systems, and not only from the point of view of method, but also because of the essence of the processes under way in the intellectual life of socialist and capitalist societies. The very concept of M. C. is discredited and debased, and linked fast to the ideological positions of the bourgeoisie. Its antithesis is socialist culture, which characterises the contemporary intellectual world of the new society, the intellectual image of the people who have risen to a high level of conscious and active social life.

In bourgeois society itself M. C. is opposed to a genuinely advanced, progressive culture for the masses, a truly popular, democratic culture, representing broad social strata and striving to develop people intellectually and achieve freedom, social progress and socialism. M. C. and people's culture are on opposite sides of the barricade in the struggle that is being waged between the socialist and bourgeois cultures; the former is on the side of reaction, the latter on the side of progress.

**Mass Information and Propaganda Media** are the social institutions (the press, book publishers, press agencies, cinema, radio, television, etc.) engaged in the mass-scale retrieval, proceeding and dissemination of information in compliance with the laws of the society in which they function. Mass information is intended for a numerically large, usually geographically dispersed audience. It is marked by quick and regular dissemination, one-time consumption, and an indirect and somewhat stereotyped character. Its dissemination is an inalienable part of the mass intellectual communication between people, which arose at a definite stage in mankind's development, to supplement direct interpersonal communication.

Mass communication and its media appeared during the emergence of capitalism when, as Marx and Engels put it, "In place of the old local and national seclusion and self-sufficiency, we have intercourse in every direction, universal interdependence of nations. And as in material, so also in intellectual production" (K.Marx, F. Engels, *Collected Works*, Vol. 6, p. 488).

This process was dominated by economic and social factors, rather than technical ones, as bourgeois sociologists are prone to assert. At the same time, thanks to the appearance in the 20th century of special technical devices and systems for quick information transmission, the process of mass communication has become more comprehensive and varied, turning into an important factor of social-political administration and the dissemination of culture, a powerful means for influencing the people's consciousness and behaviour. The mechanism of mass communication is, by nature, intended for broad information exchanges on the scale of the whole of society. In an exploiting system, however, it is yet unable to reveal all its potentialities. From the start, the bourgeoisie uses it in its own narrow class interests and it has now become a means for manipulating the people's consciousness and behaviour, a weapon in the ideological struggle against socialism. This gives rise to the contradiction, unsolvable under capitalism, between the nature of the mass media and the method by which they are employed.

Only a takeover of the mass media by the people can open up vistas for intellectual communication on a truly mass scale, in the interests of the working people. Under capitalism, the mass media system was formed largely spontaneously, while in socialist society it is formed systematically, according to a plan. The socialist press, cinema, radio and television are powerful levers in the ideological and political education of the working people, and the fostering of communist ideology and morality in them (see *Communist Ideology; Communist Morality*). Being a weapon of social control over the people's thoughts and feelings, under capitalism the mass media are used to impose alien views and ideas on working people, to obscure their class consciousness. Under socialism, the purpose of these media is different: it is to help the working people comprehend their own interests, to promote the growth of their self-consciousness and involve them in the management of society's affairs, and to cultivate initiative and responsibility in them. Socialism provides access for all the people to the cultural treasures of past and present

(and not to the cultural surrogates typical of the "mass culture", q.v., under capitalism). Hence the signal role played by the press, cinema, radio and television in disseminating genuine cultural values, in the intellectual development of the individual and divestment of vestiges of the past, in ensurance of his aesthetic education (q.v.). The educative function of the mass media has changed fundamentally because of the current accelerated renovation and accumulation of knowledge. In the 20s and 30s, they were used to eliminate illiteracy and disseminate elementary knowledge, whereas today they are involved in the continuous expansion of the world-view and raising the educational level of each member of society, which meets the requirements of the scientific and technological revolution (q.v.).

The radical difference in the character and functioning of the mass media in capitalist and socialist societies does not indicate that information exchanges between them are fundamentally impossible. The activity of the press, cinema, radio and television under capitalism is inherently contradictory and two-fold: it is linked with the interests of the exploiters, but also satisfies the requirements of society as a whole. Information exchanges are, therefore, possible under conditions of peaceful coexistence between socialism and capitalism (see *Peaceful Coexistence of States with Different Social Systems*). They must be based on the principles of the non-use of force or threat of force, respect for sovereignty, non-interference in one another's internal affairs, equality and mutual advantage. The socialist countries are opposed to mutual communication through the mass media being used to impose alien ideas and disregard the principles and freedoms inherent in the socialist system. Under advanced socialism, the impact of the mass information and propaganda media on the economy, science, culture, and social life is steadily growing, thanks to the purposeful activities of the Communist party. This increased role has been enshrined in the Constitution of the USSR. Thus, the Soviet citizens' right to enjoy cultural achievements is ensured, in particular, by the development of television and

radio, book publishing and the periodical press. Exercise of the guaranteed freedoms of speech and the press is ensured by the broad dissemination of information and by the opportunity to use the press, television and radio (see the 1977 Constitution of the USSR, Art. 50).

**Material and Moral Incentives** are the social factors encouraging man to activity, determining his interest in the process and results of his work.

Since production activities are the principal means for satisfying man's vital requirements, they primarily determine the major factors (stimuli, incentives), that encourage a person to carry out various types of activity and display social activity (q. v.) A major role in their system is played by material incentives. Another type of incentive is moral (intellectual) ones, i. e. various ideological, moral, aesthetic and other motives making a person approach work not merely as a means of livelihood but as something that brings joy and satisfaction with socially significant results, etc. The content of incentives and relations between them are determined by the nature of relations of production.

In bourgeois society, the working people are formally free, but have no means of production. They are forced to work for the capitalists, the owners of the means of production, otherwise they risk hunger and the real possibility of remaining without means of livelihood. It might appear on the surface, however, that capitalists and workers are equal commodity owners: capitalists own means of production and workers their labour power. This appearance becomes even more plausible thanks to the wage and salary systems used, which produce the illusion that the working people's material standards depend solely on their attitude to work, abilities, qualifications, and productivity.

Economic coercion is supplemented by various incentive systems, payment of bonuses for industry, for initiative, etc. All these methods aim largely to increase the surplus-value appropriated by the entrepreneurs and give the impression that contradictions between labour and capital have been overcome and settled.

Under socialism, material incentives re-

tain their great importance, primarily in the form of remuneration for labour but, at the same time, they are increasingly being applied in combination with moral incentives. Work, remaining the source of the means of livelihood, also serves to satisfy moral, research and aesthetic requirements. Thus, in socialist society, the individual's material interest in remuneration for the final product of labour and in the amount of this remuneration is combined with his interest in the social recognition for labour, and assessment of its quantity and quality. Where there are no distinct criteria for determining the amount of labour and labour contribution by each working man, however, this usually causes both material and moral losses and undermines the role of lofty social motives of labour activity, which are a gain of socialism. Elaboration of objective criteria for assessing the quantity and quality of the labour both of individual workers and of the collective as a whole, and the use of the many factors determining high efficiency and quality of labour are, thus, under advanced socialism, a major economic and socio-political task. Special attention is focused on the organisational problems that play an important role in the purposeful impact on the entire system of material and moral incentives.

A major part in forming incentives to the development of production is now played by current measures to enhance the collective material interest, and improve collective forms of labour organisation and remuneration — such as team contracts, full-job and composite teams, etc. Great importance for improving incentives to labour activity also attaches to the further development of socialist emulation (q. v.).

Expansion in the sphere of material incentives creates favourable socio-economic conditions for the development of moral incentives that stem from an understanding of the social significance of work, its character and content and relations of collectivism (q. v.), and involve assessment by the collective and other factors. A healthy moral atmosphere in a collective and relations of comradely mutual assistance, as well as public opinion, are important reserves for the development of the indivi-

dual's creative activity. Among the moral incentives, a greater role is played by interest in work itself, the satisfaction derived from the process of labour activity in which man's creative abilities are realised. All this serves to develop people's activity and fosters a communist attitude to work. The moral and material incentives add to and intensify each other's effectiveness. He who gives more to society, receives more material benefits and greater social recognition, and enjoys greater moral prestige. Material and moral incentives under socialism are also based on a combination of personal and collective interests and the interests of society as a whole.

As society moves on to communism, the role of moral incentives will grow, because labour activity will increasingly become creative activity connected with the moulding of a communist consciousness. The tendency for the role of moral incentives to grow will be expressed more vividly as the major material requirements are better satisfied, as labour becomes man's primary vital need.

**Material and Technical Base of Communism,** the production and technological foundation of the higher phase of the communist socio-economic formation, characterised by the level of production (primarily, the means of production) needed to implement the principle: "From each according to his abilities, to each according to his needs" (see Basic Principle of Communism, the).

Capitalism has created large-scale mechanised industry as its production and technological base. Though more and more sophisticated automatic appliances are being introduced in the developed capitalist countries, they are unable to automate production completely, since that would presuppose planned economic development and integral, centralised management; it is incompatible with exploitative relations and is only possible on the basis of public property.

The production and technological foundation of communism is being laid down gradually, as the material and technical base of socialism is created. It emerges as a result of radical qualitative changes that occur in production and involve, pri-

marily, the technological principles of man's impact on nature and the technical form that serves to exert that impact. Of decisive significance in this is the scientific and technological revolution (q. v.), for in material and technological terms, communism presupposes automation of production and technological processes throughout society, and that means science is fused not only with the material elements of production (technology), but also with the participants in it, the working people. The content and character of labour change radically as a result of automation (q. v.); it is freed from mechanical, abstract functions, and requires, instead, a highly creative endeavour, excellent professional qualifications and education. The share of functions that involve people's intellectual power rises sharply in such types of labour, which becomes increasingly manifold and stimulates the multi-faceted development of man himself. As a result, labour becomes the most important sphere of man's creative self-assertion, his primary vital need (see Harmonious Development of the Individual; Labour, Communist). Marx showed that, as technology develops, the moment comes when the worker ceases to be an immediate participator in production and a living extension of the machine, which is indispensable for it to operate. Man is liberated from uncreative, tedious types of work, and technology is liberated from man, who is an imperfect and insufficiently effective "implement" in machine production. Social shifts brought about by automation give grounds for calling it the technology of communism. Not only the functions of physical labour, but also some of those of intellectual labour as well, are now taken over by automatic appliances, with man assuming the role of "conductor" in social production and holding the right to engage in scientific research and creative endeavour. Thus automation provides opportunities for all man's endowments to flourish, as well as for technology to develop in conformity with its nature, its inner logic, the results being an accelerated growth of labour productivity. Developed, automated production in future society will do away with man's degrading de-

pendence on means of subsistence. An abundance of material goods available to everybody is indispensable for society to be transformed along communist lines: it will spell the greatest revolution in human history. By making high demands on the human intellect and, at the same time, providing people with considerable free time (q.v.) in which they can develop all their abilities, the production of the future will break the rigid cord directly binding man and machine into a single working mechanism. Thus, the individual will become the centre of society's entire life. In Marx's words, the development of human energy which is an end in itself, the true realm of freedom, which, however, can blossom forth only with this realm of necessity as its basis (K. Marx, *Capital*, Vol. III, p. 820), i.e. material production, begins beyond that material production. It becomes clear that the true wealth of society consists in the profusion of the individual's manifestations, in the scope of his creative potential. Man is not freed from labour, but labour is turned into a process through which man asserts his active relationship with nature, his personality.

The formation of the material and technical base of communism is a major link in the chain of economic, social and cultural tasks facing developed socialist society (q.v.). Their accomplishment will lay the foundations for: (1) ensuring an abundance of material benefits and thus making it possible to implement distribution "according to one's needs"; (2) turning work into a source of joy, inspiration and creative endeavour and eliminating the fundamental distinctions between mental and manual work; (3) transforming socialist production relations into communist ones, and drawing all working people into the management of social affairs and production; (4) erasing the fundamental distinctions between town and country (see *Overcoming Differences Between Town and Country*); (5) fully implementing the principle "From each according to his abilities" and establishing an organisation of society that will provide everyone with an opportunity to choose occupation according to his inclinations.

Middle Sections are the classes and so-

cial groups occupying an intermediate position between the two basic classes, the two poles of an antagonistic society (under capitalism — between the bourgeoisie and the proletariat). Marx pointed to the existence under capitalism of "the middle classes, those who stand between the workman on the one hand and the capitalist and landlord on the other" (Karl Marx, *Theories of Surplus-Value*. Part II, 1975, p. 573).

Economically, socially, politically or ideologically, M.S. do not represent a single whole. This is an aggregate of differing groups, each of which occupies a unique place in the class structure of society anywhere between the bourgeoisie and the proletariat. The petty bourgeoisie of town and country (artisans, craftsmen, petty traders, owners of small enterprises, small and middle peasants and farmers), like capitalists, own private property and, like workers, belong to the working people, live largely through their own labour, rather than exploitation. These are working people who are owners. The intelligentsia and office workers (qq.v.), unlike capitalists and petty bourgeois, are not owners. They are working people, wage workers, just like industrial workers. But, first, many of them live on their income without producing surplus value, and, second, they hold a unique place in the social division of labour, being connected with mental labour, which the bourgeoisie seeks to use against the proletariat. Servants and declassé elements also hold a special place between the bourgeoisie and the proletariat.

Under capitalism, M.S. are, on the one hand, eroded (largely the petty bourgeoisie), adding up to the two main classes of capitalist society and, on the other hand, they are replenished by bankrupt capitalists and some workers who become intellectuals and office workers. Owing to this mixed, intermediate position, M.S. may be allies of both opposite classes of capitalist society.

In its struggle for socialism, the working class regards the M.S. as its real allies. Moreover, in order to work out a correct strategy and tactics in relation to them, it is of prime importance to take account of objective trends in the development of each of



the components of the intermediate sections and assess their role and proportion in society and the liberation movement.

In the period of pre-monopoly capitalism, the principal ally of the working class (q.v.) is the petty bourgeoisie, primarily peasantry (q.v.). This is the most mass-scale non-proletarian section of the working people in that period.

As capitalism passes to the monopoly and state-monopoly stages, the numbers and proportion of the petty bourgeoisie in town and country (especially peasants) decrease, since they are ruined. At the same time, the numbers and proportion of intellectuals and office workers grow rapidly. In the capitalist countries, office workers and intellectuals, alongside working artisans and craftsmen, become mass allies of the proletariat and, in the developed capitalist countries, they become the chief ally of the working class, owing to a drastic decrease in the numbers of the petty bourgeoisie.

Because each of the groups comprising the M.S. is heterogeneous, some members of these groups link their destinies with the bourgeoisie and others with the proletariat. Within the petty bourgeoisie itself, the wealthiest strive to become capitalists and therefore support the bourgeoisie, while the least prosperous, faced with the danger of bankruptcy, link their future with the working class. Social differentiation is equally manifested among intellectuals and office workers. On the one hand, as Lenin said, there is "the rapidly growing horde of careerists and bourgeois hirelings, an 'intelligentsia' contented and satisfied, a stranger to all wild fantasy and very well aware of what they want" (V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 1, pp. 294-95). On the other hand, there is the liberal, radical, proletarian (socialist) intelligentsia. In the capitalist countries today, the upper crust of the intelligentsia and office workers (top officials and managers, politicians, brass hats in the army, police, intelligence service, etc.) merge with the bourgeoisie, becoming, to all intents and purposes, an actual component of it. The mass of office workers and intellectuals (low and medium echelons) draw closer to the workers in their living and working conditions and consciousness.

They are proletarianised, adhere to the working class, becoming a section that can be hardly separated from it (though they still differ from it in terms of their place in social production), and a section of them becomes industrial workers, as they acquire the features typical of the working class.

As a result of these processes, the ever smaller proportion of the M.S. remain a loyal and reliable ally of the bourgeoisie, while the ever greater proportion takes the side of the proletariat. It can be argued that, today, the M.S. do not contribute so much to the social stability and strength of the "upper ten thousand", as was the case in Marx's time, as they expand the basis of the revolutionary struggle of the proletariat, promoting the growth of its power. As the International Meeting of Communist and Workers' Parties noted in 1969, "the convergence of interests of the working class, farmers, urban middle strata and intellectuals as well as their growing co-operation reduce the social foundations of monopoly power". The M.S. remain in existence during the period of transition from capitalism to socialism (q. v.) and represent the non-socialist groups of the working people (petty bourgeoisie, bourgeois and petty-bourgeois specialists) who hold an intermediate position between the victorious working class and the overthrown, but still surviving bourgeoisie, which still puts up resistance. "The peasants, like the petty bourgeoisie in general, occupy a half-way, intermediate position even under the dictatorship of the proletariat" (V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 30, p. 116). Once the bourgeoisie has been abolished, the peasants turned into socialist workers and a socialist intelligentsia formed, a united socialist society has been established and the M.S. are dispensed with (see Social-Political and Ideological Unity of Society). The socialist peasantry, socialist intelligentsia and office workers are in the same ranks and in close alliance with the working class. Led by the working class, they form an inherently united social structure of socialist society (q. v.) and its social foundation (see also Obliteration of Socio-Class Distinctions).

Mode of Life under Socialism and Com-

munism, implies various spheres of human non-productive activity, such as housekeeping, family life, the spending of leisure time, various forms of daily cultural activity. M.L. is characterised by traditions, customs, rites, habits and social norms. It reflects the entire way of life of society and is influenced by the socio-economic relations. In a class-antagonistic society, in the final analysis, the dominance of private property determines the different modes of life in the opposed classes, giving rise to such vices as inequality of woman in the family and everyday life. The opposition of the city and village also tells on M.L. The socialist M.L. came into being as a result of fundamental socio-economic and cultural transformations, the implementation of the principles of collectivism (q. v.) and relations of social and national equality (q. v.) in people's lives. Socialism is characterised by a gradual levelling out of M. L. of various social groups, by a diminishing difference between the way of life of manual workers and that of mental workers, of the urban and rural populations. M.L. under socialism is influenced by the constantly rising material and cultural standards of the working people. Socialist society pursues a purposeful policy of satisfying people's most important needs by building housing, as well as service and cultural facilities, improving health care, organising trade and public catering, expanding and improving service amenities. To a great extent this function is served by the social consumption funds (q. v.), which are constantly growing.

The increasing role of state enterprises and public organisations in the upbringing of children contributes greatly to the changes in M.L. under socialism. This not only improves the quality of the education of the younger generation, but also enables women to take an active part in production and public life. This is an essential condition for their equality with men in the family and in the social and political spheres. The inevitable change-over to public upbringing of children was pointed out by Marx and Engels, who emphasised that, under communism, "the care and education of the children becomes a public matter" (K. Marx, F. Engels, *Selected Works* in

three volumes, Vol. 3, p. 249). It stands to reason that an increase in public forms of child education and care, aimed at helping parents, does not mean a decrease in their responsibility for the upbringing of the rising generation.

A major part in the development of M.L. is played by changes in housekeeping. As a result of the historically established division of labour in the family, most chores fall to women and this either prevents them from taking part in social production or means they are greatly overworked if they are engaged both in production and housekeeping. Lenin wrote: "The real *emancipation of women* ... will begin only where and when an all-out struggle begins ... against this petty housekeeping, or rather when its *wholesale transformation* into a large-scale socialist economy begins" (V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 29, p. 429). As society proceeds towards communism, housework becomes ever more mechanised or is replaced by public services.

As a result of the planned reduction of the working day and expenditure of time on child care and housekeeping, free time (q. v.) is increasing. Members of socialist society devote an ever greater part of their spare time to learning, public activities, creative work, the arts, physical culture and sports. "In accordance with the communist ideal — 'The free development of each is the condition of the free development of all' — the state pursues the aim of giving citizens more and more real opportunities to apply their creative energies, abilities, and talents, and to develop their personalities in every way" (*Constitution of the USSR*, Art. 20). The rising number of theatres, cinemas, clubs, libraries, concert halls, and sport facilities leads to a change in M.L. of people, who develop high cultural standards and aesthetic tastes. The constructive use of leisure time is aimed at ousting such an irrational pastime as drinking.

The socialist M.L. shows a tendency towards growing public activity by the population (see Social Activity; Local Community Organisations). Volunteer organisations are active both as initiators of collective measures in city improvement (such as planting trees and shrubs, etc.) and as

organisers of ways of spending leisure time, keeping public order, etc. Changes in social life, including M.L., entail corresponding ones in the forms and principles of population settlement. This is reflected, for example, in the creation of microdistricts in cities which combine housing with cultural amenities and service facilities, in the reconstruction of rural settlements into townships with a network of organisations and facilities catering for the population's cultural and material needs.

Improvement of the socialist M.L. paves the way for the advent of proper communist conditions of life. The communist M.L. will be marked by a high level of development of public services and facilities, collectivist principles firmly imbedded in social relations, and the disappearance of negative vestiges of the past (such as leftovers of actual inequality between men and women in housekeeping, irrational ways of spending leisure time, etc.). For all that, communism does not mean a levelling out of people in any way, their M.L. included. The communist M.L. will provide for the many important needs of the comprehensively and harmoniously developed individual (see also Socialist Way of Life; Family under Socialism and Communism).

**Modern Epoch** — an epoch the main content of which is mankind's transition from capitalism (q. v.) to socialism (q. v.); the epoch of the struggle of the two opposing social systems (see *Struggle Between the Two Social Systems*), of socialist and national-liberation revolutions (see *Revolution, National-Liberation; Revolution, Socialist*), of the collapse of imperialism (q. v.), the abolition of the colonial system (see *Disintegration of the Colonial System*), the transition of ever more peoples on to the road of socialism, and the world-wide triumph of socialism and communism. The M.E. is highlighted by the international working class (q. v.) and its main achievement — the world socialist system (q. v.).

The M.E. was initiated by the victory of the Great October Socialist Revolution in 1917, which was a major event of the 20th century that radically changed the entire development of mankind. The October Revolution split the world into two op-

posing social systems, capitalism and socialism, and thus ushered in the collapse of capitalism and establishment of socialism. "The abolition of capitalism and its vestiges, and the establishment of the fundamentals of the communist order comprise the content of the new era of world history that has set in," wrote Lenin after the October Revolution (V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 31, p. 392). The M.E. is transitional in character, for its main content consists of the replacement of one socio-economic formation by another. This is an essentially revolutionary epoch, for this change comes about as a result of socialist revolution.

The historical framework of the M.E. is keynoted by the development of the world revolutionary process (q. v.) from the first victorious socialist revolution in Russia, in October 1917, to the victory of socialist revolution world-wide. Within the M.E., a distinction should be drawn between narrow historical periods reflecting certain stages in the changing alignment of forces between capitalism and socialism, in the narrowing down of the capitalist world and expansion of the socialist one. These stages in the M.E. largely coincide with those of the general crisis of capitalism (q. v.).

The essence of the M.E. is closely linked with its main contradiction, that between socialism and capitalism. It is the development, the higher stage of the contradiction between labour and capital, taking the form of one between the working class that is dominant in one part of the world, and the bourgeoisie that is dominant in the other. In the M.E., the class struggle has risen to the interstate level of struggle between the two opposing social systems, and the coexistence between the states belonging to these systems is a specific form of class struggle between socialism and capitalism (see *Peaceful Coexistence of States with Different Social Systems*). The main contradiction of the M.E. is not a partial or local one affecting merely some individual countries or groups of them, but a universal, world-wide, global contradiction inherent in modern mankind as a whole. It is an all-embracing contradiction, permeat-

ing all aspects of social life; the economy, politics and ideology. Its development and resolution produce a serious, direct and determining impact on the development and resolution of all other contradictions and problems of the M.E. "Reciprocal relations between peoples and the world political system as a whole," Lenin wrote, "are determined by the struggle waged by a small group of imperialist nations against the Soviet movement and the Soviet states headed by Soviet Russia. Unless we bear that in mind, we shall not be able to pose a single national or colonial problem correctly, even if it concerns a most outlying part of the world. The Communist parties, in civilised and backward countries alike, can pose and solve political problems correctly only if they make this postulate their starting-point" (V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 31, p. 241).

An important feature of the M.E. is the emergence of a powerful anti-imperialist current consisting of three principal revolutionary forces of today: the struggle of the socialist nations to build socialism and communism, the revolutionary struggle of the working class in the capitalist countries (see *Class Struggle under Capitalism*), and the national liberation movement. The struggle of the international working class largely determines the character of the M.E., though this is also determined by the development of contradictions between imperialism and the nations struggling to abolish colonialism and all its aftermath, the contradictions between the monopolistic, militarist circles hatching plans for war, and the forces struggling for peace. The M.E. is one of struggle "to liberate nations from imperialism, to put an end to wars among nations, to overthrow capital and to win socialism" (V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 28, p. 167).

A profound analysis of the essence of the M.E. is of fundamental methodological significance for a correct understanding of more particular problems of modern times, for evaluation of the place and role of each of the motive forces behind the world revolutionary process, for elaboration of a science-based strategy and tactics (q. v.) of the world communist and working-class movement. As Lenin pointed

out, "only on that basis, i. e., by taking into account, in the first place, the fundamental distinctive features of the various 'epochs' (and not single episodes in the history of individual countries), can we correctly evolve our tactics; only a knowledge of the basic features of a given epoch can serve as the foundation for an understanding of the specific features of one country or another" (V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 21, p. 145).

The essence of the M.E. is the subject of an acute ideological struggle. Most bourgeois ideologists cannot deny the dynamism of our epoch, but their class limitations make them avoid the historical truth that the world is advancing towards the complete collapse of capitalism and the world-wide triumph of communism. Hence their numerous attempts to allege that the essence of the M.E. lies in the transformation of old, traditional capitalism into a "welfare society", or in the spread of the conceptions of "convergence", "single industrial society", "post-industrial society", etc. in bourgeois sociology today. The class basis of all these conceptions is quite clear: to distort the character of the M.E., to conceal the objective world historical need to replace capitalism by socialism. The world is advancing towards an epoch when socialism in its specific, historically conditioned form will become the all-embracing social system on earth, bringing peace, freedom, equality and welfare to all mankind.

**Municipal Councils**, bodies of local self-government and administration in the capitalist countries, formed on the administrative-territorial principle. In many countries they are fully or partially elected by the population. Municipal councils dispose of local finances, supervise the construction of crèches and schools, dispensaries and hospitals, youth hostels and old peoples' homes; they are responsible for road-building and city transport, the planting of greenery, etc.

Local self-government bodies are the most democratic institutions in the bourgeois state; they are utilised by the working people to promote their immediate interests and are always an arena of the class struggle. If M.C. are headed by representa-

tives of the working people, they resist the monopolies and try to improve the material and living conditions of the people. The monopolies, for their part, try to restrict the rights of local self-government bodies and reduce their activities to a narrow range of administrative and economic matters. Governments cut allocations for building public amenities and cultural establishments and decree that these should be financed from local taxation. Sometimes on various pretexts, governments dissolve the local self-government bodies if democratic forces prevail in them. The opportunity to make use of M.C. in the interests of the people hinges directly on the level of democracy attained in the country concerned, and on whether active participants in the anti-monopoly struggle, especially Communists are elected to them. The latter have already won many places in local self-government bodies and mayoral posts in several capitalist countries. In Italy, France, Finland, and Japan the Communist parties head, alone or in alliance with other democratic organisations, a considerable number of M.C. In those countries where the Communists and other left parties join forces, the sphere of activity of M.C. expands despite the obstacles raised by governments and monopolies, and they take part in tackling important political, economic and cultural issues, and wage an active struggle for peace and general disarmament.

The international communist movement has accumulated vast experience of Communists' activities on local self-government bodies, on the one hand, through overcoming errors and eliminating the tendency to underrate the importance of work on these bodies, which used to interfere with the Party extending its ties with the masses and, on the other hand, through throwing off the illusion that "municipal socialism" can lead to the abolition of capitalism. Today, Communist Parties regard participation in local self-government bodies as an important field of activity, a form of work among the masses and their involvement into an active political struggle. It helps them study, in a comprehensive way, the actual needs of various sections of the population, establish contacts with them and prove the correctness of their

party programme in practice. During municipal election campaigns, Communists come forward with their own programme drawn up on the basis of the Party's general strategic line, oriented on the interests of the population in the region concerned. While engaging in the struggle to resolve the major problems facing the country, Communists do not ignore so-called minor issues. Their everyday work on local self-government bodies graphically demonstrates to the working people that they are able to manage the economy in a thrifty and efficient way, and take good care of the people's vital needs. The main principles of their activities are: constant reliance on the masses, development of their initiative, and the organisation of mass actions in support of the plans suggested by local municipal councils. Communists are trying to draw more of the ordinary people into the work of local self-government bodies, and to give more publicity to their activities. They make the proposals they put forward on these bodies widely known to the masses by discussing them in factories, mass organisations (trade unions, youth and women's organisations), local community meetings, parents' and pupils' committees, etc. They try to draw the people into the work of various commissions, dealing with the issues involved in school education, health protection, construction, town development and reconstruction, employment, etc. Work on local self-government bodies is conducive to a rapprochement between the left parties, termination of the split within the ranks of the working class, and achievement of unity of democratic forces.

## N

**Narodnik Socialism** — see Populist Socialism

**National Bourgeoisie**, the local class of entrepreneurs in economically less developed, subjugated, or newly liberated countries, who are interested in their country's independent political and economic development. The section of the pro-imperialist bourgeoisie that operates as an intermediary of foreign monopoly capital, and is the principal social mainstay of neocolonialism (q.v.), cannot be considered as part of N.B.

As it develops, national capital virtually always comes up against the prevailing foreign capital and the pre-capitalist relations that are preserved by the colonialists in all spheres of economic activities in the developing countries (q. v.), be it industry, agriculture, crediting or insurance system. This engenders an acute contradiction between N.B. and the imperialist bourgeoisie of the metropolitan countries, which objectively rouses N.B.'s interest in an anti-imperialist and anti-feudalist revolution. Describing the revolutionary potential of the national bourgeoisie, Lenin wrote: "In 'advanced' Europe, the *sole advanced* class is the proletariat. As for the living bourgeoisie, it is prepared to go to any length of savagery, brutality and crime in order to uphold dying capitalist slavery... Everywhere in Asia a mighty democratic movement is growing, spreading and gaining in strength. The bourgeoisie there is *as yet* siding with the people against reaction" (V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 19, pp. 99-100). Indeed, N.B. led the anti-imperialist struggle of the peoples in several Asian and African countries, or was one of the leading forces in the anti-imperialist bloc. From among its ranks it advanced influential political leaders and raised the masses to the struggle, with the help of their patriotic programme for national liberation.

N.B. has a dual social nature, which becomes especially evident once national independence has been won. On the one hand, it is oppressed by imperialist monopolies; on the other, it itself exploits the working people. It profits to various extents from general-democratic reforms, yet its typical conciliatory tendencies prevent it from implementing them consistently. While trying to strengthen national sovereignty, N.B. seeks support among the broad popular masses but, at the same time, it is afraid that democratic elements, expressing the interests of the people, may acquire too great an influence. N.B. struggles to win the right to dispose independently of its country's natural and labour resources, but it lacks the stamina to carry through a general expropriation of foreign monopoly capital and is inclined to seek the resolution of its contradictions with foreign monopo-

lies through a compromise, by modifying the terms and forms of co-operation rather than by waging a determined struggle against them. Though it has a vital interest in agrarian reform to create a domestic market, N.B. does not resolutely eradicate the feudal institutions of serfdom, for it is afraid of establishing a precedent that might jeopardise private property as such. As the bearer of the capitalist mode of production, N.B. emerged on the historical scene at the time when world capitalism as a social system began declining (see Modern Epoch). Its persistent efforts to lead the countries along the capitalist road conflicts with the anti-capitalist trend inherent in social development and with the interests of the working people, and makes the popular masses part ways with N.B. The result is a crisis of the bourgeois leadership of the national liberation revolution (see Revolution, National-Liberation). N.B. is now, therefore, drawing nearer to imperialists and domestic reactionaries, fighting in the economic sphere for free capitalist enterprise, and in the political sphere for maximum strengthening of the machinery of its class domination, consisting of the police, army, courts of law, bureaucratic administrative machine, etc. It often resorts to violent means to suppress the proletarian and peasant movement, and unleashes terror against Communists and left forces.

N.B. pursues a policy of consolidating its dominant class positions under the banner of nationalism (q. v.). If they call for upholding sovereignty, national culture, traditions and customs, the slogans of nationalism can still play a positive role in popular anti-imperialist movements. But as class contradictions move to the fore, its anti-democratic reactionary aspect becomes increasingly pronounced.

When evaluating N.B., in addition to describing it in general terms, it is important to take account of its specific features. For example, in Latin America a certain section of the local bourgeoisie has become so closely intertwined with North-American monopolies that it no longer upholds national interests or presents a serious anti-imperialist force. In several countries of the Middle East and Africa, in the absence of

a mature industrial section of N.B., the role of the state's leading administrative and political force is played by the bourgeoisie linked up with the bureaucratic-administrative top echelons, living off the public sector and profiting from co-operation with foreign capital. It resents foreign domination and strives to take over the country's natural wealth, means of production, etc. In the socialist-oriented countries, N.B. is, as a rule, deprived of monopoly power, but can take part in the country's progressive development, particularly in the economic sphere, as one of the factions of the national democratic movement.

**National Relations Under Capitalism,** relations of economic, social and political inequality, exploitation and suppression, of enmity and distrust among peoples.

Capitalism (q. v.) has not only given birth to nations and national distinctions, but also to the national question; it has made some nations an object of exploitation and suppression by others. In capitalist society, based on private property and class antagonisms, exploitation of man by man is systematically augmented by the subjugation and plunder of some nations by others, so that N.R. inevitably assume the form of domination of some and subjugation of others. The national question became even more acute under imperialism (q. v.), as vast territories were seized and many peoples colonised; it turned into the national-colonial question (see Disintegration of the Colonial System; Revolution, National-Liberation).

Analysing the objective laws of N.R. under capitalism, Lenin exposed two major historical trends: that of invigorating and developing national life and national movements and of establishing national states, which prevails at the early stages of capitalism, and that of furthering the ties among nations, breaking down national partitions and internationalising social life, which becomes prevalent under imperialism. Both trends are enhanced as capitalism develops but, owing to its antagonistic nature, it generates and constantly aggravates the irreconcilable contradiction between them, which is growing stronger and stronger and which cannot be eradicated

within the framework of capitalist society. Though national contradictions were somewhat alleviated in certain countries as bourgeois democracy developed there, all attempts to solve the national contradictions inherent in bourgeois society and set up stable and viable inter-national communities within its framework have invariably failed. Modern history provides convincing examples of such failures, e.g. the disintegration of the "patchwork" Austro-Hungarian Empire, the bankruptcy of the British Commonwealth and the collapse of the entire colonial system of imperialism, sharp national and national-language conflicts in the USA, Canada, Britain, Belgium, Spain, and elsewhere.

Realising that the problem of national interrelationships occupies a prominent place in socio-political life, Marxist-Leninist parties attach great importance to theoretical work on the national question and the conditions required to liberate the nations and ensure their unhindered development, and to the elaboration of a corresponding programme and policy course. The national question is filled with a specific class content and plays a specific role in the class struggle in each historical period and at each stage of the historical development of a country. A concrete-historical and class approach in evaluating national movements is a major methodological principle of scientific communism in the elaboration of the national policies and programmes of Marxist-Leninist parties. In Russia, for example, where the national question ranked high in the country's life, Lenin and the Bolshevik Party considered it, prior to the February Bourgeois-Democratic Revolution, as a component of the general-democratic transformation of society, as part of the question of the bourgeois-democratic revolution. In this connection the first Party Programme, adopted at the Second RSDLP Congress in 1903, dealt with the ways and means to reduce national contradictions and national isolation to a minimum so as to rally the working people of all nationalities for the struggle against tsarist autocracy. The Programme demanded that democratic changes be introduced in the country, the right to national self-determination up to

and including secession and formation of independent states be ensured; it also demanded regional autonomy, equality of nations and the building of the Party according to the principle of internationalism. Shortly before and after the October Socialist Revolution the national question was part of the socialist revolution (q. v.) and a socialist transformation of society. The Party was no longer satisfied with eliminating national oppression and inequality, but called for actual equality of nations based on their all-round development, a fundamental transformation of N.R. in the spirit of socialism, and establishment of friendship and of socialist mutual assistance between nations.

The historical experience gained by the USSR and other multinational socialist countries has fully proved in practice the most important proposition of scientific communism contained in the *Manifesto of the Communist Party*, written by Marx and Engels, to the effect that exploitation of one nation by another will disappear only to the extent that exploitation of man by man is eliminated, just as enmity in relations between nations will disappear together with class antagonisms within nations. As it overthrows the sway of the reactionary classes — the bourgeoisie and the landlords who sow hostility and strife in relations between the peoples — the socialist revolution abolishes all forms of social and national oppression and eliminates all obstacles in the way of nations growing closer together.

National Relations Under Socialism take shape and develop on the basis of friendship among peoples (q. v.), their all-round co-operation, mutual assistance and international unity.

These relations are formed parallel to the building of socialism and become completely developed as socialism wins and socialist nations emerge, these being fundamentally different from nations in capitalist society in their economic base, class structure, cultural development and intellectual make-up. Socialist nations consist of the friendly classes and strata of working people characterised by shared interests and goals (see Social-Political and Ideological Unity of Society). The

community of economic, socio-political and cultural life engenders internationalist features in the people, socialist national self-awareness, socialist way of thinking and behaviour. Relationships between such nations rest on a harmonious combination of their national and international interests.

Relationships between nations and nationalities in the USSR have their political base in the Soviet state system (see Democracy, Socialist). All Soviet nations and nationalities have their own statehood, which serves to direct their efforts towards strengthening the united socialist state rather than to isolate one people from another. "The USSR," runs Article 70 of the Constitution of the USSR (1977), "embodies the state unity of the Soviet people and draws all its nations and nationalities together for the purpose of jointly building communism." The principle of democratic centralism (q. v.) underlying socialist statehood ensures harmony between national interests and those of the Union as a whole.

Economically, relations between nations under socialism are based on social socialist ownership (q. v.) of the means of production and the socialist economic system, and this has made it possible to even out the levels of economic development in all Soviet nations and nationalities. More advanced nations rendered wholesale assistance to nations and nationalities that lagged behind in their development, and the process of one people helping another gained momentum.

Relations between nations under socialism have their ideological and theoretical basis in Marxism-Leninism (q. v.) and socialist internationalism (q. v.). To educate the millions of working people in the spirit of internationalism and to make them participate vigorously in the building of a new life requires raising their cultural standards. The cultural revolution (q. v.), as Soviet experience has proved, helps create a national intelligentsia and makes it possible for the working masses to acquire scientific knowledge. Socialist internationalism, friendship and mutual assistance between the peoples, and Soviet patriotism are features inherent in Soviet nations, which reflect new, socialist relations.



Vitally important for the development of socialist national relations in the USSR was the denunciation of Stalin's personality cult (q. v.) by the CPSU, which had put an end to violations of the principles of the Leninist nationalities policy: restoration of national autonomy for the Balkars, Ingushes, Kalmyks, Karachais and Chechens, and extension of the rights of Union and autonomous republics in managing the economy and culture, in legislation and court proceedings, etc.

The Soviet people (q. v.) as a new historical entity embodies a new and higher type of socialist N.R., the international unity of the nations and nationalities of the USSR. Today the evolution of the socialist nations consists of two progressive processes — the flourishing of all nations and their overall drawing closer together. These processes are interconnected and are taking place on the basis of a united Soviet socialist economy; the social homogeneity of the nations and nationalities of the USSR; their social and class unity; and shared political and cultural life (see *Developed Socialist Society*). Decisive in the drawing closer together of the nations is the establishment of the material and technical foundation of communism, when the productive forces develop increasingly beyond the boundaries of the individual constituent republics. Specialisation and co-operation, and the joint construction of major industrial projects become vitally important for all nations and imply their closest collaboration. The economy of each republic forms part of the all-Union economic complex, comprising a component of the integral process of building the material and technical base of communism. National relations are taking shape on the basis of an integrated economy and an extensive exchange of personnel. Achievements in any one economic region are increasingly a result of the joint labour input of all nations and nationalities. This creates the necessary conditions for educating the working people in the spirit of internationalism, for preventing manifestations of national conceit, consolidating and developing socialist internationalism, and strengthening the intellectual unity of nations and nationalities. Socialist N.R. enhance the mutual cul-

tural enrichment of the nations and consolidate the international unity of Soviet culture. The all-round co-operation between the nations and nationalities of the USSR, and their economic and cultural drawing closer together are also conducive to the emergence of bilingualism, particularly a combination of the national language and Russian as the inter-national language.

The CPSU's policy is aimed at educating the working people in the spirit of the Leninist principles of socialist internationalism and patriotism, which express the unity of the working people's national and international interests, and is, at the same time, hostile towards all manifestations of nationalism.

The socio-political base of international relations expanded as the world socialist system emerged, and a new type of relationships between nations took shape: equality and sovereignty of all socialist nations, diversified fraternal co-operation and mutual assistance, and a combination of national with international interests. As each socialist nation flourishes and the sovereignty of the socialist states is consolidated, their mutual links become closer, more and more common elements appear in their politics, economics and social life, and their economic development levels are gradually evened out. Today, this gradual rapprochement of the socialist countries is turning into a law. The 26th CPSU Congress noted: "Relations between states have been called international since olden days. But it is only in our time, in the socialist world that they have truly become relations between nations. Millions upon millions of people take an immediate part in them. That ... is a fundamental gain of socialism, and its great service to humanity" (*Report of the Central Committee of the CPSU to the 26th Congress of the CPSU...*, p. 9).

Close attention to the experience gained by each fraternal country, the joint search for the most rational forms and methods for building socialism, co-operation and mutual assistance are all promoting the flourishing of each socialist nation and the socialist system as a whole. A divorce between national interests and the international tasks facing the working people

has always been detrimental to socialist national relations. The content of national and international interests is objective, but their harmonious combination largely depends on the subjective factor, the policy pursued by the parties in power, their ability to maintain unity, fight exclusion and national isolation, take account of common international tasks, and launch joint actions to fulfil them. Marxist-Leninist parties are striving to cognise the causes and nature of the emerging contradictions scientifically and draw on this scientific knowledge to find a way to overcome them. The countries of the world socialist community (q. v.) are directing their efforts towards the all-round development of nations and their drawing closer together, and are employing all the opportunities provided by socialism to attain this goal.

**Nationalisation**, the transfer of enterprises or branches of the economy that were privately owned to state ownership. The nature of N. is determined by the social system existing in the given country. The theoretical foundation of the concept of socialist N. was elaborated by the founders of Marxism-Leninism, who saw it as a form of the socialisation of the means of production on the socialist principle, and politically it is preconditioned by the triumph of the proletarian revolution. Having established its dictatorship (see Dictatorship of the Proletariat), the proletariat forcibly confiscates the property of capitalists and landowners and transfers it to the ownership of the whole people. Socialist N. abolishes the alienation of the working people from the means of production, existing under capitalism, and transforms the working class from an exploited appendage into the master of production. Stressing that the expropriation of expropriators is justifiable because capitalist and landed property was acquired not by personal labour but as a result of the exploitation (q. v.) of the working people, Marx wrote: "Even if that capital was originally acquired by the personal labour of its employer, it sooner or later becomes value appropriated without an equivalent, the unpaid labour of others materialised either in money or in some other object" (Karl Marx, *Capital*, Vol. I, p. 535).

Marxism-Leninism draws a distinct line between big and small private ownership of the means of production. Big capitalist property is subject to N. as soon as the proletariat comes to power, while the small property of peasants and handicraftsmen is not expropriated but turned into socialist property by way of voluntary co-operation (see Agricultural Co-operation).

Pointing out that N. is a must in all socialist revolutions, the founders of scientific communism foresaw the measures the proletariat would take to nationalise the means of production, i.e. the ways and means of N. can differ, depending on the specific historical conditions. These ways and means are defined by the political party of the working class.

The first act adopted by Soviet power in Russia was the Decree on Land endorsed by the Second Congress of Soviets on October 26 (November 8) 1917 (see Nationalisation of Land). N. of other major means of production and circulation was carried out by stages, the priority order being determined by the importance of the given enterprise and branch of the economy for the consolidation of the socialist economy as a whole, and by the attitude on the part of the owners of the means of production in question. In December 1917, private banks were nationalised, and in June 1918, all big industrial enterprises.

Simultaneously, other branches of the economy underwent N., too, as well as the merchant fleet, foreign trade, and the railways. The last act of N. in industry was that adopted in November 1920, by which all enterprises with more than five workers and a power-driven machine, or ten workers without such a machine, were transferred to the state.

In the People's Democracies, N. of industry had certain specific features. It was carried out during the development of the democratic into a socialist revolution. While enterprises belonging to the fascist states, monopolies and war criminals were confiscated without any compensation, a certain amount was often paid out to those owners of nationalised enterprises who had not collaborated with the fascists.

N. with compensation is not a deviation from Marxism. Engels emphasised

that the way of expropriation (with or without compensation) would depend primarily on the circumstances under which the proletariat came to power, and on the behaviour of the capitalists themselves.

Partial N. (of certain branches and big enterprises) may be effected by a bourgeois state, too; as a rule, it occurs under pressure from democratic forces. Such N. is a complex and contradictory process. On the one hand, it shows that the productive forces of the capitalist countries have overgrown the boundaries of private property; on the other, as partial N. proceeds under the economic and political pressure of the monopolies, it involves big payments by way of compensation to the former owners of nationalised enterprises, while the monopolies that employ the services of the nationalised sector enjoy certain privileges. When enterprises in the fuel and power industry and transport, the railways, and a considerable portion of the motor vehicle fleet were nationalised in Britain after World War II, the government modernised these enterprises from the national budget (the revenues of which consist mostly of taxes), while the former owners were issued government bonds to replace their shares and were thus ensured a rather high guaranteed annual income. Under capitalism, N. only modifies the form of capitalist property: private capitalist property is changed into state-monopoly property (see State-Monopoly Capitalism). Sometimes bourgeois governments carry out denationalisation (re-privatisation), selling state enterprises to monopolies on favourable terms.

N. is also effected in the newly free countries. There it concerns first of all the property of foreign companies and private owners. Its real importance largely depends on which path of development the country has opted for. In countries that have opted for a non-capitalist road, N. assumes a broad scale and involves the property of the national bourgeoisie; N. of foreign and national enterprises becomes an important factor in creating elements of socialism in their multistructured economies. Revenues accruing in these countries from the nationalised sector, in particular from the sale

of oil and oil products, go to facilitate the strategy of national development.

**Nationalisation of Land**, the transfer of land from private property to state ownership.

N.L. was first suggested by Utopian socialists (see Utopian Socialism), who criticised the existing agricultural relations and described an ideal society with socially-owned land. During the bourgeois revolutions in Britain and France, N.L. became a principal demand of the urban and rural poor. In Russia, the idea of N.L. was put forward by the Decembrist, Pavel Pestel, and the revolutionary democrats, Alexander Herzen, Nikolai Ogaryov and Nikolai Chernyshevsky.

Marx showed, as he considered agrarian relations, that "landed property differs from other kinds of property in that it appears superfluous and harmful at a certain stage of development, even from the point of view of the capitalist mode of production" (Karl Marx, *Capital*, Vol. III, p. 622). Theoretically, N.L. under the bourgeois system abolishes absolute rent and makes it easier for capitalism to penetrate agriculture. Though it is the bourgeoisie who would primarily profit by N.L., however, it has not been introduced anywhere, for fear that the offensive against any one form of private property might endanger capitalist property as a whole.

The proletarian demand for N.L. was put forward in general terms by Marx and Engels in the *Manifesto of the Communist Party*. It was subsequently specified for different countries, different forms of landed property, and different stages of the revolution. Marx and Engels pointed out that the entire course of capitalist development in Britain had most fully prepared its agriculture for N.L., while in France, where small landed property predominated, to put forward the slogan of N.L. would be a political error, because the expropriation of the peasantry would interfere with its entering into an alliance with the proletariat.

N.L. was first applied in practice in the USSR. Private ownership of land was abolished by the Decree on Land adopted at the Second Congress of Soviets on 8 November 1917. Land was turned into national property and handed over for equal

use, free of charge, while hired labour on land was prohibited. The Soviet government exempted land from the sphere of commodity circulation, thus delivering the peasants from expending large sums of money to buy land or to pay rent to landowners. N.L. was of immense importance for the preparation of the economic conditions for the socialisation of agriculture on the socialist principle and for the consolidation of the worker-peasant political alliance (see Alliance of the Working Class and the Peasantry).

In other socialist countries, N.L. had a number of specific features explained by the particular agrarian relations existing in each of them.

Typical of the East-European People's Democracies was partial N.L., under which only forests, irrigation installations and fallow land were nationalised. After confiscation, the bulk of the arable land was handed over to the peasants, because formerly the majority of them had tilled the plots they owned as private property. This fact had a certain impact on the process of the co-operation of peasant economies (see Agricultural Co-operation).

In Cuba, N.L. had its own specifics. Right after the Revolution, co-operatives of farm workers were organised there on the basis of nationalised farms formerly belonging to foreign and local owners, which were later reorganised into state-owned people's estates. In 1963, kulak and capitalist economies were also nationalised. As a result, the main part of the farm land now belongs to the state socialist sector.

Partial N.L. is under way in the developing countries (q. v.). There, it is largely characterised by an anti-colonial thrust, the state taking over land formerly owned by colonialists.

Thus, N.L. is a measure that can be implemented in the course of both bourgeois-democratic and socialist revolutions. Its expediency and scale are determined by the specific historical conditions, and its social content depends on the nature of the revolution. "Nationalisation of the land," Lenin wrote, "is not only 'the last word' of the bourgeois revolution, but also a *step towards socialism*" (V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 13, p. 430).

Nationalism, the psychology, ideology, world outlook and policy of preferring certain nations to others, of extolling one's own nation and fanning national strife and racial hatred (see also Racism).

There are many varieties of N., from open fascist chauvinism to refined N. camouflaged by Marxist phrases. It may be manifested as the Great-Power chauvinism of an oppressor nation, slighting other nations, or as local N. of an oppressed nation, reflected in its striving to isolate itself from other nations and in its distrust of them. Imperialist cosmopolitanism is the reverse side of N.; it propagates the dissolution of nations and nationalities within certain "model" (dominant) nations.

N. is generated by relations of private property and exploitation (q. v.); its apologists are the bourgeoisie and the petty bourgeoisie. N. is hostile to the nature of the proletariat as the bearer of internationalism. As history has proved, however, it is possible, through systematic and prolonged efforts, to poison considerable masses of the people with it, including certain sections of the working class too. That was achieved, for example, in Germany by the Prussian militarists and, later, by the Nazis.

National strife interferes with the class struggle waged by the proletariat, and sometimes even paralyses it. The bourgeoisie fans national hatred and unleashes aggressive wars under cover of "general national" interests. Monopoly capital draws widely on chauvinism and racism to persecute entire races and nationalities.

Marxism is incompatible with N. There are periods in national liberation movements, however, when N. of an oppressed nation may emerge as a programme for national revival, as the ideology and policy of the struggle against imperialism and for political and economic independence, for the sovereignty and all-round development of their nation. Marxist-Leninists regard N. filled with such general democratic content as historically justified, and support it if that is the case, without losing sight of those forces that only use the general democratic struggle to conceal their true face and are prepared to betray the nation's interests at any moment.

Socialism uproots N. in social terms by

eliminating antagonistic classes. Yet some manifestations of N. and national narrow-mindedness do not disappear of their own. "Nationalist prejudice and survivals of former national strife are a province in which resistance to social progress may be most protracted and stubborn, bitter and insidious" (*The Road to Communism*, p. 469). This is not explained by the fact that life in general has a national form, or that nationalistic psychology is an inborn feature of man, as bourgeois ideologists maintain, but by real historical conditions: the aftermath of the former hostility and distrust between the peoples, vestiges of different development levels of various nations, constant efforts on the part of imperialists and their ideologists to revive and bolster nationalist prejudice, and an exaggerated or distorted manifestation of national sentiment. The fact that consciousness lags behind socialist being, as well as violations of the norms of the socialist way of life, also play a part in this (see *Socialist Way of Life*). These factors are expressed in infringements on the equality of nations in economic and cultural development, personnel policies, in ignoring the achievements and contributions made by a particular nation to society's evolution, slighting of national sentiment and substitution of prejudiced national pseudo-patriotism for genuine socialist patriotism (see *Patriotism, Socialist*) and turning it, in fact, into national narrow-mindedness, etc. For all the variety of the sources of N., it always results in national strife and disruption of the working people's fraternity. Local N. often exists in the form of survivals and operates in a camouflaged way, rather than openly, for example, under the banner of defending specific national features, traditions and customs, without distinguishing between the progressive and reactionary elements contained in them. An inordinate exaggeration of the "original" development of nations and their cultures, allegedly free from mutual influence, generally interferes with sound relationships and the processes involved in the nations' or nationalities' mutual enrichment.

As the world socialist system has formed, the number of nations that have established mutual relations based on socialist in-

ternationalism (see *Socialist Internationalism; Friendship among Peoples*) has increased. Nationalist trends are incompatible under these conditions either with the interests of the working people's international co-operation or with the genuinely national interests of nations.

N. is hostile to socialism and the Marxist-Leninist world outlook in its nature; it contradicts the objective evolution and rapprochement of the socialist nations. Bourgeois N. assumes particularly sophisticated forms today and is spearheaded first and foremost against the USSR, the world's first socialist state.

N. serves as a breeding ground for both "left" and right opportunism (q. v.), once again corroborating Lenin's thesis that "the ideological and political affinity, connection, and even identity between opportunism and social-nationalism are beyond doubt" (V.I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 21, p. 154). When coupled with opportunism in the revolutionary movement, N. becomes particularly dangerous, for it often masks itself with Marxist-Leninist phrases. No Communist party can remain a genuine Marxist-Leninist party and fulfil its mission as vanguard in the building of a new society, unless it creates an atmosphere of intolerance towards N. and overcomes it first of all within its own ranks.

The CPSU attaches primary importance to the internationalist education of the working people and to the overcoming of all manifestations of nationalism. Article 36 of the Constitution of the USSR (1977) says in part: "Citizens of the USSR of different races and nationalities have equal rights.... Any direct or indirect limitation of the rights of citizens or establishment of direct or indirect privileges on grounds of race or nationality, and any advocacy of racial or national exclusiveness, hostility or contempt, are punishable by law." The struggle against N. is a major condition for the consolidation of the world socialist system, ensuring unity between the world communist and working-class movement and successful national liberation struggle of the oppressed peoples. As Lenin remarked, "the urgency of the struggle against this evil, against the most deep-

rooted petty-bourgeois national prejudices, looms ever larger with the mounting exigency of the task of converting the dictatorship of the proletariat from a national dictatorship (i. e., existing in a single country and incapable of determining world politics) into an international one (i. e., a dictatorship of the proletariat involving at least several advanced countries, and capable of exercising a decisive influence upon world politics as a whole)." (V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 31, p. 148.)

**Nations and Their Future.** The nation is a stable historical community of people, a form of social development that emerged on the basis of shared economic life coupled with a common language, territory, and specific features in culture, conscience, and psychology.

Nations emerged as a result of a long historical evolution of society and are preceded by certain pre-nation forms of social community, such as a tribe or an ethnic group. The emergence and development of capitalism (q. v.) were conducive to the formation of nations. Lenin remarked that "nations are an inevitable product, an inevitable form, in the bourgeois epoch of social development" (V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 21, p. 72). Nations are formed as different nationalities unite when they overcome feudalist isolation, and when capitalist production appears and develops, which implies a strict division of labour, extensive and strong economic ties, a vast shared market, etc.

Nations did not appear simultaneously everywhere, since capitalism emerged and developed extremely unevenly from country to country. In Europe, this process was completed ages ago, while in many colonies or former colonies (in Africa, for example) it has lagged behind and is still under way as the national liberation struggle goes on and young independent states emerge. The experience gained in the USSR and other socialist countries shows that nationalities that have not taken shape prior to the victory of the socialist revolution may sometimes be formed even during the transition to socialism.

Affiliation to a certain nation rallies

people together, yet national community does not eliminate differences within nations. Class antagonisms permeate all aspects of the nation's life in bourgeois society, splitting it into two opposite sections. In analysing any national movement or phenomenon, it is, therefore, necessary to approach it from the angle of a certain class, taking into account the distinctions in the interests of classes and social groups. Lenin said that there are two nations within each bourgeois society: that of the exploiting classes, capitalists and landowners, i. e. the nation of the oppressors, and that of the working and exploited masses, workers and peasants, i. e. the nation of the oppressed; correspondingly, each national culture also falls into two national cultures. As Lenin wrote, "there is the Great-Russian culture of the Purishkeviches, Guchkovs and Struves — but there is also the Great-Russian culture typified in the names of Chernyshevsky and Plekhanov. There are *the same two* cultures in the Ukraine as there are in Germany, in France, in England, among the Jews, and so forth" (V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 20, p. 32). Typical of the nationality policy pursued by the exploiting classes is a constant striving to pass their own, egoistic and self-seeking class interests as general national ones, and to use the slogan of defending "national unity" in the struggle against the working class and all working people.

Socialist nations are those of a society free from exploiting classes and class antagonisms, and resting on a firm alliance of all social groups — the working class (q. v.), co-operated peasantry (q. v.) and people's intelligentsia (q. v.). Their ideological basis is that of Marxism-Leninism (see Socialist Internationalism). The social-political and ideological unity of society (q. v.) is determined by its nations' cohesion and ability to function; for the first time in history, nations appear with a national culture, world outlook and ideology shared by all society, and basic interests and goals common to all its members.

The transition from socialism to communism involves further development of socialist nations, their economies and cultures and the disappearance of the remaining distinctions between them.

The social homogeneity of nations increases as social relations improve and the distinctions between classes are gradually erased. Simultaneously, an intensive rapprochement between all nations and nationalities develops, their economic, socio-political and intellectual interests increasingly coincide, and all aspects of their life are further internationalised. Mutual impact, co-operation and assistance between nations and nationalities are enhanced; they increasingly enrich one another, and more common features appear in all spheres on their material and intellectual life as each nation's intrinsic progressive potentialities are more and more fully manifested and developed.

The rapprochement between nations during the building of communism leads to the eradication of national distinctions, various spheres being affected unevenly. For example, distinctions in the economic sphere are overcome comparatively quickly. National cultural distinctions, and especially those in language, are more stable; they will evidently persist much longer. General features and trends in the disappearance of national distinctions help clarify the emergence of a new historical community — the multinational Soviet people (q. v.). However, it should be remembered that the erosion of national distinctions on a global scale is a more complicated process, having its own peculiarities as compared with the similar process under way within the socialist countries. For that reason, nations will probably exist for a long time, even after capitalism has been done away with internationally.

Nations are nevertheless a historical phenomenon; in the final analysis, they will inevitably disappear, no matter how prolonged and complicated the process of the eradication of national distinctions may be, in the same way as they inevitably emerged at a certain stage of history. The coming, highly developed communist society will have no socio-class or national distinctions. The future merger of nations and nationalities into a single non-national communist association of all humankind will be attained as a result of the complete liberation and full development of all peoples, through maximum disclosure and pro-

motion of everything that is of value in each people and in each national culture. Lenin stressed that "in the same way as mankind can arrive at the abolition of classes only through a transition period of the dictatorship of the oppressed class, it can arrive at the inevitable integration of nations only through a transition period of the complete emancipation of all oppressed nations, i. e., their freedom to secede" (V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 22, p. 147) (see also *Revolution, National-Liberation; National Relations Under Capitalism; National Relations Under Socialism*).

**Natural Environment and Man.** Humanity is organically linked with the natural environment in which it exists, above all, with the planet Earth and its biosphere. In the course of the evolution of our planet, life appeared on it; the evolution of live nature culminated in man. A biochemical metabolism started between man and nature, but, with the advent of man, a qualitatively new relationship between living things and nature came into existence, which is man's work or material production. People do not find enough means of subsistence or favourable conditions in the environment, so have to make them from the substances of the environment, from objects of nature, by changing or transforming them. In material production the objective of man's labour is to "appropriate Nature's productions in a form adapted to his own wants" (K. Marx, *Capital*, Vol. I, p. 173). In making vital things from objects of nature "he is constantly helped by natural forces" (*ibid.*, p. 50). Natural processes controlled by man, such as mechanical, electrical, chemical, thermal, biological and other functions in material production, are integral parts of it, and combine with the material activities of people and are deliberately used by them. On the other hand, the production sphere, which is a system of man-controlled-and-regulated substance-energy and biological processes, interacts with the system of elemental natural processes, regional and global. As Engels emphasised, "at every step we are reminded that we by no means rule over nature like a conqueror over a foreign people,

like someone standing outside nature — but that we, with flesh, blood and brain, belong to nature, and exist in its midst, and that all our mastery of it consists in the fact that we have advantage over all other creatures of being able to learn its laws and apply them correctly" (F. Engels, *Dialectics of Nature*, p. 180).

Since the advent of man and social material production, the environment increasingly ceased to be purely natural, elemental, or "virginal". Since ancient times, a "second nature" (or man-induced nature) established itself in the environment and was the material body of civilisation. All objects made by people, all their transformations of natural objects become objective reality as much as purely natural formations. Every expansion and intensification of production, while making society increasingly independent of natural forces, also link society and nature ever closer by increasing the total mass and number of natural objects and processes involved in material production. The productive activity of society results in the materialisation of much of the natural potential that could not be realised by itself (thus hundreds and thousands of chemical compounds not found in natural minerals have been synthesised and manufactured on a tremendous scale); various elemental natural processes are suppressed or accelerated or new ones generated (this is the case of the adaptation of living organisms to environmental pollution, to the use of pesticides, etc.). The entire evolution of the biosphere, nature of our planet since man's appearance cannot be separated from the history of human productive activity, inasmuch as the latter cannot be separated from the history of nature. Unlike metaphysical conceptions that regard nature and society as purely external opposing realities, Marxism recognises their organic unity and regards the development of nature and society as a single natural historical process. Historically, only the shape of this necessary and inseparable link between man and nature changes, depending to a decisive degree on the character of production relations.

At this time of scientific and technologi-

cal revolution (q. v.), society's economic activity takes on a world-wide scale. Space exploration has begun. On the other hand, the increasing environmental pollution that is undermining the natural reproduction of many resources vital for humanity (oxygen, fresh water, forests, etc.), the need to combine spontaneous, natural and material production processes and the environmental control are becoming increasingly acute. Entire natural complexes, the whole biosphere, as well as individual natural forces or properties and kinds of natural processes and living organisms, should be put to productive use.

In this context, the role of social relations in society-nature interaction becomes especially important. The uncontrolled evolution of social relations and social antagonisms have resulted in history in adverse consequences for the state of the environment. "The conclusion is that cultivation when it progresses spontaneously and is not consciously controlled... leaves deserts behind it..." (K. Marx and F. Engels, *Selected Correspondence*, p. 190). It is because of class antagonisms that the practical mastering of natural forces and new natural resources culminates in the new social disasters, such as wars, the enslavement of nations, mass unemployment, poverty, and the development of more and more powerful weapons of mass destruction of people and the fruits of their work.

While enhancing the ever more extensive utilisation of nature, capitalism, a society based on private ownership of the means of production and natural resources, engenders a predatory treatment of nature. The colonial system combined predatory exploitation of the natural riches of colonies with the subjugation of the peoples there. The successes scored under capitalism in utilising natural forces inevitably acquire an anti-human, anti-popular orientation and materialise in increasingly strong and sophisticated tools of human exploitation, warfare, and destruction of the environment. Capitalism is, therefore, incapable of ensuring a rational ecologically sound utilisation of natural resources from the viewpoint of the entire society. The vested interests of the monopolies make consis-



tent and large-scale environmental protection impossible.

Public ownership of the means of production and natural resources turns planned control of both social relations and society-nature relationship into a realistic possibility. Marx wrote that, in the society of the future, the associated producers, rationally regulate "their interchange with Nature, bringing it under their common control, instead of being ruled by it as by the blind forces of Nature; and achieving this with the least expenditure of energy and under conditions most favourable to, and worthy of, their human nature" (K. Marx, *Capital*, Vol. III, p. 820). In socialist society, where the purpose of production is man's well-being and meeting his needs, rather than profit, the harmonisation of society-nature relations is organically combined with the principles of economic activity. The broad-scale protection of natural resources was started in the first years of Soviet power and is continued today. The diverse nature-protection activities of the Soviet state were made law by the 1977 Constitution of the USSR. Article 18 runs: "In the interests of the present and future generations, the necessary steps are taken in the USSR to protect and make scientific, rational use of the land and its mineral and water resources, and the plant and animal kingdoms, to preserve the purity of air and water, ensure reproduction of natural wealth, and improve the human environment." Rational utilisation of natural resources is now organised within the framework of the socialist community countries (see World Socialist Community). Because many environmental disasters are global, Soviet policy is to secure wide and active international co-operation in resolving ecological problems. Practical steps in environmental protection and rational utilisation of natural resources, like the safeguarding of peace and prevention of a new world war, have become the highest priority for all mankind.

**Neocolonialism**, an imperialist policy of exploitation and undermining the independence of the liberated countries (see Developing Countries), pursued with the help of slightly modified old ways and

means.

In material terms, N. is rooted in foreign monopoly ownership of the means of production, and in social terms—in the top echelons of the exploiting classes and strata in these countries, the elite of the bourgeoisie (q.v.), landowners, and bureaucracy (q.v.). The ideological platform of N. is anti-communism (q.v.) and apologetics for diverse forms of "interdependence" between the former metropolitan countries and their dependencies. Among the methods applied by N. are: the economic sway of imperialist monopolies, all kinds of action launched to extend its social base, various political and ideological manoeuvres, the fanning of hostility among nations and tribes, the setting of political groupings against one another, the implantation of anti-popular regimes, military intervention, espionage, subversive activities, etc. N. is a product of contemporary imperialism (see State-Monopoly Capitalism) trying to adapt to the new historical situation by inventing a more sophisticated mechanism to suppress the world revolutionary and national liberation movements.

The policy of N. was exerted by the disintegration of the colonial system (see Disintegration of the Colonial System) and the weakening of imperialism's positions, which made it impossible for it to shape its relations with the liberated countries exclusively on the principle of military-political coercion. While "classical" colonialism tried to apply non-economic means for exploiting enslaved nations, N. gives priority to economic ways: it makes broad use of achievements provided by the scientific and technological revolution (q.v.), draws the developing countries into the system of economic relations of the world capitalist market, the capitalist financial and credit system, and an unequal division of labour. Unfair trade and price-fixing on the developing countries' exports, primarily in the interests of the imperialist countries' economic development are a graphic manifestation of this policy. The huge profits the monopolies (multinationals in the first place) derive from the developing countries are, in fact,

an embodiment of the unpaid labour of the great mass of working people in the former colonies. Amidst the struggle between the two world systems N. is often forced to make fundamental tactical concessions for the sake of a strategic gain. Thus, the export of capital is now effected not only to derive superprofits, but also to implant the capitalist mode of production in the liberated countries and to promote their industrial development somewhat. While, formerly, the monopolies tried to conserve backward, pre-capitalist relationships there and hold back the growth of capitalism, now they are striving to accelerate the young countries' development along the capitalist lines.

N. is characterised by exceptional flexibility and manoeuvrability. While retreating under pressure from the national liberation forces, it tries to retain its positions. It strives to undermine the liberated countries' sovereignty, distort the meaning of the principle of self-determination of nations, and place power in the hands of its class allies, using bourgeois ideology to disarm the champions of national independence in ideological terms. A basic military-political form of N. is a military alliance, all types of fettering "bilateral" agreement, imposed on the developing countries by imperialists. The activities of such alliances are a manifestation of the "collectivist forms" of imperialist policy aimed at preserving a reactionary social order. Therefore, the oppressed peoples are waging a struggle not just against individual imperialist powers, but against the system of N. as a whole.

N. is a serious obstacle for the liberated countries' progressive development. Yet, being essentially on the retreat, N., a moribund form of colonialism, is incapable of checking the national revival of former colonies and semi-colonies, which increasingly involves ever new popular masses: the working class, the peasantry and other non-proletarian contingents of the working people, and the middle social strata in town and country. As a result of the progressive, anti-imperialist policy pursued by the young states that

rely on the practicable support of world socialism, the activities of foreign monopolies are being more and more restricted, and the national economies are developing. The patriotic, democratic forces of these countries more and more often see the prospect of a national renaissance as hinging on a national-democratic revolution and a socialist orientation (see Non-capitalist Path of Development).

NEP, the New Economic Policy, a course launched by the Communist Party and the Soviet government during the period of transition from capitalism to socialism (q. v.). The foundations for it were laid by Lenin in his work "The Immediate Tasks of the Soviet Government" and it was initiated in the spring of 1918. The military intervention by international imperialism and the Civil War (q. v.), however, made it imperative to launch War Communism, a special, extraordinary economic policy. In March 1921, it was abolished by decision of the 10th Congress of the RCP(B) as not meeting the requirements of building the economy in peace time, and the food surplus appropriation system (a system of procurement of agricultural produce the Soviet government applied during the Civil War and the military intervention of 1918-1920, under which all surpluses from peasant holdings had to be sold to the state at a fixed price) was replaced by a tax in kind; the peasants were also granted the right to sell their surplus produce on the market once the tax had been paid. That was the first step taken from the policy of War Communism in the direction of NEP.

The substitution of the tax in kind for the food surplus appropriation system and the development of commodity-money relations made the peasants materially interested in expanding agricultural production. In order to effect a further rise in peasant economies and transfer them gradually on to the road of socialist development, measures were taken to introduce the simplest forms of co-operation in the village, which would prepare the peasants for engaging in joint production on collective farms. Lenin's co-operative plan was a component part of NEP.

The Soviet government's policy in the sphere of industry was also based on the use of economic levers, commodity-money relations, and the principle of the workers having a material interest in the development of production. The government concentrated all large- and medium-scale industry in its hands and leased small enterprises, including to individuals. A small number of enterprises were leased out as concessions to foreign capitalists. Both lease and concession were forms of state capitalism (q. v.) allowed in the Soviet economy; they did not take deep root, however. Industrial enterprises, especially in light and the food industries, were gradually transferred to a system of self-financing. The wages of industrial workers were fixed proceeding from the socialist principle of remuneration according to the quantity and quality of work done. The excessive centralisation of industrial management that existed during the Civil War was abolished, and it was largely entrusted to production trusts based on the cost-accounting principle, and syndicates engaged in the planned realisation of the trusts' output. Attention was focused on the principle of one-man management as the most suitable for enterprises operating on the cost-accounting principle.

Objectively speaking, the transition to NEP brought about a revival and a certain growth of the capitalist element in the economy, such as private trade, private capitalist industries, a certain growth of the kulak section as a result of the development of commodity-money relations in the countryside, the lease of land and the use of wage labour in tilling it, concessions and the lease of public enterprises to individuals. The only correct policy in these circumstances was to make use of capitalism (the development of which was strictly limited and controlled by the state) in order to step up the productive forces.

NEP provided for the accelerated development of the socialist element: while giving free rein to small-commodity production, it channelled this development, in forms acceptable to the working people, towards socialism, restricting and

ousting the capitalist element. NEP is essentially a method for building socialism, characterised by the following features: the proletarian state controls the economy; capitalism is admitted in to the economy, but within certain limits and under state control, which inevitably implies an economic struggle between the socialist and capitalist elements over the issue of "Who triumphs over whom"; trade develops as the basic form of economic relationships between socialist industry and small-commodity peasant production; economic levers and commodity-money relations are used widely to develop all branches of the economy; socialist industrialisation (q. v.) is implemented as a decisive condition for establishing the material and technical base of socialism; a voluntary transition is gradually effected through co-operation (see Agricultural Co-operation), from small-commodity production to a large-scale socialist economy. NEP ensured the establishment of a close and mutually beneficial link between town and country, between industry and agriculture. Its political importance consisted in that, at the current stage of the country's historical development, it strengthened the alliance of the working class and the peasantry, and was a vital condition for consolidating the dictatorship of the proletariat (q. v.). On the one hand, NEP promoted the restoration and advance of the economy and the consolidation of the socialist element while, on the other, it created conditions conducive to the strengthening of capitalist tendencies. It therefore signified a continuation of the class struggle, though in new forms, rather than its termination (see Class Struggle in the Transition Period from Capitalism to Socialism). NEP was instrumental in the rapid restoration of the economy ravaged by the intervention and Civil War. Over two five-year periods, industrialisation and the transfer of the peasants to large-scale collective production were accomplished. NEP helped overcome the multistructured system and establish the economic foundations of socialism. By the end of the second five-year period socialism had been basically

achieved. The transition period from capitalism to socialism came to an end, and NEP, the economic policy applied during that period, had outlived itself.

NEP was of major international significance. It ensured successful economic development, socialism's victory in the economy, where the world-wide struggle between capitalism and socialism was continued after the Civil War. At the same time NEP was a science-based method for building socialism and involved the multi-million masses in it — the task that, as Lenin emphasised, would eventually face Socialists in all countries. The experience of building socialism gained in other countries has fully borne out Lenin's prediction: allowing for their specific historical conditions, all of these countries pursued an economic policy fundamentally similar to NEP in the transition period from capitalism to socialism.

**Non-capitalist Path of Development,** the gradual emergence of the objective and subjective prerequisites for building socialism in countries that have shaken off the colonial yoke. When socio-economic formations replaced one another in a regular manner, it used to appear at the capitalist stage; it is a way of transition to socialism by formerly backward countries and peoples. The revolutionary liberation struggle of the peoples has put forward several concrete-historical forms of N.C.P.D. One of them (the Soviet form) has been embodied in the revolutionary practice gained by the peoples of the Soviet East, who took the path of non-capitalist development within the context of the multinational centralised state led by the CPSU, a proletarian party. Another form (People's Democracy) emerged in the course of the revolutionary practice of Mongolia. A socialist orientation led by the vanguard revolutionary-democratic parties has appeared as a new form of N.C.P.D. in modern conditions (see *Disintegration of the Colonial System*). In socio-economic terms, N.C.P.D. basically relies on the public sector of the economy, and in political terms, on a revolutionary-democratic dictatorship of the broad alliance of the petty-bourgeois masses, the

middle strata of society, in particular the intelligentsia (q.v.) and office workers (q.v.), the toiling peasantry (q.v.), other non-proletarian contingents of the working people, and the working class (q.v.).

The idea of N.C.P.D. was put forward by the Utopian socialists (see *Utopian Socialism*) and was provided with a scientific base by Marx and Engels. Engels emphasised that backward peoples would be assisted by the victorious proletariat in "considerably shortening their advance to socialist society and largely sparing themselves the sufferings and the struggles through which we in Western Europe have to make our way" (K. Marx, F. Engels, *Selected Works* in three volumes, Vol. 2, p. 403). Lenin developed this thesis in the new historical situation that emerged after the Great October Socialist Revolution, and said that "with the aid of the proletariat of the advanced countries, backward countries can go over to the Soviet system and, through certain stages of development, to communism, without having to pass through the capitalist stage" (V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 31, p. 244). Today, this conclusion has been fully borne out by the experience gained in national liberation struggles by oppressed peoples who, in the long run, orientate their social development towards socialism.

The internal objective conditions for socialist orientation are largely formed as a result of the competition between the two world social systems. The liberated countries have to opt for either a capitalist or a socialist path. Capitalist relations cannot enable the liberated countries to break away from the world system of capitalist economy, achieve economic independence and raise the working people's living standards. National capitalism gradually reveals its inability to fulfil the urgent tasks of the working people's social liberation. The anti-capitalist struggle waged by the broad popular masses is also boosted by the fact that capitalism is associated in their minds with colonialism and imperialism. A radical solution of social problems proves possible only by the path orientated on building a future society free of all forms of exploitation.

The set of measures typical of a socia-

list orientation includes ousting foreign monopolies, restricting private capitalist accumulation, developing the public sector in every possible way, and co-operating agriculture. All this accelerates the growth of the productive forces. In production relations, transitional forms usually appear that are involved, for example, in mixed state-capitalist property, collective-group property, etc. The objective necessity of such a transition to socialism results from the exceptionally backward socio-economic structures of the former colonies, which must be overcome in order to create the highly developed economic and socio-political structure of the new society.

The diverse assistance rendered by the socialist countries is of exceptional importance for N.C.P.D. of the liberated countries. Lenin pointed out that the Russian working class would spare no effort to render "disinterested cultural assistance" to backward and oppressed nations, i.e. it would "help them pass to the use of machinery, to the lightening of labour, to democracy, to socialism" (V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 23, p. 67).

N.C.P.D., a socialist orientation included, may also be regarded as a specific process of a general-democratic national liberation revolution (see Revolution, National-Liberation) developing into a socialist revolution in the economically backward countries where capitalism is not the dominant or prevailing social system. Under contemporary conditions, an opportunity to interrupt capitalist development, implement the programme of democratic changes, and assume a socialist orientation exists even in countries that have attained a certain level of capitalist development. The expropriation of private capital in the liberated countries should be carefully prepared in organisational and economic terms. A hasty nationalisation of private capital, especially that of the small bourgeoisie, usually does serious harm to the productive forces. A certain development of capitalism as one means for stepping up the productive forces of society (see State Capitalism) is permissible here within certain limits (with the key economic positions held firmly by the revolutionary-democratic state).

Assuming a socialist orientation does not come about of itself, but is the result of a persistent class struggle; the anti-capitalist thrust of national liberation revolutions is only a potential opportunity, which, given an unfavourable balance of power, will not be realised. The forces of domestic reaction in the young states, in particular the local bureaucratic and monopoly bourgeoisie, some sections of the elite and officials, which have certain internal reserves at their disposal and draw on the strength of world capitalism, are still in a position to launch a counteroffensive to restore or consolidate capitalist relations. Only if the masses' activities neutralise and overcome the resistance of reactionary circles, does the struggle for national freedom, closely intertwined with that for social liberation, reduce to the utmost the possibility of a forcible counterrevolutionary turn on to a capitalist development course.

A socialist orientation begins with fundamental reforms in society's political superstructure and the establishment of a revolutionary-democratic government to carry out radical social transformations. Foreign monopolies are ousted from the socialist-oriented countries and landed estates owned by the feudalists are confiscated; at the same time, the public sector is strengthened and industrialisation (q.v.) implemented, democratic social legislation introduced and the working people's living standards raised; conditions conducive to invigorating the masses' socio-political activity are created and measures taken to bring education within the reach of the broadest sections of the population. Today, the number of socialist-oriented countries has grown. Their progress does not, of course, proceed uniformly, and is often complicated. "But," as was pointed out at the 26th CPSU Congress, "the main lines are *similar*. These include gradual elimination of the positions of imperialist monopoly, of the local big bourgeoisie and the feudal elements, and restriction of foreign capital. They include the securing by the people's state of commanding heights in the economy and transition to planned development of the productive forces, and encouragement of the co-operative movement in

the countryside. They include enhancing the role of the working masses in social life, and gradually reinforcing the state apparatus with national personnel faithful to the people. They include anti-imperialist foreign policy. Revolutionary parties expressing the interests of the broad mass of the working people are growing stronger there" (*Report of the Central Committee of the CPSU to the 26th Congress of the CPSU...*, p. 17). The transformations taking place in different countries are not equally profound and far-reaching, and there is much new and specific introduced into the forms of social progress as a result of the masses' revolutionary creativity. The achievements of the foremost group of socialist-oriented countries have a great impact on other liberated countries, for they graphically demonstrate the best way to national renaissance and social progress.

A socialist orientation is not some "synthesis" of capitalism and socialism, but a revolutionary way of effecting, against a background of constantly strengthening socialist forces, a transition to socialism in a historically short period, bypassing the capitalist stage, which is fraught with suffering for the working people.

**Obliteration of Socio-Class Distinctions** is the increasing and more intensive convergence of classes and social sections in socialist society, owing to which the distinctions between the working class, peasantry and intelligentsia and also within these social groups (inter-group differences) gradually become less pronounced and important, while the common features in living and working conditions play a greater role. The process will end in a merger of all social groups and the establishment of complete social homogeneity of society. It represents a general pattern in the development of socialism and transition to communism. The convergence of the working class, co-operated peasantry and intelligentsia (q.v.), and the gradual overcoming of the essential distinctions between town and country, between mental and manual labour are the main lines in the building of a classless, communist society (see *Overcoming Differences Between Town and Country; Physical and Mental Labour*).

The development of the modern productive forces, and the scientific and technological revolution (q.v.) and other social factors call for the class differentiation of society to be overcome, this being equally inevitable as the requirements of the progressive development of production engendering a transition from the social homogeneity typical of the primitive-communal system to socially heterogeneous, antagonistic class forms of social life. This objective trend is already latent under the conditions of modern capitalism (q.v.), owing to the broad mechanisation and automation of production processes, changes in the character and conditions of work, and other factors. But the system of private capitalist relations leads to the utmost consolidation and intensification of the social heterogeneity of the society based on class antagonisms.

The victory of socialism (q.v.) results in the abolition of the exploiting classes and the socialist transformation of all other classes and social groups, and is a major landmark towards overcoming the class differentiation and completely eliminating the social heterogeneity of society. The policy pursued by the Communist and Workers' parties of the socialist countries in obliterating socio-class distinctions plays tremendous and constantly growing role in furthering this process. The establishment of the new system means the end of class antagonisms, but there are still many essential socio-class distinctions in society, caused by the old division of labour which has not been fully overcome.

The gradual transition from socialism to communism leads to the obliteration of: 1) class distinctions between the working class and co-operated peasantry; 2) social distinctions between predominantly manual workers (industrial workers and peasants) and mental workers (intellectuals); 3) the socio-economic, cultural and other distinctions between the urban and rural populations; 4) social distinctions within the working class, co-operated peasantry, intellectuals and office workers, urban and rural dwellers (intra-group distinctions).

The socio-class distinctions in socialist society are obliterated along the following main lines: (1) the working class and the

co-operated peasantry converge in their position within the system of economic relations and relation to the means of production; (2) these classes and the intelligentsia converge in the nature of their work, and their cultural and technical standards; (3) the prerequisites are being created for a gradual obliteration of distinctions in distribution; (4) measures are being taken to draw the living conditions of all social groups closer together. All these processes are closely linked with overcoming the socio-economic, cultural and other distinctions between town and country, and the social distinctions between mental and physical labour. The decisive material cause of the obliteration of socio-class distinctions is the development of socialist production, scientific and technological progress, growing productivity, and the development and improvement of economic relations in the creation of the material and technical base of communism (see Material and Technical Base of Communism). Of major importance, also, is a further general growth of culture, especially development of the public education system and improvement of social services and other spheres. This is paralleled by a gradual transformation of agricultural labour into a variety of industrial labour; increased socialisation of the means of production in agriculture and the broad dissemination of small inter-co-operative and state-co-operative (in the USSR inter-collective-farm and state-collective-farm) production associations and enterprises, which promote a gradual convergence of co-operative property with public; a levelling up of workers in different social spheres in their occupational structure, cultural and technical levels, skills, etc; a gradual overcoming of existing inequality in distribution; reduction of income differences, etc.

The drawing together of different social groups in socialist society thus embraces diverse social spheres: socio-economic, political and intellectual. Of great importance in this process is improvement of country-wide socialist democracy (q. v.), and involvement of all social groups and sections in administering state and public affairs. Socio-class distinctions are being

erased under the conditions of the socio-political and ideological unity of society (q. v.). The further consolidation and development of this unity and an increase in the working people's communist consciousness lead to a gradual merger of industrial workers, co-operated peasants (collective farmers) and intellectuals into a single collective of workers in communist society.

Obliteration of inter-class and inter-group distinctions is closely linked with that of intra-class and intra-group differences, i. e. differences between people in the nature of labour, skills, education, etc. In relation to the working class, this implies elimination of unskilled and low-skilled labour and a levelling up of medium-skilled workers to highly-skilled ones, as well as drawing of workers on state farms to industrial workers, etc. This serves as the basis for raising the general educational, cultural and technical level of various groups of workers, their levelling in terms of wages, living conditions, etc. The formation, by and large, of a classless social structure will occur within the historical framework of developed socialism.

**Office Workers** are mental workers who are paid wages or salaries. They are divided into several large professional groups: administrative and managerial personnel, engineers and technicians and other specialists, commercial workers, clerks, etc.

At the stage of mature industrial capitalism, i. e., approximately since the 1870s, the professions of O.W. have become mass trades as a result of the division of social labour and also of the gradual transfer by capitalists of the functions of management to wage workers. The numerical increase in O.W. is promoted by the development of transport, communications, trade and credit, the expansion of the educational system, medical and other services. Under capitalism, the major factor that increases the numbers of O.W. is the growth of the bureaucratic machinery of the bourgeois state and the development of state-monopoly capitalism (q. v.). In the USA, for example, the proportion of "white collar" workers in the working population grew from 17.6 to

50.2 per cent between 1900 and 1977.

Initially the O.W. occupied a comparatively privileged position in relation to other sections of the working people. As capitalism developed, the category of O.W. became more numerous and, at the same time, more homogeneous. The bulk of them gradually lost their privileged status, while the upper crust, on the contrary, became closer to and even merged with the bourgeoisie. That is why Marxists reject the apologetic bourgeois theories of a "new middle class" and regard O.W. as a category the different sections of which occupy different positions in the social structure of capitalist society. Under capitalism, different groups of O.W. enjoy varying working and living conditions. Hired specialists mostly retain their privileged status, though they, too, feature considerable differences. Owing to the growing mechanisation, automation (q.v) and capitalist "rationalisation", the work of many ordinary O.W. (postmen, telegraphers, clerks) is becoming increasingly closer to that of industrial workers by its conditions and character. They also experience growing psychical and nervous strain, and suffer increasingly from monotonous work that brings them no satisfaction. The bulk of O.W. once had considerably shorter working hours than industrial workers, whereas today they have the same and sometimes even longer working hours (especially in trade and transport services). The earnings of most O.W. and factory workers have levelled off, owing to the O.W.'s rapid numerical growth, proliferation of female labour in suitable trades, devaluation of old skills, etc. Some groups of O.W. earn considerably less than skilled workers. The incomes of the managerial upper crust, on the contrary, have grown enormously. Ordinary O.W. are increasingly affected by higher prices, inflation and also cyclical crises and the concomitant mass unemployment. But these shifts in the socio-economic situation are not immediately reflected in their consciousness, which is usually impregnated by petty-bourgeois views and professional prejudices. Typical of O.W., in particular, is the notion that they are superior to manual workers, this being

explained both by the features of their work and a measure of their separation from workers in enterprises, as well as their direct contact with entrepreneurs or managers. The entrepreneurs, in turn, strive to maintain the existing differences in the mentality of O.W. and factory workers (they advocate "natural solidarity" between the managerial personnel and capitalists, social security and insurance privileges, etc.). Most backward sections of the O.W., therefore, often follow in the wake of conservative and reactionary forces. As the O.W.'s position deteriorates, however, the factors that hamper the development of their class consciousness become weaker. Many ordinary O.W. come to realise the community of interests with the working class (q. v.). According to relevant sociological surveys, roughly half the clerks and workers in trade in the West place themselves among the working class. Changes in the O.W.'s consciousness are reflected in the activities of their trade unions, which sprang up in the late 19th century and grew considerably after the Second World War. Communist Parties see the O.W. as a close ally of the industrial working class, uphold their vital interests and strive to involve them in the common struggle of the working class and all working people. In recent decades, especially since the latter half of the 60s and the early 70s, strikes by O.W., particularly on a regional, industrial or countrywide scale, have become quite common. The mass of O.W. are highly receptive to the socio-economic and political problems of today, and are becoming an increasingly significant factor in the democratic, anti-monopoly movement.

Socialism has radically altered the social position of the O.W. This is graphically illustrated by Soviet society. In pre-revolutionary Russia, the O.W. (including the intelligentsia, q.v.) accounted for nearly 2 per cent of the working population. They were dominated by petty-bourgeois and bourgeois elements (bureaucracy, q. v., Zemstvo O.W., etc.). These sections vacillated during the socialist revolution. At the same time, a considerable portion of lower-level O.W. immediately took the side of the October Revolution. The Bolshevik Party drew the proletarian sections of the



O.W. into the work to implement socialist reforms in the country (participation in workers' control, nationalisation, q.v. etc.). Some of the old petty-bourgeois and bourgeois O.W., however, resisted the Soviet government in the form of sabotage. The proletarian vanguard made a tremendous effort to cut off these hostile elements and, by re-educating the rest of the O.W., involve all of them in building socialism. As society advanced to socialism, their class composition changed in favour of the O.W. with worker and peasant backgrounds. The ratio between the non-specialist and specialist O.W. also changed sharply: in 1940 there were four times as many of the former as there were of the latter, whereas in the 1970s, on the contrary, the latter tended to predominate. The level of general education and specialised training is steadily rising. In 1939, only 51.2 per cent of people engaged mainly in mental labour had secondary or higher education, whereas in 1977, 97 per cent of them had it. In socialist countries, the O.W. enjoy all social benefits. Their material well-being is rising alongside that of the rest of the people. They are active builders of the new society and struggle to improve the socialist economic system and the work of the government apparatus. The socialist countries are characterised by a high level of professional organisation of the O.W. Their advanced sections join the respective Marxist-Leninist parties.

**Opportunism** is adaptation of the policy and ideology of the working-class movement to the interests and needs of non-proletarian (bourgeois and petty-bourgeois) strata. O. is usually associated with revisionism (q.v.) or dogmatism (q.v.). It can be right-wing or "left"-wing.

Right-wing opportunism comes into being together with the organised working-class movement (trade-unionism, Lassalleism, "Economism", etc.). It manifests itself in the rejection of revolutionary methods of struggle, conciliation with the bourgeoisie and, in the final analysis, abandonment of the struggle for socialism. The right-wing opportunistic ideology and policy reflect the interests of those petty-bourgeois strata (including the part of the working class

who turned bourgeois) that are rather prosperous under capitalism and so oppose breaking down capitalist social relations and support reformism (q.v.). As a rule, right-wing O. expands in rather "tranquil" periods, when no revolutionary crises occur and the mechanism of bourgeois democracy (see Democracy, Bourgeois) functions smoothly. Thus, the relatively "peaceful" character of the period between 1871 and 1914 "served to foster opportunism first as a mood, then as a trend, until finally it formed a group or stratum among the labour bureaucracy and petty-bourgeois fellow-travellers" (V.I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 22, p. 111). It was then that right-wing O. became a formidable political force and prevailed in the leading parties of the Second International (q.v.), the result being a split of the working-class movement. To this day, right-wing opportunists retain strong positions in the working-class movement and play a significant role in adapting capitalism to the modern environment. While subjecting the O. of international Social-Democracy (q.v.) to principled criticism, the Communist Parties work to overcome the split, to achieve unity with the socialist parties (see Unity of Action of the Working Class). From time to time a struggle between Marxists and opportunists also flares up within Communist Parties. This was the case in the mid-1920s, when the Third (Communist) International (q.v.) had to defend itself against right-wing elements. This was also the case in the late 1950s, when a wave of revisionism surged through many Communist Parties. Vigilance against the right-wing opportunistic danger remains, therefore, a major duty of the international Communist movement.

"Left"-wing O. is, on the face of it, the diametrical opposite of right-wing O. It urges the most resolute and super-revolutionary methods of struggle, rejects all compromise and any co-operation with reformist organisations, and disdains the struggle for the partial demands of the working people. This difference is, however, of another nature. Like right-wing, "left"-wing O. reflects the mood of petty-bourgeois strata. While right-wing O. is personified by the trade union official, the representative of the middle-class-like upper crust of the

working class, the leftists are backed, in Lenin's words, by "the frenzied petty bourgeois" (V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 27, p. 352), who may be unsettled by the poverty and suffering and prepared to do anything to escape the horror of his life's torpor. Like right-wing O., "left"-wing O. misinterprets revolutionary theory. It gives ground to anarchism and dogmatism (qq. v.). Both right- and "left"-wing O. hamper the revolutionary process and side-track the working-class movement, the former towards class conciliation and the latter towards adventurism. "Left"-wing opportunists usually step up their activities in periods of more acute class struggle, difficulty and hardship. On the international scene, "left"-wing opportunists are now represented by Trotskyism (q.v.) which wages a fierce anti-communist and anti-Soviet campaign. There was a noticeable increase in leftist radicalism in the 1960s.

**Overcoming Differences Between Town and Country.** Town and village are different types of settlement formed as a result of social division of labour in society. The basic feature differentiating them is the work in which the population is engaged. In the town, it is handicrafts, industrial manufacturing, and commerce, while in the village it is farming. Towns formed when the primitive-communal system disintegrated as a result of handicrafts separating from agriculture. Early towns were different from villages, above all, in a high concentration of the population engaged in handicrafts and the continuous functioning of marketplaces.

Once the town sprang into existence, a conflict arose between town and village. This antithesis was rooted in private ownership and the ensuing separation of society into antagonistic classes. A concentration of economic and political power, the town exploited the village through inequitable exchange, high taxes, and usury. Disunited by the low marketability of output, the village was doomed to agonisingly slow development. For centuries the gap was widening between the levels of development of productive forces, between the living and cultural conditions of the urban and rural population. The entire economic history of class-antagonistic society, wrote

Marx, "is summed up in the movement of this antithesis" (K. Marx, *Capital*, Vol. I, p. 333). Today's capitalism intensifies this conflict. Internationally, it manifests itself in the conflict between developed capitalist countries and those that lag behind economically. The capitalist international division of labour reduces countries that are economically dependent on developed capitalist ones to the role of suppliers of agricultural and mineral raw materials. In developed capitalist countries, the antithesis between town and country is maintained and manifests itself as a conflict between agriculture and industry. Small farmers and peasants are ruined by the monopolies. The revolution in science and technology has accelerated the rate of population urbanisation and the ousting of small producers from agriculture. In all capitalist countries, the price gap grows between industrial and agricultural products, colossal profits from non-equivalent exchange are reaped by industrial and trade monopolies.

The antithesis between town and country cannot be overcome unless private ownership of the means of production is eliminated and industry and agriculture undergo socialist transformations. The victorious socialist revolution and the toppling of the capitalist and landowner power in Soviet Russia signified elimination of the political basis for the antithesis between town and country. Nationalisation (q. v.) of the land, industry, the banks, transport, and, partially, trade undermined that basis, but did not remove it, because the existence of several economic structures during the period of transition from capitalism to socialism (q. v.) inevitably resulted in a conflict of economic interests on the market. The transition of the village to large-scale socialist farming amounted to a revolution in the entire way of life of the peasantry (q. v.). In the process of building socialism, the village has approached the town in terms of economic development, but the essential historical distinctions between town and country in socio-economic conditions, cultural and service levels remain under socialism. As communist society is being built, these distinctions are being gradually overcome, and their importance

decreases; in the long term, they are bound to disappear.

Socio-economic distinctions between town and country exist in all socialist countries but in each they manifest themselves in different ways, depending on the share of industry and agriculture in the country's output, on the level of development of the productive forces and culture, the social and class structure of the population, etc. The variety of socio-economic distinctions between town and country can be expressed as the differences in the development of the productive forces, in economic relations between the state and collective-farm and co-operative sectors, in everyday conditions, in the living and cultural standards of the urban and rural population. As for the technological differences between industry and agriculture, they will survive in communist society.

A prerequisite for the material and technical base of communism (q. v.) is an equal level of techno-economic sophistication in different sectors. Agriculture becomes a highly advanced economic sector and agricultural labour a kind of industrial. A major direction in this process is the creation of agro-industrial associations where, as Marx predicted, society will attain "a higher synthesis in the future, viz., the union of agriculture and industry" (*ibid.*, p. 474). As the productive forces of agriculture in the USSR develop, the state and the collective-farm and co-operative forms of property gradually converge, as is evidenced by the concentration of collective-farm production and development of inter-collective-farm and collective-farm-state production links. As the economy advances, subsidiary personal plots will become obsolete. Today, however, they make a significant contribution to meeting the needs of the rural population, and the Soviet state stimulates their development. In terms of economic conditions, the collective farms will catch up with state enterprises in agriculture and together they will become enterprises of a communist type. Villages will turn into larger settlements with modern housing, communal and other services, cultural and medical centres. The rural population will enjoy equal cultural and living standards with

the urban population. Concurrently, towns will develop. Rational planning, optimal population sizes, removal of hazardous processes from the towns, expansion of green areas, resolution of transport problems, and reduction of noise will contribute to healthy conditions for the work and recreation of the urban population. Elimination of distinctions in socio-economic, cultural and living standards between town and country will be a major achievement of the building of communism.

## P

**Paris Commune** was the first government of the working class in history, a form of dictatorship of the proletariat (q. v.); it was founded as the outcome of a victorious popular rising on March 18, 1871. Initially, the power in the French capital was vested in a provisional revolutionary government, which was the Central Committee of the National Guard, a body elected by battalions of the corps of volunteers for defending the city against the Prussian invading armies; on March 26 the power was transferred to the Commune, an assembly of people's deputies. The proclamation of the P.C. invoked sympathy all over France. Unrest swept over many other cities. Even though the people did not succeed in toppling the bourgeois-and-land-owner government throughout the country, the P.C. was essentially a herald and forerunner of a new, revolutionary government in France. The majority of P.C. members were workers and craftsmen; it was the first time ever that such people had run a government. They set out to implement a sweeping programme of democratic and revolutionary changes, as was the will of the people, even before the election. To manage state affairs, elected commissions were set up. They replaced former ministries and dealt with labour, industry and exchange, public services (i.e. transportation and communication), food, finances, public security, justice, education, foreign relations, and the armed services. Their activities were co-ordinated by an Executive Commission, which included,

at a later stage, representatives of all the sectoral commissions. On May 1 the Executive Commission was replaced by the Committee of Public Salvation, the highest executive body of the P.C. Each P.C. member was also a commission member and remained in touch with his precinct and electorate. The old state machine was broken down, the bureaucracy and top officials of the old regime removed, the staff reduced in numbers; the salaries of P.C. functionaries and members were made equal to average worker's wages; the old army was disbanded and replaced by a National Guard; the police and gendarmerie were abolished; reactionary judges were replaced by elected ones. Monuments to militarism and reaction were demolished. Streets bearing the names of hated oppressors were renamed; the church was separated from the state and deprived of its backing; newspapers and magazines hostile to the P.C. were closed down. The P.C. met daily and in public. Its members not only adopted decrees, they followed through their implementation by organising the masses. The daily press, posters, and leaflets gave information on the activities of the P.C., criticised deficiencies, and gave advice. The popular masses were involved in running the state also through "vigilance committees", unions, and political clubs (meeting places for citizens in Paris districts). Many clubs nominated members of the P.C., discussed decrees, contributed to their implementation, and neutralised enemy agents. The same functions were performed by sections of the International and National Guard battalion committees. The increased prestige of teachers and improvement of their living conditions, the opening of new schools, involvement of schoolchildren in aiding the P.C., free museum and library services, new reading halls, public lectures and concerts, the appearance of new songs and verses were evidence of the unprecedented popular attraction of culture. The social activity of women also increased. The transformations in the political and social life initiated by the P.C. left whatever had been achieved by previous revolutions far behind. In the socio-economic sphere the P.C. also took numerous meas-

ures to make the life of the popular masses easier. It made wages immune to illegal fines and discounts; set up a compulsory minimum wage level, enforced work safety procedures, took steps to eliminate unemployment, wrote off tenants' back pay, issued relief payments to the needy, halted sales of things pawned by the poor and returned them to the owners, granted pensions to families of killed fighters, introduced free textbooks and breakfasts for schoolchildren; handed over flats that were left by the fleeing rich to workers' families whose houses had been destroyed by artillery bombardments; introduced firm prices for bread; and set up a food delivery service. Especially important were the P.C. decrees on creating workers' associations (producer co-operative societies), on transferring to them orders for military equipment and factories abandoned by their owners, and on introducing workers' control and elections of managers in some factories; these steps were of socialist nature. Radical social changes were hindered by the lack of consistent programme for such changes, and differences among the members of the P.C., for it included Blanquists, neo-Jacobins, and bourgeois radicals, as well as members of the First International; among the latter were adherents of petty-bourgeois Proudhon socialism. Finally, the P.C. was short of time. By April 2 the Versaillais had started hostilities against the P.C. and defence devoured the Commune's entire strength. On May 28, the last barricade of the Communards fell.

The defeat of the P.C. is attributable to the absence at that time of the necessary socio-economic conditions for a victorious socialist revolution (see *Revolution, Socialist*) and the immaturity of the working class. Nevertheless, the 72 days of the P.C. were a landmark in the international working-class movement. The P.C. delivered the first blow to capitalism and foreshadowed its inevitable fall; it was a lesson in the concrete formulation of socialist revolutionary goals.

The experience of the P.C. (its weaknesses and setbacks, as well as its achievements) enriched the theory of scientific communism with numerous new tenets. It

confirmed the need for the revolutionary overthrow of the power of the exploiters and the establishment of the dictatorship of the proletariat; the impossibility, at that time, of the proletariat taking power without armed insurrection (q. v.). It proved that the working class should not simply take over and set the old state machine in motion; rather it should break it down and replace it with a new one. The P.C. itself was a form, discovered by the masses, of proletarian dictatorship, a working-class state. The lessons of the P.C. indicate the need for armed defence of revolutionary conquests, for offensive tactics in a revolutionary war, and speak of the inadmissibility of softness or credulity towards enemies. They also showed the inability of various forms of non-proletarian socialism to find a true way for the revolution to triumph; they emphasised the importance of a scientific social theory and the significance of the leadership provided by a proletarian party as the fighting vanguard, the most important weapon in the liberation struggle. They demonstrated the need to combine collegiate discussion with everyone's personal responsibility for his own task, and the importance of proletarian discipline and international solidarity of the working class. "In the present movement we all stand on the shoulders of the Commune," wrote Lenin (V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 8, p. 208).

**Parliamentary Activity of Communists.** Parliament is the highest legislative body in a bourgeois state, and is completely or partially elected. Under bourgeois democracy (see Democracy, Bourgeois) it is an arena where the interests of capital and the democratic strata of the population collide.

The founders of Marxism-Leninism held that Socialists should use election campaigns in bourgeois states and participation in representative bodies to strengthen ties with the working class, to educate the masses politically, and win concessions from the bourgeoisie that might somewhat improve the position of the working people. They also cautioned against the dangers of a reformist approach to parliamentary activities that might hamper education and organisation of the proletariat and the prepa-

ration of the working people for a socialist revolution. Lenin emphasised that parliamentary activity is a legal form of struggle wholly subordinate to the needs of the extra-parliamentary revolutionary movement.

Even though the monopoly bourgeoisie resorts to various limitations of suffrage and political intrigues to hinder the participation of the working people in voting and genuine expression of their will, the protracted and tenacious struggle of the working people in a number of capitalist countries has made it possible for them to send their representatives to elective bodies. Communists view parliament as an institution that can be used in their struggle for democratic reforms inside the country and a peaceful foreign policy. They oppose the drive of reactionary forces to limit the rights of representative bodies or to disband them, work for extending the people's opportunities for influencing government policy through these institutions. Communists recognise only revolutionary parliamentarism, i. e. parliamentary activities that are supported by mass actions of the proletariat and all working people. They struggle against both the leftists' rejection of work in elective bodies of the bourgeois state and the opportunists' desire to divert this activity into reformism (q. v.).

The Communist Parties in many capitalist countries receive significant support in elections and win numerous deputy mandates. The activities of Communists on representative bodies of the bourgeois state is a form of Party work. Communist Parties are very careful in choosing people for these positions and seek to ensure that the Party line is defended in elective bodies by politically mature members, experienced in work among the masses, and full of initiative, people who are averse to careerism and soft jobs. A Communist's mandate belongs to the Party on whose behalf he acts. The Party directs its representatives in parliament, helps them make the right decisions, supports progressive bills by massive extra-parliamentary action, and assists in their implementation. Issues in P.A.C. are discussed by national congresses and conferences. The Central Committees hear regular reports from chairmen of parlia-

mentary groups and individual deputies. A Communist deputy is responsible to both the Party and the electorate. A major requirement made by the Party is a continuous link between its representatives and the electorate, knowledge and protection of their everyday needs, regular meetings with them, and enhancement of their initiative and activity.

P.A.C. is above all work among the masses. During electoral campaigns the most diverse methods and forms of work with the population, all channels for links with the masses are used. Communist candidates address rallies, write letters, meet individual voters, write newspaper articles, speak on radio and TV, etc. Communists offer a programme based on the general political line of the Party, which indicates ways to solve the country's problems allowing for the interests of various strata of the population. In working to unite all democratic forces, Communists encourage their unity in election and co-ordinate action of the parties of the Left on elective bodies.

In parliaments, Communists expose the anti-popular nature of the policies pursued by reactionary circles of monopoly capital and oppose it with a positive democratic programme. Communist deputies address the working people and explain the real goals of the policies of the monopolies and urge a massive struggle for a democratic solution to the problems of relevance to the working people. Written and oral inquiries, bills put forward by Communist deputies are discussed within mass organisations, factories, and neighbourhoods. Strikes, demonstrations, and rallies are organised in support of moves made by Communist deputies, petitions are submitted. P.A.C. goes hand-in-hand with the extra-parliamentary struggle, with mass action.

Analysis of a new balance of power in the world and, in particular, capitalist countries has brought the Communist Parties of these countries to the conclusion that the institutions of bourgeois democracy can be used for bringing the working class and its allies to power. These parties attach major importance to winning a parliamentary majority at the stage of the struggle for democracy, for social change to ensure the most favourable conditions for the

triumph of socialism. This struggle will be successful, however, only if the activities of Communists in representative institutions are backed by a revolutionary movement of the working class and other working masses. Only if there is a coalition of democratic forces and the masses unanimously demand a revolutionary government the reactionary classes may be deprived of the possibility of armed resistance and have to succumb to the popular will. In this case, the forces of the Left can start socialist changes by parliamentary legislation, by extending the people's democratic rights.

**Parties, Workers'** are parties supported by the proletariat and more or less consistently expressing its class interests.

P.W. are set up under capitalism, as the labour movement develops and the proletariat becomes aware of its ultimate, as well as its short-range economic, objectives. They unite the most conscious and active proletarians. The first P.W. that sprang up in Western Europe and the USA in the 1820's and 1830's were small and fragile. A landmark in the history of the labour movement was the Chartist party, founded in England in the 1840's; with a membership of about 50,000 it involved broad masses of proletarians, but it lacked a solid organisational structure and its members — socialist convictions.

Continuing the traditions of the revolutionary struggle for the emancipation of the people and for democracy, inherited from revolutionary democratic parties of the past (the Jacobin movement and Blanquists in France, Correspondence Committees in England, Carbonari societies in Italy, revolutionary Narodniks in Russia, etc.), the P.W. opened a new page of history, initiated the political struggle of the proletariat.

P.W. which consistently express the vital interests of the working class, result from a synthesis of the spontaneous labour movement and scientific socialism. They aim to embed socialist ideology in this movement, inspire in workers a faith in their own strength, organise them, and develop their revolutionary consciousness; these parties are the vanguard of the proletariat.

The first revolutionary workers' party that set out to rally the proletariat for winning political power and transforming society into a communist one was the Communist League set up by Marx and Engels (1847-52). Its membership was only 400, but it was international and the first ever Marxist party. Certain features of a proletarian party were inherent in the International Association of Workers (see First International). It laid the foundations for the formation of class parties of the proletariat that were basically Marxist in all developed countries. The strongest of these parties was, for decades, the German Social-Democratic Party, which was headed by Marx and Engels.

In the 19th century, the Social-Democratic parties (see Social-Democracy) contributed greatly to the organisational rallying of the workers. In a network of Party newspapers and through publication of Marxist literature, they propagated the ideas of scientific socialism among the working people and involved many progressive-minded workers in vigorous party activities. The success of Social-Democratic workers' parties was a blow to anarcho-syndicalism and sectarian trade unionism, which opposed the participation of workers in the political struggle. The P.W. were successful in electoral campaigns and managed to have representatives of the working people elected to parliaments. However, in that relatively peaceful period opportunism (q. v.) which was not resolutely rebuffed was hatched in Social-Democratic parties; the workers' party began to be viewed as a bloc of proletarian and petty-bourgeois elements that tolerated a divergence from Marxist teachings and from a revolutionary policy.

Revolutionary Marxists came out against these dangerous trends in the parties of the Second International (q. v.); the most resolute opponents of opportunism were Bolsheviks, led by Lenin. The Russian Social-Democratic Labour Party (Bolshevik) became the strongest and most experienced proletarian party. In continuing the traditions of the Communist League, led by Marx and Engels, and the best traditions of the Social-Democratic P.W.

it acted as a party of a new, higher type, capable of directing all forms of the struggle of the working class (q. v.) towards a single goal, leading the people, mercilessly fighting opportunism, and providing flexible and effective leadership in the revolutionary struggle for power and for the triumph of socialism.

The growth of reformism (q. v.) within Social-Democratic P.W. resulted, during the years of World War I, in their defection to social-chauvinistic positions and in an overt split of the working-class movement. The revolutionary trends in these parties, faithful to the Marxist banner, formed independent Communist and Workers' Parties (see Third International). The reformists who regained a significant influence on the people maintained their hold on the machinery of old Social-Democratic parties. Professing the ideas of "democratic socialism" (q. v.) they slid into class collaboration with the bourgeoisie. Despite the profound ideological differences with Marxist-Leninist parties, however, the functionaries of many Social-Democratic parties and even more so their rank and file workers are responsive to calls by Communist Parties for unity of action and share in joint undertakings (see Unity of Action of the Working Class; Popular Front).

Marxist-Leninist P.W. are different from all non-proletarian parties in the clear vision of their goal, scientifically sound policy, and multifarious links with the people. Their efforts are all directed at the great goal of liberating the workers and achieving the triumph of socialism; they have no special "party interests" other than those of the working class. They jettison those who join in pursuance of mean personal ambition and want every member to be profoundly convinced of the justice of the cause and ready to give all his strength for the cause. These parties are built on the principles of democratic centralism (q. v.), collective leadership (q. v.) and initiative of its members, criticism and self-criticism (q. v.) and Party discipline. They exercise a directing influence over all other organisations of the working class and are the higher forms of its class organisation.

Developing under the conditions of the class struggle and pressure exerted by exploiting classes on unstable elements, the Marxist-Leninist P.W. encounter difficulties and live through trials that lead to opportunist shattering among the less hardened members, who fall prey to petty-bourgeois adventurism (see Revolutionary Adventurism). The parties succeed in weathering these trials. In bourgeois countries, they gradually increase their influence and win new members from among the unorganised people and the best representatives of other parties. They become the forerunners of creating progressive coalitions and active participants of the united popular, patriotic front. In countries that develop along the socialist road they play the leading part. The increase in their strength, internal and international cohesion, the ever more profound influence on the popular masses are a historic necessity, the natural course of current historical development.

**Party, Political**, the most active and best organised part of a class or stratum. The existence of political parties is attributable to the division of society into classes and to the heterogeneity of the classes, to differences in the interests of these classes and their components. A P.P. is a major tool of its class (or stratum) to struggle for its goals.

The origin of political parties can be traced back to the early stages of class society, but the true history of political parties starts at the time of the French bourgeois revolution of the late 18th century. In today's society with its class structure, parties may be bourgeois, petty-bourgeois, proletarian, landowner, and peasant. Some parties represent the interests of a coalition of parties (bourgeois and landowner parties, those in blocs of proletarian and petty-bourgeois elements, etc.). Sometimes, especially in multinational states, parties have a national colouring and put forward purely national goals. But in this case, too, their activities stem from class interests. The same is true of so-called religious, "traditional", and other parties.

Unlike classes, which emerge spontaneously, political parties are set up by

people and deliberately pursue certain goals. A P.P. is a voluntary social organisation, a union of people sharing the same views. Its members usually act together, their activities being controlled by party discipline. Unlike non-political social organisations such as economic, trade, cultural, scientific, charitable ones, P.P. always pursues certain political goals, striving for a leading influence on the life and organisation of society, for seizing and retaining power to promote its policies.

A P.P. is an integral part of society's superstructure. But unlike the state, which possesses power and means of coercion, a P.P. usually acts through persuasion, by disseminating its views and uniting adherents of its policies. A P.P. has, however, a certain material force, such as its organisation, material funds, and mass media.

Parties emerge when the formation and rallying of a class reaches a certain state of maturity. The very fact of their establishment demonstrates that the class is conscious of its interests. Parties involve the most active part of the class and never cover the entire class. The historical role of parties depends on the role played by the relevant classes in the life of society (revolutionary, progressive, conservative, reactionary, and counter-revolutionary). Party members are not necessarily aware of this. Thus, various peasant parties often call for "socialism" while, in fact, they advocate a land reform that leaves the capitalist system intact (see Populist Socialism). Since they seek anti-popular goals but require mass support, reactionary parties usually camouflage their true goals and offer demagogical programmes and catchwords and assume deceptively attractive names. Thus, the party of most aggressive circles of German monopoly capitalism was named "National Socialist" and even "Workers'" (see Fascism). The true nature of a P.P. should be judged by its concrete actions rather than by names or even programmes.

Even in those countries where the division of society along class lines is most distinct, political parties do not necessarily



reflect this, because they express the interests of various groups inside the classes or social strata. Differences between the financial, industrial, and merchant factions of the bourgeoisie or between the urban and rural petty bourgeoisie result in the formation and consolidation of numerous parties. In some countries, where the prevailing population is petty-bourgeois, political parties are especially numerous. The ruling classes often encourage this variety to underscore the "democratic" nature of the political system. As the class's struggle with other classes intensifies, however, its need for a single, sufficiently powerful P.P. becomes increasingly urgent to defend its vital interests. In some countries, the ruling class makes two influential parties that differ in ways of attaining political aims rather than in their essence; depending on the situation, the ruling class moves them alternately to the political forefront.

Today the P.P. usually has an objective described and argued for in a programme or declaration (sometimes in resolutions of congresses), pursues a certain policy, relies on certain organisational principles and an internal set of rules such as a constitution or rules and selection of membership; it incorporates local organisations and committees, convenes congresses, collects dues, issues party cards, has a flag, an anthem, and traditions; some subsidiary organisations adhere to it. A P.P. usually has press and publishing houses at its disposal, is represented in parliament and on local self-government bodies, and is supported by more or less organised groups in various social organisations.

In bourgeois democracies (see Democracy, Bourgeois), the activities of a P.P. are formally permitted by law but progressive and especially workers' parties are subjected to various types of harassment. Under military fascist dictatorships, the activities of political parties are banned, or the ruling clique creates a single ruling P.P. to serve as a tool of oppression and consolidation of the fascist regime.

In the course of the political struggle, the political parties that represent differ-

ent classes and strata often enter into electoral agreements or blocs. On some occasions, this is attributable to a coincidence of their interests in the confrontation with a common internal or external enemy; in others, to unscrupulous vote hunting and the search for cushy jobs in the government or the state machinery.

Marxist-Leninist parties do not refuse to join blocs with other parties or enter into electoral agreements with them, but they are invariably guided by high goals, such as the need to defeat the most dangerous adversary or to safeguard the vital interests of the working class and all the working people. Despite ideological differences, Marxist-Leninist parties co-operate with Social-Democratic, petty-bourgeois, peasant or national parties as long as there are grounds for such co-operation. Following the establishment of the power of the working class (see Dictatorship of the Proletariat), their co-operation continues provided these parties do not side with enemies of the revolution. In this way the broadest spectrum of democratic forces is involved in social change and the building of socialism (see People's Democracy). Marxist-Leninist parties provide the leadership of society.

When the state is taken over by communist social self-government (q.v.) and society is homogeneous, there will be no need for political parties. People will be able to unite in conformity with their interests and inclinations, but these unions will not be political or parties in today's sense (see also Parties, Workers'; Social-Democracy; Communist Party of the Soviet Union).

**Patriotism, Socialist**, devotion of the working people in socialist countries to the social and state system, to the socialist homeland (q.v.), to the communist cause.

P. in general "is one of the most deeply ingrained sentiments, impregnated by the existence of separate fatherlands for hundreds and thousands of years" (V.I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 28, p. 187). But since the homeland is a historically changing socio-economic, political, and cultural environment, P. implies differ-

ent things at different times; this is dictated by socio-economic conditions rather than some mystical national or racial spirit, as some bourgeois ideologists assert. P. acquired special importance in the period of the making of nations, becoming the standard of struggle against the feudal fragmentation of countries and national oppression. As the antagonism of classes in capitalist society becomes increasingly acute, the P. of the bourgeoisie turns false and hypocritical, because this class ever more frequently sacrificed the interests of the homeland and nation to its class interests.

P. of the proletariat was internally contradictory, for love of the homeland was combined with hatred for the oppressive system. This used to give bourgeois ideologists cause for slanderous accusations that the proletariat rejects P. At the beginning of the first imperialist war, when the chauvinists whose motto was "defence of the homeland" accused the Leninists of anti-patriotism, Lenin in his article "On the National Pride of the Great Russians" showed that the Russian proletarians loved their country and language but this was precisely why they could not "defend the fatherland" otherwise than by using every revolutionary means to combat the monarchy, the landowners and the capitalists of one's *own* fatherland, i.e., the *worst* enemies of our country" (*Collected Works*, Vol. 21, p. 104). At the same time, Lenin emphasized that "defence of the fatherland is a lie in an imperialist war, but not in a democratic and revolutionary war" (V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 23, p. 23).

The working people are genuine patriots, spokesmen for the true national interests. In the first years of Soviet power, the working people of Russia rose in arms to defend their socialist homeland from the onslaught of imperialist interventionists and their White Guard accomplices. In Lenin's words, "the patriotism of a person who is prepared to go hungry for three years rather than surrender Russia to foreigners is genuine patriotism, without which we could not hold out for three years. Without this patriotism we

would not have succeeded in defending the Soviet Republic, in doing away with private property" (V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 42, p. 245). In the Great Patriotic War, socialist P. was a decisive factor in the victory of the USSR over fascism. Having grown up in the context of close fraternal co-operation between the Soviet Republics, this P. is all-Soviet and internationalist. A qualitatively new sentiment has come into existence, the national pride of the Soviet man in the great achievements of the first socialist country in the economy, science, and culture, in its socialist way of life, new moral values and ideals. This is a higher kind of P., and outgrowth of the joint work and struggle for socialism, rather than of love for "isolated homelands".

Socialist social property is the economic basis of Soviet P., the Soviet state and social system that grew up and gained strength in the overthrow and elimination of oppressive classes is the socio-political basis, and Marxism-Leninism (q.v.) is its ideological and theoretical basis. This P. is deeply rooted in the progressive patriotic traditions of all peoples of the USSR. In Soviet P., the national and international components are united, so it does not separate nations and nationalities, but rallies them into a fraternal family where friendship among peoples (q.v.) prevails. The developed socialism built in the USSR "...is a society of high organisational capacity, ideological commitment, and consciousness of the working people, who are patriots and internationalists" (*Constitution of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics*, p. 14). The internationalist essence of Soviet P. is felt not only in the fraternal unity of the USSR's peoples, but also in friendship with the working people of other countries, in awareness of their international duty to the working people of the world.

Socialist P. is displayed in all spheres of social life: in daily work, in emulation of front ranking workers, in encouragement of technological and cultural advances and in scientific management techniques. It is also expressed as intolerance of deficiencies, of any deviations from the socialist norms of life. Its strength lies

in awareness of the superiority of socialism over capitalism and in an understanding, on the part of the working people, of the historic importance of their transforming activities.

With the rise of the world socialist system (q.v.), the sphere of socialist P. has expanded. It signifies devotion to the communist cause, love of the socialist homeland, close fraternal friendship, mutual aid and co-operation between socialist countries. While developing as sovereign states, the socialist countries cannot feel like "isolated homelands" in the old sense. The understanding of the organic link between the welfare of one's own country with the prosperity of the entire world socialist system brings about a desire and willingness to work for the common good of all peoples in the world socialist community (q.v.).

Socialist P., internationalist in its nature, is hostile to bourgeois nationalism (q.v.) and cosmopolitanism and is incompatible with trends towards national bigotry, in whatever form. Today, with the increasing role of P. in social progress, bourgeois ideologists and also "left"- and right-wing opportunists do their best to substitute nationalism for P. in their drive to implant national egoism and national enmity in the working people. An antidote to nationalistic propaganda is Marxist-Leninist Party-sponsored education of the working people in socialist P. and internationalism and overcoming the survivals of the past in people's minds and behaviour.

**Peaceful and Non-peaceful Forms of the Transition to Socialism**, diverse forms of the revolutionary movement towards socialism determined by the specific conditions of the historical situation (see Revolution, Socialist). Marxism-Leninism maintains that all forms of struggle against capitalism should be used, but also emphasises that choosing the most expedient ones depends on the deployment and balance of social forces on the national scale and worldwide.

This stand was, in the main, substantiated by Marx and Engels. In 1847, when working on defining the principles of communism, Engels pointed out that

Communists would be the last to object to the abolition of private property by peaceful methods if it were not for the fact that the proletariat's development was forcibly suppressed in nearly every civilised country, which makes the other prospect more realistic (see K. Marx, F. Engels, *Collected Works*, Vol. 6, p. 349). Marx held similar views on this. In July 1871, after the defeat of the Paris Commune (q.v.), he wrote: "An uprising would be a folly where peaceful agitation could lead to the achievement of the goal set in a quicker and surer way. The existence of many repressive laws and a deadly antagonism between the classes in France evidently make a forcible resolution of the social war inevitable. But it is the working class of this country itself that must choose the method in which to achieve that resolution" (Marx/Engels, *Werke*, Bd. 17, Berlin, S. 641). Several months later he repeated the same idea: "We must announce to the governments: we know that you are an armed force directed against the proletarians; we shall act in a peaceful way against you wherever we find it possible for us, and with arms in hand when it becomes necessary" (Marx/Engels, *Werke*, Bd. 17, S. 652). The stand assumed by Marx and Engels is clear: a peaceful way, if and when possible, and a non-peaceful one, when necessary. The option between the opportunity and necessity is determined by the specific circumstances and the balance of power, and particularly by the condition of the military-bureaucratic machine, the resistance put up by the ruling classes, the nature of the country's political institutions and traditions, and the role and place of parliament in its social life.

Lenin also spoke repeatedly about the possibility of achieving socialism in different ways. Seeing the gigantic growth of the police apparatus, militarism and imperialist reaction, he emphasised that an "extremely valuable" opportunity for the revolution's peaceful development was "extremely rare" and "only occurs once in a while" (see V.I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 25, pp. 310-11). Lenin described this opportunity in the following way: "It cannot be denied that in

individual cases, by way of exception, for instance, in some small country after the social revolution has been accomplished in a neighbouring big country, peaceful surrender of power by the bourgeoisie is *possible*, if it is convinced that resistance is hopeless and if it prefers to save its skin. It is much more likely, of course, that even in small states socialism will *not* be achieved without civil war, and for that reason the *only* programme of international Social-Democracy must be recognition of civil war, though violence is, of course, alien to our ideals" (V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 23, p. 69). As we can see, Lenin did not consider the two opportunities as equally likely. Under the conditions obtaining at that time, a peaceful transition to socialism was hardly possible. But if there was the slightest chance to do without bloodshed, without armed violence Lenin was always the first to exert every effort to follow a peaceful road. That was the case, for example, during certain periods of revolutionary development in Russia. "Our business," Lenin wrote in September 1917, "is to help get everything possible done to make sure the 'last' chance for a peaceful development of the revolution" (V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 26, p. 60). It is well known that it proved impossible to "make sure" of that chance: the bourgeoisie imposed war on the Russian working class (see Civil War). The situation was made worse by imperialist intervention. Imperialist reaction throughout the world went over to open armed suppression of popular movements and launched bloody reprisals against Communists. A peaceful revolutionary development was out of the question. That is why the Communist International called on the working class and all working people to prepare for an armed struggle for socialism.

After World War II, the historical situation was entirely different. The world socialist system (q. v.) had appeared and the colonial system had disintegrated (see Disintegration of the Colonial System); the general mood of the public in the developed capitalist countries had shifted to the left and the social base of the rev-

olutionary movement had expanded. All these conditions made it possible to consider the chance of the transition to socialism in several countries without an armed uprising or civil war. The struggle to realise the opportunity of passing to socialism in a peaceful way is connected, in particular, with the Communists' more active work in parliaments (see Parliamentary Activity of Communists). This is not to say that a peaceful way to socialism is identical with the parliamentary way: the socialist revolution can develop peacefully outside existing parliamentary institutions, too. Yet sometimes wide use can be made of democratic parliamentary institutions to effect the peaceful way to socialism. The Communist Parties, while stressing the possibility of the socialist revolution's peaceful development, do not overlook the fact that, at a certain stage in the revolution's development, the masses might have to take up arms. Such a situation may emerge if the ruling circles give up democratic principles and go over to violent, armed suppression of the revolutionary movement. The dominant classes will never cede power voluntarily; so their overthrow is invariably social coercion in essence. The forms of this coercion may be different, depending on the balance of class forces in general, and on the nature and extent of the toppled classes' resistance, in particular.

**Peaceful Coexistence of States with Different Social Systems**, a form of the struggle waged between the opposite social systems in the world arena (see Struggle Between the Two Social Systems).

P.C. is rooted in socio-economic causes and is objectively necessary because socialism does not win simultaneously in all or even in the leading capitalist countries, and because capitalism, in turn, cannot engage in an incessant battle against the states where socialism has triumphed. P.C. of socialist and capitalist countries is, therefore, historically inevitable and not subject to the will of men. In the final analysis, it is a result of a balance of power between the two embattled systems that makes war hopeless for the bourgeoisie. The latter, by force of its

social nature as a class basing its sway on violence and suppression, tries to resolve international conflicts by means of war, and only the growth of the forces of socialism and progress and, in the final count, their fundamental superiority, make it possible to neutralise this striving and exclude from international practice a world war and every type of unjust war.

The possibility (and objective necessity) of P.C. is realised in each particular case primarily through the policies of the states concerned. The chief goal set in the policy of P.C. is to preclude a new world war, which is, with the present level of destructive weapons, a major earnest of social progress and the attainment of socialism and communism. A nuclear war would not only take an enormous toll of human life and inflict immeasurable suffering on mankind; it would also bring in its wake, and precisely in the world's most developed states, the destruction of society's economic foundation, a huge devastation of the productive forces. To lift the threat of war and the heavy burden of the arms race would fundamentally accelerate social progress.

The policy of P.C. is called on to create the conditions conducive to mass revolutionary movements (see World Revolutionary Process); to enhance socialism's political authority and economic might, and hence its revolutionary impact (see World Socialist System; World Socialist Community); and to activate the working people's class struggle in the capitalist countries and the national liberation movement, as it precludes interference by world reactionary forces into the internal affairs of other countries (see Export of Counter-revolution).

The policy of P.C. is realised through the struggle to ensure strict observance of the principles of sovereignty, equality, territorial integrity and non-interference into other states' affairs. In conformity with Marxist-Leninist teaching, the revolution is the outcome of the internal development of each society concerned, so it cannot "break out in a foreign country to order, by agreement" (V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 27, p. 480). At the same time, its victory was precluded

in several countries, as history proved, precisely by the intervention of world reaction. To provide a real guarantee against the export of counter-revolution, which can only be ensured if the principle of non-interference in other states' affairs is strictly observed, favourable conditions must be created for the liberation struggle of every nation.

To realise the policy of P.C., it is very important to enhance mutually beneficial economic, scientific and cultural ties between states with different social systems in every possible way. The benefit gained by individual capitalists or capitalist countries from such ties cannot, of course, prevent or noticeably slow down the general decay of the capitalist system resulting from the aggravation of inherent contradictions.

As the principle of P.C. wins growing recognition and the contacts between the two social systems are enhanced, the role and importance of ideological struggle as an indispensable component of the world revolutionary process increases.

The principle and policy of P.C. are constantly attacked and criticised by both the most aggressive part of the monopoly bourgeoisie and petty-bourgeois revolutionaries, who are in no position to understand that socialism's political superiority in the world would gradually exclude coercion (see Violence) from international relations rather than unleash an armed struggle against the capitalist system, and would finally lead to the total elimination of international armed conflicts. Critics "from the left" maintain that P.C. interferes with the revolutionary struggle. Contemporary ultra-revolutionaries see the world revolutionary process as an armed international conflict and ignore Lenin's instruction concerning the necessity of mastering all forms of struggle; they exaggerate one of these forms inordinately and, in fact, push the world towards a nuclear war, like the reactionary monopoly bourgeoisie, while hampering the use of all possible means to strengthen socialism's forces.

The CPSU and the international communist movement regard P.C. as a form of the class struggle under way in in-

ternational politics, economics and ideology. The struggle to consolidate the principles of peaceful coexistence and mutually beneficial co-operation with the capitalist countries, for a lasting peace, and reduction and subsequently elimination of the threat of a new world war, has always been central to the CPSU's policy with respect to the capitalist countries. The 26th Congress of the CPSU proclaimed: "At present nothing is more essential and more important for any nation than to preserve peace and ensure the paramount right of every human being — the right to life... To safeguard peace — no task is more important now on the international plane for our Party, for our people and, for that matter, for all the peoples of the world." While fighting to prevent the unleashing of a new world war and leading the international working-class, national liberation and general democratic movements, Communists are blazing the road towards the consummation of the cause of communism throughout the world. The Soviet Union's consistent struggle to implement the Peace Programme proclaimed by the CPSU, the co-ordinated foreign policy pursued by the fraternal socialist countries, and the concerted efforts made by progressive forces worldwide seek to make the international climate more healthy. Peoples all over the globe are waging a resolute struggle for detente (see Detente) in relations between states belonging to the two opposite social systems, which is a new and higher stage in the struggle for the general recognition by states of the principles of peaceful coexistence. The world's progressive forces are working to make the process of international detente irreversible.

**Peasantry**, the class engaged in agricultural production on the basis of private or co-operative ownership of the means of production and participating in this production through its members' personal labour.

The peasantry emerged as a special class in the course of the disintegration of the primitive-communal system and development of private ownership of

the means of production; it will continue to exist until the building of communism has been completed. Its social essence and position in society are determined by the prevailing mode of production and are modified as socio-economic formations and the stages in their development replace one another. In pre-socialist formations, P. consists of isolated and predominantly small private agricultural producers. Under capitalism, P. as the section of small property-owners and commodity-producers, forming part of the petty bourgeoisie, is subject to increasing differentiation. It falls into three groups, differing by their class position: small peasants (agricultural labourers, poor peasants), middle peasants, and the rural bourgeoisie (kulaks). The capitalist concentration of production and growing expropriation erode the middle peasant section, the result being that, on the one hand, the ranks of rural proletarians and semi-proletarians swell, and, on the other, the bourgeoisie is strengthened. Under capitalism, P. has a dual socio-economic nature: it may be characterised as both a class of the working people and a class of property-owners. By force of their economic position "the peasants must follow either the workers or the bourgeoisie. *There is no middle way* (V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 29, p. 370). The fundamental interests of the working class and the toiling P. coincide already under capitalism. The exploitation of the peasants, Marx noted, "differs only in *form* from the exploitation of the industrial proletariat. The exploiter is the same: *capital*" (K. Marx, F. Engels, *Collected Works*, Vol. 10, p. 122). This provides the economic foundations for the alliance between the working class and the toiling peasantry (see Alliance of the Working Class and the Peasantry). At the stage of imperialism, when P. suffers from mounting exploitation by the monopolies, from growing taxes and indebtedness to banks, it allies itself with the working class in a joint struggle against the monopoly bourgeoisie. In countries where a national liberation movement develops, P. becomes its largest motive force (see National-Liberation Revolution).

The socialist revolution (q.v.) causes profound changes in the P.'s historical fate. The transformation of individual holdings into large collective farms brings considerable changes in the peasants' economic relationships, labour, everyday life, and entire life style. In the USSR, collectivisation did away with kulak bondage, class stratification and poverty in the village. Having abolished private ownership of the means and implements of production, P. is gradually transformed into a class that is closely connected as a whole with public socialist property. Guided by the CPSU and led by the working class, it develops a socialist world outlook. From being an individual producer, the peasant becomes a labourer in a social economy, this determining his new social status. Of great significance for the peasant's life is better technical equipment of his labour: greater mechanisation of agricultural production, electrification and the use of chemicals. Technical progress in farming and increased labour productivity reduce the demand for labour power in agricultural production proper. In 1959, collective farmers and co-operated handicraftsmen accounted for 31.4 per cent of the country's population; in 1970 — for 20.5, and in 1978 — for only 15.1 per cent. Gross agricultural output has increased owing to greater labour productivity. More and more industrial-type occupations are appearing in the countryside, and the number of engineers and technicians is growing. The socialist P. is characterised by a steady improvement of production and technical skills, higher cultural standards and consciousness. All vestiges of the past, connected with hard, inefficient manual labour and patriarchal principles in family life are dying away, and the socialist principles of culture and everyday life are taking firm foot. As socialist changes are introduced in the countryside, workers and peasants develop similar features, which serves further to strengthen the alliance between the working class and the peasantry. Under socialism, however, certain distinctions between the working class and the peasantry still persist, since they are rooted in dif-

ferences in the form of property (state and collective-farm-and-co-operative property). As the building of communism goes ahead, and the two forms of property become more similar and gradually merge into one, social homogeneity will gradually be achieved, the social and class distinctions will disappear, and P., together with the working class and the intelligentsia, will form a single army of communist society labourers (see also Obliteration of Socio-Class Distinctions).

**People's Democracy**, a form of the dictatorship of the proletariat established in several European and Asian countries as a result of popular-democratic revolutions in the 1940s which developed into socialist revolutions. It emerged at a new stage in the world revolutionary process and reflected the specific way in which the socialist revolution was developing at a time when imperialism was weakened and the balance of world forces had tipped in favour of socialism.

The common features characteristic of people's democracy as a form of the dictatorship of the proletariat (q.v.) were determined by the broad social base underlying the socialist revolutions that occurred in the European and Asian countries after World War II, their relatively peaceful development and the assistance and support rendered to them by the Soviet Union. Yet, in each particular country, people's democracy has its own distinctive features, since the socialist changeover took place there under specific historical and national conditions.

The general principle of proletarian dictatorship is an alliance of the working class and non-proletarian working people, and the proletariat's leading role in it. But the forms and boundaries of such an alliance may vary. In the majority of the states of people's democracy, the middle peasants, who did not wage any active struggle against workers' power, were drawn into the alliance rather than neutralised. Intellectuals and representatives of the urban petty bourgeoisie also accorded active support to the proletariat. Hence the dictatorship of the proletariat in its people's democratic form

enjoyed a broad social base. Mass socio-political organisations like the Popular Front (q. v.), consisting of various parties and other public organisations, became an organisational form of the working class's alliance with the non-proletarian working people, and the principal feature of P.D. The Popular Front is an important element in the system of proletarian power and has a major role to play in the building of socialist society and its further evolution. As national and social liberation was attained and society transformed on the socialist lines, the balance of class forces underwent a change, which was also reflected in the Popular Front.

Unlike the Soviet Union, where a single-party system emerged in the course of history, in most of the countries of P.D. a multi-party system was formed. The parties united in the Popular Front to fight fascism and imperialism; under these conditions, the multi-party system helped to expand the social base of the revolution and better fulfil the tasks facing it. Leading positions were held by Communist and Workers' Parties (this was the case in the GDR, Hungary, Poland and Czechoslovakia). To strengthen cohesion within the ranks of the working class, the Communist and Workers' Parties in several European countries of P.D. merged with Social-Democratic parties on the basis of Marxism-Leninism (q. v.), while in Hungary and Romania the multi-party system was replaced by a single-party one.

Today, too, co-operation between Communist and Workers' Parties, and non-proletarian democratic parties is going on successfully in several countries of P.D. Experience gained by these countries clearly shows the false nature of assertions by bourgeois ideologists and reformists that Communists have always opposed co-operation with other parties, both in the fight for power and during the building of socialism.

The exploiting classes in the countries of P.D., unlike in the USSR and Mongolia, were not, as a rule, deprived of electoral rights because, given the correct policy of the Marxist-Leninist parties and favourable internal and external condi-

tions, their exercise of this right could not present a threat to people's rule. Only in Romania were the exploiting classes completely deprived of electoral rights for a time; in the rest of the countries of P.D., restrictions only concerned particular categories of persons those engaged in hostile activities against people's power and traitors who collaborated with the occupation forces during the war. This proved Lenin's thesis that, in order to implement a proletarian dictatorship, it is not always necessary to restrict the exploiters' electoral rights.

There were also certain other peculiarities in some countries of P.D. In Poland and Czechoslovakia, for example, use was made of some old democratic parliamentary forms modified to conform to the new requirements.

Like the Soviets (q. v.), P.D. ensures participation by the workers and all working people in administration of the state, electivity and rotation of the working people's representatives on governmental bodies, the unity of legislative and executive power, establishment of the state administrative system based on the principle of democratic centralism (q. v.), and leadership by the Communist and Workers' Parties. P. D. undergoes a change as socialism is built and consolidated, the result being that existing forms of the socialist state draw closer together.

The experience of P.D., like that of the Soviet Union, is of great importance for the international working-class and national liberation movement and the peoples' struggle to attain socialism. The socialist revolutions that are bound to occur in the future will create new political forms of proletarian power; however, for all their diversity, their essence, as Lenin noted, will invariably be the same: a dictatorship of the proletariat (see Period of Transition from Capitalism to Socialism).

**Period of Transition from Capitalism to Socialism** is the period of the revolutionary transformation of capitalist into socialist society.

This period is necessary because, unlike the other socio-economic formations that were hatched in the depths of the



preceding one, socialism was not hatched by capitalism. The latter merely created the material conditions for the transition to socialism. The building of socialist society follows the removal of the bourgeoisie from power and establishment of a dictatorship of the proletariat (q.v.). Even so, socialism cannot be "decreed" as soon as the proletariat has taken the political power. Lenin wrote: "This object cannot be achieved at one stroke. It requires a fairly long period of transition from capitalism to socialism, because the reorganisation of production is a difficult matter, because radical changes in all spheres of life need time, and because the enormous force of habit of running things in a petty-bourgeois and bourgeois way can only be overcome by a long and stubborn struggle. That is why Marx spoke of an entire period of the dictatorship of the proletariat as the period of transition from capitalism to socialism" (V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 29, p. 388).

The dictatorship of the proletariat is the chief tool for tackling the tasks involved in the transition from capitalism to socialism, such as eliminating capitalist production relations and replacing them with socialist ones, abolition of the exploiting classes (q.v.), exploitation of man by man and its causes; creating the material and technical base of socialism through industrialisation of the country and technological reconstruction of the national economy; overcoming the diversity of economic structures and building the economic foundations of socialism; gradually transforming small-scale commodity production into large-scale socialist production; collectivising agriculture; accomplishing a cultural revolution (q.v.).

In the USSR, the period of transition started with the Great October Socialist Revolution of 1917, which put an end to the power of the bourgeoisie and landowners, established a dictatorship of the proletariat, the leading and guiding force of which became the Communist Party. The tasks involved in the transition to socialism were tackled in compliance with objective laws applicable to all countries that embarked on building socialism (see General Laws and Specifics of the Transi-

tion to Socialism). A number of historical features affected the forms, methods and rates of resolving these tasks.

The main socio-economic feature was overall economic, technical, and cultural backwardness, a legacy from pre-revolutionary Russia; an extreme diversity of regional socio-economic levels, and the existence of five economic structures ranging from the primitive patriarchal economy to the most advanced, socialist one. Furthermore, small-scale commodity production prevailed for years. Many peoples were still at a pre-capitalist stage of evolution and had to make the transition to socialism without going through the stage of capitalism. The main political feature was that the Soviet Union built socialism within a hostile capitalist encirclement. The imperialists did their best to thwart the building of socialism in the USSR. They staged a military intervention, economic blockade and diplomatic isolation, backed up the capitalist elements inside the country in every way possible, so the latter increased their resistance tenfold, and encouraged them to use the fiercest devices. All these factors put the Soviet country in unprecedented difficulties and called for numerous specific methods of struggle against capitalist elements, of forms and methods of socialist construction. The capitalist encirclement influenced the specifics and rates of the nationalisation of industry, the collectivisation of agriculture, the methods of eliminating kulaks (rich farmers) as a class, and the evolution of Soviet democracy. Another specific feature of the building of socialism in the USSR was that the Soviet people had no predecessors in doing this, no examples to emulate.

The period of transition in the USSR went through several stages. The first stage (1917-20) was chiefly that of the expropriation of the expropriators. In these years, the landowners' property was confiscated and all land, industry, banks, transportation, and trade were nationalised. A socialist structure was created in the economy. The classes of landowners and big capitalists were eliminated. At that stage, in the context of intervention and Civil War, the Soviet state was forced

to pursue a special, extraordinary economic policy that became known as War Communism. The basic provisions of it were: the food surplus-appropriation system; a ban on free trade; state-controlled distribution according to class allegiance; payment in kind; the free issue of food, industrial goods and state services, universal compulsory labour, etc. At the second stage (1921-25), the national economy, which had been destroyed in the imperialist and civil war, was restored and the conditions created for all-round socialist construction. Of special significance was NEP (q. v.). The third stage (1926-37) saw the socialist reconstruction of the country. The most important and difficult problems of the transition period were resolved then. The implementation of the first (1929-32) and second (1933-37) five-year plans resulted in industrialisation of the country, collectivisation of peasants' farms, and in overcoming the diversity of economic structures. The socialist reconstruction of the national economy was completed; the socialist economic structure became almost dominant. Capitalist elements in town and village were eliminated. A cultural revolution was accomplished. Socialism in the USSR had practically been built. The period of transition came to an end.

Having made a transition to socialism for the first time in history, the Soviet people blazed the trail to new society for all humanity. Allowing for their historical and national specifics, all peoples that build socialism make extensive use of Soviet experience.

**Personal Property Under Socialism**, a form in which the citizens of socialist society appropriate consumer goods and other benefits used to satisfy their individual needs. Within this bracket are included essentials, objects required to satisfy cultural and everyday needs, household utensils, individual transport facilities, part of society's housing, individual savings, and certain means of production that do not constitute their owners' main source of income.

The principal means of production are public property (see Social Socialist Property), on which personal property

under socialism relies. The main source of P.P. under socialism is labour in the socialist economy, which provides the bulk of material and cultural benefits for the working people. The members of socialist society who reside in the countryside, settlements, or small towns receive another, much smaller portion of consumer goods, from their personal subsidiary plots of land. This explains why P.P. includes not only consumer goods, but also certain means of production, such as some kinds of tools, cattle, etc. Ownership of these means of production is a variety of socialist P.P. It cannot be classified as private property because it does not serve to exploit others, but only to satisfy the owner's personal needs; its scale is limited, too, so it is not the main source from which its owner obtains material benefits.

As the productive forces develop under socialism, the people's material standards grow steadily, too, and this is reflected in P.P. Its size is also growing, as is evidenced by the population's deposits in savings banks, livelier retail trade, the larger quantity of consumer goods purchased, etc. The structure of P.P. is also improving. Many articles that, until recently, were rarity, have now become essentials, a conventional part of P.P. As real incomes grow, P.P. is growing too. Under socialism, however, P.P. connected with earned income does not embrace the entire range of material and intellectual benefits that satisfy the people's individual needs; part of them are met out of the social consumption funds (q. v.). P.P. is safeguarded by socialist society and guaranteed by legislation. Article 13 of the Constitution of the USSR (1977) reads: "Earned income forms the basis of the personal property of Soviet citizens. The personal property of citizens of the USSR may include articles of everyday use, personal consumption and convenience, the implements and other objects of a small-holding, a house, and earned savings. The personal property of citizens and the right to inherit it are protected by the state... Property owned or used by citizens shall not serve as a means of deriving unearned income

or be employed to the detriment of the interests of society."

The issue of P.P. has always evoked an acute ideological struggle. In the mid-19th century, apologists of the bourgeois system accused Communists of wishing to abolish all P.P. as such. Marx and Engels countered by writing: "We by no means intend to abolish this personal appropriation of the products of labour, an appropriation that is made for the maintenance and reproduction of human life, and that leaves no surplus wherewith to command the labour of others. All that we want to do away with is the miserable character of this appropriation" (K. Marx, F. Engels, *Collected Works*, Vol. 6, p. 499). Assertions to the effect that the people's welfare has improved and that P.P. under socialism leads to the restoration of capitalism, have nothing to do with Marxism, but reflect petty-bourgeois strivings for egalitarianism (see *Egalitarian Distribution*). P.P. cannot turn into private property under socialism or bring back capitalism because the main means of production cannot become its object. Works, factories, the land, and mineral wealth are not to be bought or sold. Besides, socialist society makes sure that P.P. does not turn into a source of unearned income. Persons guilty of using it to derive profit are regarded as law-breakers.

As socialism develops into communism (q.v.), the size and structure of P.P. will change. Yet P.P. in the form of consumer essentials will continue to exist even under developed communism. Its structure will evidently be determined according to the principle of full satisfaction of all man's rational needs (see *Basic Principle of Communism*, the).

**Personality Cult**, an exaggeration, alien to Marxism-Leninism, of the role of an individual, ascribing him supernatural qualities and a power to determine the course of history.

The ideology and practice of P.C. contradicts the Marxist-Leninist, materialist view of social development, according to which history is made by the people, by the working masses rather than by outstanding individuals or "heroes". It is

through the labour of the people that the means of existence are created; it is their energy and will-power that determine the outcome of social revolutions and all political and national liberation movements. The main harm done by P.C. is that the role of the people as the maker of history and of the Communist Party as the collective leader of the masses is played down. In ideological work, it leads to dogmatism (q.v.), sticking to the letter and inordinate use of citations, which is detrimental to the evolution of scientific thought in general and of social sciences in particular. P.C. has deleterious effect on literature and art, imposing subjective views on them and often making them extol an outstanding personality instead of truthfully depicting feats of labour and combat by the people.

Marx, Engels and Lenin never tired of fighting attempts to introduce the idea and practice of P.C. into the working-class movement. Being very unassuming and modest men themselves, the founders of Marxism-Leninism resolutely rebuffed all attempts at adulation and flattery. Marx wrote in one of his letters: "Because of aversion to any personality cult, I have never permitted the numerous expressions of appreciation from various countries, with which I was pestered during the existence of the International, to reach the realm of publicity, and have never answered them, except occasionally by a rebuke. When Engels and I first joined the secret Communist Society we made it a condition that everything tending to encourage superstitious belief in authority was to be removed from the Rules" (Marx, Engels, *Selected Correspondence*, p. 291).

Stalin, who for a long time led the Communist Party and the Soviet state and who did a great service to the building of socialism in the USSR and to the world communist and working-class movement, ignored the warnings of the founders of Marxism-Leninism. Stalin's P.C. was evident in exaggeration of his personal role, alien to the spirit of Marxism-Leninism, in deviation from the Leninist principle of collective leadership (q.v.), in uncalled-for repressions and other violations of socialist legality, which dam-

aged Soviet society. These distortions, though quite serious, did not modify the nature of socialist society or shatter the foundations of socialism in the USSR. The Party and the people had deep faith in the cause of communism and worked enthusiastically to implement Lenin's ideas and overcome difficulties, temporary failures and errors.

The CPSU, proceeding from the incompatibility of P.C. with the principles of Marxism-Leninism, denounced Stalin's P.C. and took measures to root out its aftermath, thus preparing the ground for a further democratisation of the socialist system. The rights of the Union republics, territories and regions were extended in economic and cultural matters, and those of work collectives and managers of enterprises enhanced; the role of central and local Soviets, and of public organisations in the political system of socialist society was raised. Radical measures were taken to strengthen socialist legality and extend the rights and freedoms enjoyed by citizens. The CPSU policy aimed at eliminating P.C. and its aftermath, at strictly observing the Leninist norms of party life (see Democratic Centralism), at developing to the maximum the activeness of Communists and all working people was supported by Marxist-Leninists in other countries and by the world communist and working-class movement.

While coming out against P.C., Marxist-Leninists recognise the great role played by leaders and organisers of the masses. Without the Communist Party and its experienced, well-educated and active leaders, the advanced class could not gain political domination, maintain and consolidate its power, or lead a successful struggle against its enemies. "Not a single class in history has achieved power," Lenin wrote, "without producing its political leaders, its prominent representatives able to organise a movement and lead it" (V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 4, p. 370). The working people hold in great esteem experienced and steely leaders, who give all their knowledge and creative energy to the cause of revolution and communism. The leaders, in turn, are

responsible in their activities to the masses, the Communist Party, and the world communist movement.

**Physical and Mental Labour** are types of human activity formed in the process of history.

After appearing at a certain stage of social development, the social division of labour finds its expression and consummation in the division of labour into P. and M., i.e. in the emergence of social groups identified with one of these types of activities only. "Division of labour only becomes truly such," Marx wrote, "from the moment when a division of material and mental labour appears" (K. Marx, F. Engels, *Collected Works*, Vol. 5, pp. 44-45). In contrast to bourgeois ideology, which attempts to trace the differences between the social groups engaged in either M. or P. labour to innate, intellectual or biological differences (variations in brain structure and physical distinctions), in his treatment of M. and P. labour division Marx proceeded from the requirements of social production. The early period of human social development saw no split between intellectual activity and its materialisation, consciousness and the production of ideas being intimately intertwined with material activities, while subsequent social development required a separation of intellectual activity from material production proper for increasing labour productivity, that is, for the development of production itself. "As in the natural body head and hand wait upon each other, so the labour-process unites the labour of the hand with that of the head. Later on they part company and even become deadly foes" (K. Marx, *Capital*, Vol. I, p. 476). In a society with antagonistic classes, M.L. and P.L. become socially opposed, as M.L. becomes mainly a privilege of the ruling classes. This opposition is aggravated under capitalism, featuring a parasitic upper ruling class and a swelling social group of people engaged in M.L. (see *Intelligentsia*). The labour of the individuals belonging to this social group, employed in the service of capitalist production, is utilised as a means for exploiting the individuals engaged in P.L., though M.L. itself is an object of

exploitation by the ruling class. The opposition between M.L. and P.L. has a negative effect on the development of individuals. Marx writes that a proletarian annihilates, rather than asserts, himself by his labour; he exhausts his physical nature and destroys his spirit, rather than enhances his physical and intellectual powers without hindrance. Controlled by the principle of private ownership, the development of individuals involved in P.L., as well as in M.L., becomes lopsided. Focusing narrowly on their professional preoccupation, the latter, like labourers, lose their understanding of the content, and eventually of the results, of their efforts. The spreading scientific and technological revolution (q.v.), mechanisation and automation (q.v.) of production alter the nature of labour, presupposing that workers will acquire scientific knowledge, and expand the share of M.L. in their activities. The intensification, and therefore the exploitation of labour in capitalist society are, however, growing. Although the capitalist has become more interested than before in the labourer's intellectual development, he is not concerned with this for its own sake, but only inasmuch as it promises greater profits. The intellectualisation process is aimed at giving the labourer only those capabilities that will enable him to become involved in the production process. Therefore, in spite of the fact that the present level of development of productive forces favours a convergence of M.L. and P.L. even under capitalism, their opposition can only be eliminated once private property has been abolished, and the results of both material and intellectual human activity have been placed at the service of all society. Having proved the historical inevitability of the division of labour into M.L. and P.L., Marx also revealed that its elimination is likewise historically predestined. This process being essential for the further development of production, when it becomes unproductive to use manpower as a source of one-sided, mental or physical, labour for performing monotonous, machine-like operations, where man could be replaced by machines that would do such work much more efficiently.

The road to this is opened by the socialist revolution (see Revolution, Socialist). By simply eliminating private ownership as the basis of the exploitation of the working class, including the appropriation by capitalists of the product of mental workers' labour, socialism ends the opposition of M.L. and P.L., yet it does not eliminate the essential differences between them, such as distinctions between workers, peasants, and intellectuals. Under socialism, however, scientific and technological progress acquires a special character, there being no hindrance to either its advance or its impact on the development of man's creative powers, or the nature of his labour. Social relations can be refined to help eliminate the social differences between groups associated with different types of activity. Communism will do away with classes and social groups engaged in P.L. and M.L., since man will cease to function as an immediate agent of production. Labour will be transformed into a unified creative activity of the harmoniously developed individual (see Harmonious Development of the Individual; Labour, Communist).

**Physical Education** means purposeful development of the physical abilities of individuals, aimed at achieving their physical perfection as an inseparable characteristic of the comprehensively developed individual (see Harmonious Development of the Individual). Physical perfection, above all, means sound health and creative longevity, all-round development of abilities and habits ensuring high physical and mental performance of man.

In the epoch of large-scale machine production, P.E. becomes indispensable for the worker's effective participation in the process of production and becomes a social problem, the importance of which grows with urban development and the changing living conditions. While diminishing the share of physical labour, altering the nature of muscular activity and increasing the pace and rhythm of life, the scientific and technological revolution (q.v.) requires a higher physical preparedness in people: they must be capable of concentrating longer and reacting faster, co-ordinating their movements more

precisely, etc. Sound health and proper physical training speed up the rate at which new professions and working techniques are mastered, enable people to live and work in an unfavourable environment and under hazardous working conditions at no risk to their health. To avoid unnecessary work strain (which is a condition for turning labour into a vital need of man), it is not enough just to make labour easier (by means of mechanisation, automation, q.v., etc.). People must also be able to endure great mental, nervous, psychological and physical strain.

P.E. as a purposeful process is accomplished by physical culture methods (playing games, non-utilitarian activity), which serve to improve man's physical and psychological possibilities. Physical culture is an inalienable part of social culture and, as such, it reflects social ideological conceptions and a given world outlook. In socialist society, P.E. is on a mass scale; it features broad popular involvement, internationalism, humanistic principles, an organic interface with mental and labour education. Here the unity of the intellectual and physical sides of the human personality becomes a law governing his cultural development. Concerning the tasks of P.E., Lenin stressed in his talk with Clara Zetkin that young people especially need healthy sport, such as gymnastics, swimming, physical exercises, combined with diversified interests of the mind and soul. Among the major tasks outlined in the Programme of the CPSU is that of raising a physically sound younger generation with harmoniously developed physical and mental powers. The 26th Congress of the CPSU pointed out the need to develop mass physical culture and sport in enterprises, institutions, and educational establishments, as well as in residential areas, so that physical culture might become part of the everyday life of the broad masses of the population, especially children. Concern for the health of Soviet people is the primary social task. According to the Constitution of the USSR, the Soviet citizens' rights to rest and leisure and medical care are guaranteed by the development of mass sports activities, physical culture and

tourism, and of health-building measures. In bourgeois society, P.E. is used mainly to support an individualistic morality and to cater for the poor tastes of the general public. The development of physical culture in socialist countries is distinguished by the increasingly close ties of the P.E. with intensified creative activity and mass initiative of working people. By force of its nature closely linked with overcoming difficulties in a fighting spirit, sport opens up broad opportunities for developing the willpower. Joint training sessions and competitions work for the closer rallying and collectivism, q.v., for a feeling of comradeship and mutual assistance. Participation in sports contests and involvement in sporting events tend to enhance the feeling of public duty, strengthen socialist patriotism. An expansion and deepening of international sports ties heightens the intellectual attraction of Soviet sportsmen as bearers of communist morality (see Communist Morality), of the ideas of proletarian internationalism (q.v.).

**Political Strategy and Tactics** means the political behaviour of a party, determined above all by its class character, i.e. the class with which it connects its activities, how fully it expresses its interests, how it defines its relation to other classes, the direction it gives to the class struggle through its own activities. Different working-class parties have different S. and T. depending on whether they express the interests of the class as a whole or its backward section, and whether they spread the proletariat's influence among other sections of the population or serve as vehicles for alien class influences, those of the bourgeoisie or the petty bourgeoisie.

The S. and T. as the political conduct of a Marxist-Leninist party, i.e. the practical aspect of its activities, should be distinguished from the strategic and tactical views in accordance with which this activity is carried out, from the teaching of the S. and T. of the class struggle of the proletariat. The Marxist-Leninist teaching of S. and T. is a component of scientific communism, the science of the principles of party political behaviour, of the methods of working out the ways and means for achieving the ultimate objectives of the

working-class movement, of the main rules for steering the class struggle of the proletariat, and all the working people.

The basic principles of the Communists' political behaviour were already defined by Marx and Engels in their *Manifesto of the Communist Party*.

The principle of internationalism as applied to the S. and T. is expressed in the following: a correct political line can be worked out and the characteristics of a country identified only by taking account of the major features of the historical situation in the given epoch (rather than separate episodes from the history of particular countries). Hence the interests of the revolutionary working class of a given country cannot be defended successfully nor the national S. and T. worked out, unless the interests of the international revolutionary working-class movement and, correspondingly, its general policies are taken as the point of departure. The pursuance of national S. and T. requires skilful, creative application of the basic principles of communism to the national specifics. The principle of internationalism is aimed both against national limitations in questions of S. and T. and against any disregard for national conditions and features hampering the Communist Party making its most effective contribution to the international working-class movement. It is aimed both against wait-and-see attitudes towards revolutions in other countries and against their artificial goading from without, against "export of revolution".

The revolutionary principle in the S. and T. is expressed in Communists taking a most active part at each stage of the class struggle, seeing these stages as steps leading to the ultimate aim — that of the proletariat taking over political power. This principle is aimed both against skipping the untrodden stages of development ("everything or nothing") and against a loss of perspective, and loss of the ultimate aims ("movement is everything, the aim is nothing"). It requires struggle for reforms to be subordinated to the revolutionary struggle for socialism.

The political line of a Marxist-Leninist party includes both stable elements that retain their importance over long periods, and

changing, flexible and mobile elements. The need to delimit them resulted in the differentiation between the concepts "political strategy" and "political tactics". It would be wrong both to erase differences between them or to absolutise them. The former would lead to a loss of political line for the sake of temporary political success, while the latter would lead to abandonment of the search for effective means to pursue a political line, to the loss of ability to effect the requisite political manoeuvres within the accepted course, to divorce from reality and loss of orientation in the changing situation. The unity of S. and T. makes a policy effective and is marked by a firm political line and flexible determination of the ways, means and rates for pursuing it.

The political line, i.e. the general direction of the political activity of a working-class party, includes the aim set by the working-class movement at the given stage of its development, and the basic means (system of class alliances) for achieving it. This is a kind of political plan (sometimes called a strategic plan) characterising the direction of the main thrust, the main class adversary, the main allies of the proletariat, the attitude to the intermediary sections, the indirect reserves of the revolution.

The Party cannot limit itself to the elaboration of a correct political line; it must find ways and means for implementing it and mobilise the social forces capable of doing so. To do this, it must, above all, secure and consolidate its role as political leader not only of the working class but also of the broad mass of the people.

The political leadership of the masses implies: a) the ability to keep a watch on the people's condition and sentiments, merge with the people to some extent, but not trail behind the mass movement; b) the ability to bring the masses to a new political position, educating them through their own experience, particularly mistakes and defeats; the ability to find a concrete course or turn of events making it possible to raise the masses to a new stage of the struggle. It is also important not to advance negative slogans alone, i.e. those directed

against the existing system, or slogans formulating only the ultimate aims of the working-class movement, but give the masses a positive programme of struggle for each political moment. It is also impotent to identify the chief political task at each specific time and the principal means of solving it, thus preparing for the solution of other tasks on the way to the strategic goal. Political leadership of the class struggle includes political manoeuvring, i.e., the ability to direct the mass movement in the right way, depending on the objective situation. Tactics must also differ in a revolutionary situation and in the absence of it. Political manoeuvring includes various types of action: political offensive, retreat, defence, mustering of forces, etc., depending on the "ebb" and "flow" of the revolutionary movement. The offensive tactic implies both a long "siege", i.e., pressure mounting over a long period of time, and a decisive storm of or onslaught on the positions of the class enemy. A tactic of retreat implies, above all, retreat taking full account of the situation, retaining the maximum of political forces for a new offensive. A tactic of mustering forces means gradual education of the masses, their systematic preparation for pitched class battles, political sensing of the class enemy, etc.

Political leadership of the masses requires a correct determination of the forms of struggle. The revolutionary working-class movement must master all forms of struggle and aspects of social activity without exception, without universalising them and applying them strictly in accordance with specific ideological and organisational principles. It must be prepared for a quick and sudden change from one form to another. The revolutionary party of the working class does not invent forms of struggle, but generalises and organises what has arisen in the course of the movement, and, in this sense, it must constantly study mass-scale practice, which engenders ever new forms of struggle. What is more, it must on no account limit itself to existing forms of struggle and recognise the inevitability of new forms as the social situation changes. The different forms of struggle can be grouped as follows: legal and illegal,

parliamentary and extra-parliamentary, peaceful and armed. These main types are, in turn, subdivided into more concrete forms. The forms of struggle engender corresponding forms of organisation. The main criterion for selecting particular forms of struggle is maintenance of constant ties with and guidance of the masses.

The policy of a Marxist-Leninist party, its S. and T. constitute the science and art of leadership of the class struggle of the proletariat, of all working people. This science requires that politicians take account of the experience of other countries and the specific balance of class forces within a given country, in neighbouring states and the world as a whole. The scientific basis of S. and T. is the Marxist-Leninist theory which grows from the "sum total of the revolutionary experience and the revolutionary thinking of all countries in the world". (V.I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 21, p. 354.) At the same time, it is of especial importance to take account of new experience, even if it has not been theoretically generalised. Familiarisation with the experience of other countries removes the need to cover independently the stages already passed by other detachments of the working-class movement, or to repeat their mistakes. At the same time, in elaborating S. and T. it is always necessary to take a creative, independent approach, making it possible to find the right solution in the modern situation. Policy as art presupposes an ability to translate correct tactical principles into reality. In the course of the class struggle, so many factors, both objective and subjective, intertwine that theoretical knowledge alone would not suffice for taking account of them; what is required is personal experience, a revolutionary sense and ability to take quickly the right decisions and organise the people, etc. All this is provided for by the school of revolutionary struggle.

**Political Struggle of the Working Class** is the highest form of class struggle waged by the proletariat against the bourgeoisie, for social emancipation, for elimination of capitalist exploitation, for democratic rights and freedoms, for peace and national in-



dependence. Unlike the struggle for improved living standards and labour conditions, which is confined to satisfaction of the current socio-economic demands of the working people (see *Economic Struggle of the Working Class*) it is struggle for the vital interests of the proletariat. "The fact that economic interests play a decisive role *does not in the least imply* that the economic ... struggle is of prime importance; for the most essential, the 'decisive' interests of classes can be satisfied *only by radical political changes in general*" (V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 5, p. 390). It is through P.S. that the vital economic and political goals of the proletariat, such as taking over the means of production and state power, are achieved.

P.S. involves the entire class of the proletariat. It is no longer a fight by individual groups of working people against individual employers; rather, it is a struggle by the working class against the entire class of capitalists. Its main component is the struggle for the power of the proletariat, for socialism. "Marxism recognises a class struggle as fully developed, 'nation-wide' *only if it does not merely embrace politics but takes in the most significant thing in politics — the organisation of state power*" (V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 19, p. 122).

The struggle for the best class interests of the proletariat, for power, can be either peaceful, legal or forcible, with the use of armed struggle (see *Peaceful and Non-peaceful Forms of the Transition to Socialism*; *Civil War*). One specific kind of this struggle is armed insurrection (q. v.).

The content of the P.S. for the short-term goals of the working-class movement has been continually developing and become enriched with new forms and demands. A significant role is played in it by the struggle in defence of and for expansion of democratic rights and freedoms of the working people that were gained in fierce battles with capitalism, for recognition of the rights and freedom of activity of the working people's class organisations. The proletariat and its class organisations resort to demonstrations, marches, rallies, petitioning, picketing of government offices, national conferen-

ces, peace marches, campaigns of solidarity with peoples that fall prey to imperialist aggression, etc. A widespread form of P.S. is strikes supported by marches and rallies. Contrary to what the bourgeois-reformist mass media assert, the political strike remains an effective and extensively used weapon of the proletariat.

In the forefront of the P.S. of the proletariat against the monopolies, for democracy and socialism are Marxist-Leninist parties, which provide leadership in numerous campaigns of the proletariat for the satisfaction of their political demands. "The most purposeful, most comprehensive and specific expression of the political struggle of classes is the struggle of parties" (V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 10, p. 79). The activities of legalised political parties of the proletariat include electoral campaigns, the work of their representatives in bourgeois parliaments, governments, and local self-government bodies (see *Parliamentary Activity of Communists*; *Municipal Councils*). Illegal Communist Parties use appropriate forms and methods of political work among the people.

With the further intensification of the antagonistic contradictions of capitalism and the upsurge of the workers' class struggle, the economic struggle become ever more politically motivated (see *General Crisis of Capitalism*). As the bourgeois state intervenes on an increasing scale in the sphere of socio-economic policies (state monopoly wage control, "prices and incomes" policies), the struggle for traditional economic demands, in particular wage increases, leads the working people into direct confrontation not only with individual capitalists, but also with the capitalist state itself. In this context, the P.S. involves trades unions, and other mass organisations of the working class set up for its economic struggle.

The political sphere includes relations between nations and states as well as between classes, so when the proletariat comes on to the international scene, the struggle for peace (q. v.), and national liberation and independence struggles become integral parts of the P.S. of the proletariat. In the Inaugural Address of

the First International (q.v.) Marx called on the working class "to master themselves the mysteries of international politics; to watch the diplomatic acts of their respective Governments; to counteract them, if necessary, by all means in their power" (*The General Council of the First International. 1864-1866. Minutes*, p. 287). The P.S. becomes essential and at the same time especially successful at this stage of international development, when the balance of power has moved markedly in favour of socialism and the socialist countries are pursuing a relentless struggle for equitable co-operation and security of peoples.

**Political System of Socialism** is a social mechanism whereby the working people, led by the working class and its party, exercise their power in society. It encompasses and regulates all relations between classes, social strata, nations and nationalities, society, the collective and the individual as regards power and for working out and implementing a policy that dictates the direction, content, and objectives of the development of socialist society.

The P.S.S. is created by the Marxist-Leninist party in the course of the socialist revolution and is set up immediately after its triumph. Its core from the very inception is a dictatorship of the proletariat (q.v.). The evolution of the P.S.S. on the whole is characterised by consolidation and expansion of its socialist nature. Nevertheless, at the stage of the building of socialism and even once the foundations for it have been completed, it may incorporate socio-political institutions that are linked with the past socio-politically, ideologically, and economically. These institutions, elements, and relations are eliminated by the complete and final victory of socialism and the subsequent building of developed socialist society (q.v.). When the dictatorship of the proletariat develops into the power of the entire people, led by the working class, the P.S.S. becomes socially homogeneous and monolithic, and represents mature socialist social relations.

Political power under socialism is, above all, power of the people. The state of the whole people (q.v.) is the embodiment and representative of the people's sove-

reignty, the basic tool of social change. "All power in the USSR belongs to the people. The people exercise state power through Soviets of People's Deputies, which constitute the political foundation of the USSR" (*Constitution of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics*, 1977, Art. 2). The increasing role of the Soviets (q.v.) improves the structure and activities of the state administrative apparatus, and enhances its democratic principles.

It is a specific feature of the P.S.S. that, in exercising power, the working people rely heavily on non-state socio-political institutions and organisations. In the USSR, trade unions, the All-Union Lenin Young Communist League, co-operative and other social organisations participate, in compliance with their rules or statutes, in managing state and social affairs and in tackling political, economic, and socio-cultural matters. In many socialist countries there are broad socio-political unions and movements of the national front type (see Popular Front). The P.S.S. does not, however, include all social organisations and movements in the country, but only those for which political activities are a major function and preoccupation. In recent years, the significance of non-state socio-political institutions has noticeably increased in socialist countries. The relations between state bodies and social organisations and movements are those of co-operation, interaction, mutual assistance and support. In some of these countries, there are socio-state bodies created by the public and largely active as voluntary organisations but performing the duties of state bodies. As the social conditions become ripe, social organisations will take over certain functions that used to be performed by state bodies (see Local Community Organisations).

Work collectives, which are becoming increasingly active in production management, are an integral part of economic management and society as a whole (see Socialist Collective). In recent years, various forms have formed in socialist countries for involving the working people in the management of enterprises and their associations. These are standing production conferences, general meetings, economic

committees, etc. The experience of world socialism disproves the anarcho-sindicalist slogans of "economic democracy", for, out of the context of socialist democracy, democracy in the production sphere is incapable of running the economy both for the benefit of collectives and sectors, and all society.

In some socialist countries, the P.S.S. incorporates non-Communist political parties that represent the interests of certain non-proletarian strata of the population that have accepted the programme for building and developing socialism and leadership by the working class and its party. A multi-party system under socialism results from the traditions and specifics of historical development. Non-Communist parties are represented on state bodies and actively participate in the country's socio-political life (see *People's Democracy*).

The leading nucleus of the P.S.S. is the Communist Party. Under socialism, it is in power and is a ruling party. "The leading and guiding force of Soviet society and the nucleus of its political system, of all state organisations and public organisations, is the Communist Party of the Soviet Union. The CPSU exists for the people and serves the people" (*Constitution of the USSR*, Art. 6). Without a Communist Party as a guiding force of the P.S.S. the struggle for socialism cannot be a success. The Party co-ordinates the activities of all other P.S.S. institutions and ensures comprehensive management of social affairs. It sets the political course of the whole of society on achieving the main objectives of its development, both short- and long-term. It encourages independence and responsibility of all institutions of the P.S.S. As the significance of each of its socio-political institutions increases, the scope of their activities expands, their initiative and activity grow, it is especially important to enhance the co-ordination and guidance by the Party which ensure the consistency, harmony, and integrity of the P.S.S. The P.S.S. is an integral complex with unique features rather than a mechanical sum of different socio-political institutions.

The interrelationship and interdependence between P.S.S. institutions, its unity and integrality are provided by internal

links and relations. These are relations of political leadership between the Party, and state and social organisations; of co-operation and interaction between state bodies and social organisations, etc. They are determined by the norms and traditions of socio-political life. An important contribution to the evolution of the P.S.S. is made by the political culture of the people and consolidation of socialist democracy (see *Democracy, Socialist*).

The foundations of the P.S.S. are stable thanks to the uniformity of socialist society at all stages of its development and the scientific soundness of the Marxist-Leninist theory of social management. The P.S.S. is also dynamic, this being especially pronounced under developed socialism. It continuously improves to incorporate changes in the life of society and the achievements of Marxist-Leninist theory. Its development is a natural consequence of the increased scale and complexity of activities in social transformations and the ever more active and conscientious participation of the working people in the formulation and pursuance of internal and foreign policies.

The importance of the P.S.S. in the life of society is constantly growing. The course and rate of social change are becoming increasingly dependent on the performance, sophistication, and extent of the organising role of the system. The comprehensive development of the P.S.S. is a major line in the building of communism in the USSR; the socialist state structure improves, socialist democracy develops further; the legal basis of state and social life consolidates; and social organisations become more active. Evolution of the P.S.S. implies both the generalisation of new phenomena in social life and a resolute struggle against anti-socialist conceptions of society's political organisation.

**Popular Front**, a form in which the popular masses are united; it emerged in the capitalist countries on the initiative of Communists in the 1930s, as they fought against the economic crisis, the onslaught of fascism and the threat of another world war. The social foundation of P.F. consists of an amalgamation of all national democratic forces on the basis of an alliance between the working class (q. v.) and the middle sections (q. v.).

To form P. F., it was necessary to close the rift within the working-class movement and achieve unity of action among all workers' parties and organisations; the basic tactics were worked out at the first Comintern congresses, with Lenin playing a key role. The establishment of P.F. in the 1930s was an important stage in the evolution of the strategy and tactics of the communist movement, and a turn towards a broad alliance of all democratic and anti-monopolist forces of the nation and a profound awareness of the unbreakable link that existed between the struggle for democracy and socialism. The immediate aim of P.F. was to uphold peace and democracy in the struggle against fascism, to fight for an extension of democracy and ensure social progress, using the legal means provided by a bourgeois parliamentary republic.

P.F. was established on the initiative of the French Communist Party. As the economic crisis became worse and social antagonisms intensified, and particularly after the National-Socialists, the shock force of world fascism, came to power in Germany in 1933, French fascists also stepped up their activities. In this setting, the FCP formed a united front with the Socialist Party (in July 1934) and urged the establishment of a broad anti-fascist P.F. The resistance put up by the leaders of the petty-bourgeois parties and organisations was overcome under pressure from the masses, and more than 60 parties and public organisations joined P.F., among them the Radical Socialist Party, a left-bourgeois party of radicals that enjoyed the greatest support in the middle sections of the population. Over the same period, the Spanish Communist Party also made good progress in rallying democratic forces and establishing P.F. committees.

The Seventh Congress of the Comintern (July-August 1935) (see Communist International) summed up the experience gained by the French and Spanish Communists, delineated the strategic course for the new stage in the communist movement, and substantiated and comprehensively analysed the tactics of the united workers' front as the nucleus of the broad P.F. Being well aware that it was necessary to tie up

the struggle for democracy with the struggle for socialism, the Congress put forward the slogan of forming a P.F. government as a transitional form from the rule of monopolies to the dictatorship of the proletariat (q.v.).

After the Congress, the Communist parties scored new successes with their P.F. tactics. The P.F.-united parties, which came out with a programme for curbing the sway of the monopolies and taking certain measures to improve the position of the working people, won a victory in the parliamentary elections in France (April 1936). Power was taken over by the government relying on P.F. (1936-38). The reactionaries, however, managed to split P.F. owing to certain shortcomings in its organisation, such as the disbanding of local committees, non-participation of Communists in the government, etc. Nevertheless, its historical role was immense, since it became a means for mobilising the masses and laid the groundwork for pursuing a progressive policy within the framework of Republican institutions. In Spain, the P.F. movement assumed a more mass character and the P.F. government (1936-39) functioned during the national-revolutionary war against fascist insurgents supported by Italian and German interventionists; democratic transformations changed the nature of the state, turning it from a bourgeois-democratic republic into a people's republic of a new type, a form of the democratic dictatorship of the workers, peasants, and the petty and middle bourgeoisie. Though the national-revolutionary struggle of the Spanish people was defeated, the international working-class movement subsequently drew on its experience.

Attempts to establish P.F. were made in other countries, too. In the majority, however, the relevant efforts by Communists were resisted by leaders of socialist parties and reformist trade unions. The world-wide rift that widened between the working class and anti-fascist forces made it easier for the fascist aggressors to unleash World War II. During the war, the historical experience of P.F. was used in the formation of national and patriotic fronts, which combined the goals of national liberation,

general democratic development, and social progress; it was also used in the course of popular-democratic revolutions and the establishment of new forms of statehood (see People's Democracy). P.F. proved that to couple the struggle for democracy with that for socialism is a creative revolutionary line, having nothing in common with either social-reformism or left-dogmatic sectarianism, the former urging for only trifling, inconsequential changes within the framework of the existing system, and the latter rejecting a resolute and consistent day-to-day struggle, thus dooming the working class to inertia.

As the participants in the contemporary communist movement in the capitalist countries struggle to achieve unity of action of the working class and set up an anti-monopoly coalition, they also rely on the ideas put forward by the Comintern's Seventh Congress and the experience gained by P.F. during the 1930s.

**Populist Socialism**, a variety of petty-bourgeois Utopian socialism; in Russia, the ideology of peasant democracy.

Typical of P.S. is a mixture of the ideas of agrarian democracy with dreams of socialism and the hope of skipping capitalism. P.S. has its social source in the struggle of the popular masses, peasants for the most part, to get land and abolish feudal forms of exploitation. Russian Narodism was the first classical, though not the only, form of this type of democratic ideology. The national liberation movement of the 20th century confirmed Lenin's proposition that P.S. was international in nature and that there were features of Populism in the ideology of peasant democracy in the East (Sun Yat-senism, Gandhism, etc.); contemporary forms of Populist ideology, however, differ noticeably from Russian Narodism (see Theories of "National Socialism"). Today, Populist democracy has qualitatively different and much greater opportunities at its disposal. The correlation of social forces in the developing countries (q.v.) and internationally enables its progressive representatives (see Revolutionary Democracy) to implement radical social reforms and channel their countries' development towards socialism.

The ideology of P.S. emerged largely under the impact of the June 1848 events in France and the tragic fate of the Paris Commune. The political struggle in Russia that followed the Peasant Reform of 1861 was characterised by the same anti-democratic liberalism and a need for an independent movement of the masses, if they were to achieve liberation, as in the Western countries. Russian peasant democracy sided with socialism through the efforts of Alexander Herzen, Nikolai Ogaryov, Nikolai Chernyshevsky and the revolutionaries of the 1870s. Since, however, the objective situation in Russia in the latter half of the 19th century faced the liberation movement with bourgeois-democratic rather than socialist tasks and moved the peasantry (q. v.) to the foreground as the main revolutionary force, the subjectively socialist dreams and programmes of P.S. amounted, in fact, to a programme for peasant democracy. The fundamental principles of P.S. were formulated by Herzen after the 1848 Revolution; he came to the conclusion that peasant Russia did not at all have to go "through all phases of European development" and that it could take its own, "original" path, bypassing capitalism, owing to the communal land tenure system existing there. Chernyshevsky followed Herzen in elaborating the idea of Russia's non-capitalist development and its progress to socialism through the peasant commune; he tied this up with the abolition of autocracy and the handing over of all the land to the peasants without any compensation being paid.

After the Peasant Reform of 1861, P.S. became the prevailing trend in the Russian democratic movement and assumed new features as the theory of Narodism turned into a programme for immediate practical action for Russian non-gentry intellectuals ("Narodism of action").

There was no unity of opinion among Narodnik ideologists of the 1870s on the issue of forms and methods to be applied in revolutionary activities. The rebellious trend (Bakuninists) held the leading positions (see Anarchism). There was also a propagandist trend, whose ideologist P. L. Lavrov said that neither the intelligentsia nor the people were yet prepared for

a social revolution, so a long period of the systematic propaganda of socialist ideas was necessary. Some time later a third trend emerged, Blanquists. It was founded by P. N. Tkachev, who considered a political plot accomplished by a revolutionary party, followed by a popular uprising, to be "the most advisable means of political overturn". P.S. of the 1870s underrated the political revolution and the struggle for political rights and freedoms. Many of the Narodniks opposed "socialism" to "politics" and, falling prey to the anarchist views of M. A. Bakunin, regarded such a struggle as beneficial only to the bourgeoisie. Only at the end of the 1870s did some Narodniks recognise that the struggle for political freedoms was necessary, but only outside the framework of the class struggle and mainly in the form of individual acts of terrorism. The contradictory position of the small producer in bourgeois society was reflected in the two trends of P.S., the democratic and the liberal. The first was characterised by a Utopian view of the peasant revolution and a striving to raise the broad popular masses to the struggle against the survivals of serfdom; and the second, by adjusting the ideals of socialism to serve the interests of the "thrifty peasant", the fear of radical social changes, and a striving for a deal with the dominant classes. The two trends took turns in prevailing in P.S. at various stages in the liberation movement.

In the mid-1880s, a deep crisis set in P.S., due, first, to the failure of Narodnik socialist propaganda in the countryside and, second, to the socio-economic changes that had taken place in Russia, such as the development of capitalism, the growth of the proletariat and the intensification of its struggle. Some revolutionaries (Georgi Plekhanov et al.) broke off from P.S. and went over to Marxist positions. As a result, the liberal trend prevailed in P.S. (N. K. Mikhailovsky, V. P. Vorontsov et al.), characterised by renunciation of the struggle for a revolutionary overthrow of the existing system and the belief that it was possible to achieve socialism by implementing reforms (q. v.). Having lost the strong traits of old P.S., they upheld and intensified one of its major errors — underestimation of

class antagonisms within the peasantry. Faced with reality, some of the Narodniks recognised that capitalism was under way in Russia and that the peasantry was being stratified, but they accompanied it with all kinds of Utopian and reactionary projects about assistance to "popular production". Liberal Narodniks waged a bitter struggle against Marxism and suffered an ideological defeat from Lenin.

In the early 20th century, Narodnik views were upheld by the Socialist-Revolutionaries (SRs), who used socialist phrases as an ideological cover for their petty-bourgeois revolutionariness. The SR party vacillated between subordination to the hegemony of the liberals and a determined struggle against landowner property and the serf state. The petty-bourgeois, conciliatory essence of the SRs was manifested with particular force in 1917: after the overthrow of the tsarist monarchy they (together with the Mensheviks and Constitutional Democrats) entered the government and demonstrated, by their policy of alliance with the bourgeoisie, that they had completely broken off from socialism and democracy, turning into a party of rich kulaks. Historical experience has proved that it is only in a struggle against the bourgeoisie and in alliance with, and under the leadership of, the proletariat that the peasant masses can attain their demands.

"Post-Industrial Society", the Theory of, is a bourgeois apologetic theory that strives to build a "model" of a future society to counterbalance real socialism. Its proponents proceed from the conception of an "industrial society" that allegedly exists today. Using this concept, bourgeois ideologists try to prove that there is no qualitative difference between capitalism and socialism and declare that private capitalism belongs to history (see Convergence Theory). According to bourgeois futurologists, progress in science and technology will transform the "industrial society" into a new, unprecedented system of universal material welfare, no class struggle or revolution being necessary for that change. Merely a series of petty reforms that would not affect the class structure or social institutions of capitalist society may prove desirable. Society

of the future is variously referred to as "technological", "organisational", "mass", "consumer", "active", "leisure society", "ternary civilisation", etc. The most widespread names are "post-industrial" and "technetronic society". The American sociologists Kahn and Bruce-Briggs assert that mankind has entered a period in its history equally important with that of the transition from feudalism to capitalism. The transition from the "industrial" to the "post-industrial" society would have most vital consequences for the entire way of life of contemporary man. A "rich" and "replete" society would emerge that would be reminiscent of Hellenistic society, with the essential difference that all citizens, rather than an elite, would be rich and prosperous. Services rather than manufacturing would become the most important economic activity. Brzezinski, the US sociologist and political figure, asserts that "technetronic society" of the future is shaped in all its aspects by new technology, especially computers, electronics, and the mass media. The chief purpose of such a society would be consumption rather than production; power would be taken over from the "plutocratic upper crust" by intellectual technocrats, who would look after the universal welfare; citizens would make a real contribution to the making of vital decisions; education would become universal; most important changes in the field of culture occur, and liberty combine with equality (q. v.), etc. The theory has been most thoroughly expounded in the works of Bell, a US sociologist. According to him, the "post-industrial society" would be neither capitalist nor socialist; it would be a new kind of social life dissolving both the opposite systems. Its basic features would be: replacement of commodity production by a servicing economy in which most of the working population would be engaged in trade, finances, transportation, recreation, health, scientific research, and public administration; the dominant position of the "class" of professional and technical experts, namely, an increased share of scientists and engineers in the working population which is, in Bell's opinion, the core of the "post-industrial society"; the superiority of the

theoretical knowledge with the entire social structure being dependent on science; the creation of a new, "intellectual technology" built around computer technology (linear programming, systems analysis, information theory, decision theory, games theory, and modelling) which may become, towards the end of the 20th century, as important as mechanical technology used to be; finally, self-evolving technological process, a qualitatively new form of social evolution. Over the last 150 years, in Bell's view, the pivot of social evolution was the factory, but the key social institution of the coming fifty years will be research institutes and universities; while in the past ten decades the dominant figures were employers, businessmen, and industrial managers, today they will be economists, mathematicians, computer experts, and workers in research institutions. Bell believes that the "pluralistic democracy" of the "post-industrial society" will function without any ruling class. Power, he asserts, will be an embodiment of the "meritocracy" principle whereby the most knowledgeable, skilful, and talented people come to the fore. The government, universities, research institutes, leading companies, in a word, all social and cultural institutions of society should be "meritocratised".

The T.P.S. attaches absolute value to the real processes in current social evolution, such as the growing role of science and its development into a direct productive force and increase in the number of scientific and engineering personnel. What is "overlooked" is that "science at large" depends, in the capitalist countries, on military industrial complexes, on big business, the monopolies. To assume that the monopoly bourgeoisie would voluntarily surrender economic and political power to "political managers" who would heed the advice of scientists and engineers is utopian. Bell and other bourgeois futurologists ignore the decisive role of property in the system of social relations, take great pains to avoid mentioning who would own research institutes and universities, industrial laboratories and experimental installations in the "post-industrial society". On the whole, the T.P.S. defends the ideal of a re-

formed and modernised state-monopoly capitalism (q. v.) which tries to adapt to the patterns of the scientific and technological revolution (q. v.), and compiles a picture of a scientifically controlled, organised capitalist society evolving in a planned way, in a word, an "ideal" one. In the context of the increasingly acute crisis, the theory of Bell and other bourgeois futurologists, who orient on a smooth, crisis-free technological growth of capitalism, have come into flagrant conflict with the facts of life. For this reason, criticism of the theory by some bourgeois sociologists has increased and its influence has been steadily falling.

**Proletarian Internationalism** — (1) awareness of the common unity of interests of proletarians throughout the world; a feeling of responsibility on the part of each national detachment of the international communist movement for its activities in the world liberation movement; (2) a major principle in the relations between the national detachments of the working class, the Communist Parties in socialist countries, calling for solidarity and unity of action (see Socialist Internationalism); (3) theoretical generalisation of the liberation struggle of the proletariat and the experience of the international communist movement.

The objective roots of P.I. consist in the unity of the vital interests of the working class of all countries and nations. P.I. initially manifests itself in international solidarity of proletarians, engendered by living conditions and a common struggle against oppressors, and expressed in the collection of money, food, and clothing to help proletarians in other countries, in strikes and demonstrations in support of other national detachments of the working class. Gradually, international solidarity becomes a characteristic feature of all significant actions by the working class. It is embodied in the increasing international links between its national detachments such as exchange of experience, international associations of workers in various trades and national trade union centres, in organisations and conferences held to co-ordinate the activities of the Communist Parties of different countries. As the world

revolutionary liberation movement develops, the role and significance of P.I. increase.

The ideology of P.I. came into existence as a scientific generalisation of the practical experience of the struggle of the working class, as a theoretical expression of its deep-rooted interests. P.I. is a distinct feature of the intellectual portrait of conscious workers, though people from non-proletarian strata can be attracted by the ideology of the working class, by P.I.

The principle of P.I. was first put forward and scientifically formulated by Marx and Engels, who demonstrated its value for the struggle of the working class against the bourgeoisie and for socialism and proved the need to educate the working class in the spirit of P.I. Even at the time of Marx and Engels, P.I. gradually became a major principle of the organised movement of conscious workers in various countries. The motto of the *Manifesto of the Communist Party*, "Working men of all countries, unite!" was widely acclaimed by proletarians.

The ideology of P.I. was further advanced in the works of Lenin and other leaders of the international communist and working-class movement and in the documents of Marxist-Leninist parties. Lenin posed and resolved all problems in Marxist theory and policies in pursuance of the interests of the international liberation struggle of the proletariat, in the context of world capitalism and the class struggle in the entire world. He said: "We are opposed ... to national exclusiveness. We are internationalists" (V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 30, p. 293). The victorious socialist revolution in Russia imposed a major international duty on the working class, that had come to power there, and that of capitalist countries. Lenin said that the proletariat, once the victor, had to do its utmost to develop and support the revolution in all countries, while the proletariat of all the other countries had to spare no effort in supporting the working class that came to power, in defending it from its enemies.

Today, the value of P.I. for the working-class movement has significantly increased. Experience has called for implementation of the principle of P.I. in the



relations between socialist countries. P.I. has developed into socialist internationalism. Thanks to the economic integration of CMEA member-states (see Integration, Socialist) a higher phase in the international cohesion of socialist countries has been achieved. It has social, political, cultural, and ideological as well as economic aspects (similarity of social and state systems, ways of life, world outlooks, basic features of intellectual life, etc.). A major ingredient of P.I. is a strengthening of the ties between socialist countries and the working class of the capitalist countries and the world national liberation movement, a strengthening of the unity of all liberation forces. True P.I. rules out the hegemonism of any country or party or group of countries or parties. It presumes equal rights, fraternal union and co-ordination of the policies of all socialist countries, of all Marxist-Leninist parties. P.I. does not conflict with socialist patriotism. These features of the intellectual portrait of the citizens of socialist countries form a dialectical unity. Loyalty to the principle of P.I. signifies loyalty to true patriotic interests. Respect for the culture and language, rights and customs of other nations and nationalities, maintenance of the equality of nations and intolerance towards all manifestations of contempt for, or infringement on, the rights of other nations, friendship among peoples (q. v.) and fraternal co-operation with the working people of various countries, are the rules of conduct for the conscientious members of socialist society. P.I. also calls for a struggle against national seclusion and isolation and against cultivation of outdated habits.

The principles of P.I. do not triumph by themselves. A determined and consistent struggle by Marxist-Leninist parties is essential for their implementation. Survivals of nationalism (q.v.) may be revived within socialist countries, so the Communist and Workers' Parties educate their members and the entire people in the spirit of the ideas of P.I. Internationalist education is an important part of communist education (q.v.).

P.I. is an integral part of the proletarian revolutionary stand. A proletarian revolutionary must be a consistent supporter of the international rallying of all revolution-

ary forces, above all, Communist and Workers' Parties, unity of their views and actions. Any deviation from P.I. is betrayal of the cause of the working class. Such deviation is especially dangerous in any ruling parties in the socialist countries, because it subverts the major stronghold of the world revolutionary forces, the world socialist system (q. v.). P.I. is incompatible with any concessions to bourgeois or petty-bourgeois nationalism. Only unwavering, uncompromising struggle against nationalist ideology under the banner of P.I. helps rally the working people internationally. Loyalty to the principles of P.I. is a major criterion of the maturity of each Marxist-Leninist party, each Communist, of their policies and activities.

## Q

**Quality of Life Concepts**, concepts widespread in modern bourgeois philosophy, sociology, political science and political economy, about the socio-economic, political, cultural and ecological conditions under which the individual lives, including working and living conditions, the length and structure of leisure time, commodities and services consumed, health care, education, environment, etc., and about the ideal of the future, i. e. the mode of life people would like to have in the future.

The growing economic and social problems facing capitalism have done great damage to the bourgeois myth of unlimited opportunities for its crisis-free growth and affluence. Bourgeois ideologists, who predicted the rapid advent of a post-industrial, technetronic, etc. society, in which rapid development of science and technology would not only alleviate all social contradictions but also bring about an era of general welfare, of a new, higher quality of life, have found themselves in a difficult position. The US sociologist W. W. Rostow, the author of the theory of the stages of economic growth, declares that the idea of creating a "great society" in the USA has come to nothing and points out numerous social contradictions that interfere with the search for a new quality of life. In the

capitalist countries, bourgeois and reformist ideologists use the working people's striving to improve their social position and achieve a qualitatively new standard of life, reduce the struggle for a new quality of life to implementing reforms which, though they are of a certain importance, do not go beyond the bourgeois system. Reformist theorists (see Reformism) hold that, to improve the quality of life, "opportunities in life", "educational opportunities", the health service, the technical and social infrastructure, etc. must also be improved. They speak at length about protection of the environment and natural resources (see Natural Environment and Man), which are being exhausted in the course of the scientific and technological revolution (q.v.). The quality of life concept also recognises human dignity and the high value of the individual; it shares this point with "ethical socialism", which reduces the reconstruction of society to people's moral improvement. All these calls to humanise social life, including that to attain a new "social quality of life", are Utopian, for they are divorced from the actual struggle against the sway of the monopolies.

Bourgeois ideologists are seriously worried by capitalism's inability to keep control over the rates set by scientific and technological progress and the growth of the productive forces, which are bursting out of the framework of private-property production relations. The voices of those who criticise science and technology (anti-scientism, technophobia) are raised high, and calls are heard for scientific and technological progress to be curbed and a transition made from extended back to simple reproduction in order to play down the ecological crisis and expend unreplaceable raw and energy resources more frugally. Many bourgeois ideologists have joined the campaign advertising a new quality of life under the strict regime of economies necessitated by the energy crisis, soaring inflation and recession in production. Neo-Malthusians, who see the principal cause of the growing difficulties in the unrestrained population growth, in the developing countries in particular, are also taking part in this campaign. They

maintain that the smaller the number of people left on the Earth, the higher the quality of life will be. Yet all these concepts, which, in the final analysis, are called on to justify capitalism, do not reveal the genuine, fundamental causes of certain qualitative characteristics of society's life. Marxist literature treats the concept of the way of life as the mode of man's vital activity typical of a given society and class, this being ultimately determined by the given mode of production, the development level of the productive forces, and the nature of production relations as a manifestation of social activity in the spheres of work and leisure, family relations, ideology and culture. The concept of the way of life is very capacious, and has both quantitative and qualitative aspects, which are closely interrelated. The quantitative aspect is mainly expressed in a certain system of material welfare indices, while the qualitative aspect is primarily concerned with the degree of social freedom, the opportunities provided for the development of the individual, and the intellectual and cultural values. Socialism ensures a better quality of life for the individual, for it offers incomparably greater social freedom — freedom from economic exploitation, as well as from political, national, racial, and any other kind of oppression (see Socialist Way of Life; Individual Under Socialism). Communism, the transition to which is the main content of modern age, provides still greater opportunities for the development of each individual.

## R

Racism is a psychology, ideology and social practice based on anti-scientific and misanthropic ideas concerning the alleged physical and mental inequality of human races and the possibility and even necessity of the supremacy of the "higher" races over the "lower" ones. R. and nationalism (q.v.) are closely related. They nourish and reinforce each other. The ideologists of R. declare race and national distinctions to be eternal and base their anti-scientific conceptions on the alleged de-

cisive influence these conceptions have on the development of culture and society, and on the "legitimate nature" of national and racial oppression, imperialist expansion, and the colonisation of entire countries, even at the expense of annihilating the native population (genocide). R. limits the essence of man to his biological origins and determines the merits and shortcomings of people and whole nations in accordance with these biological origins and such external features as the shape of the face, head, nose or lips, and the colour of the skin, hair and eyes. Marx denounced this approach. He wrote: "...the essence of a 'particular personality' is not its beard, its blood, its abstract physical character, but its *social quality*..." (K. Marx, F. Engels, *Collected Works*, Vol. 3, p. 21).

R. first appeared in slave-owning societies and served to justify the "natural" supremacy of the slave-owners over their slaves and of the "blue-blooded" nobility over the "mob", i.e. the exploited masses, in the Middle Ages; beginning with the primitive accumulation of capital, this philosophy was used to justify the seizure and ruthless exploitation of colonies; later, genocide was perpetrated against the American Indians, the Blacks of Africa and many peoples of South Asia, Australia and Oceania. This state of affairs continues to the present day. Under capitalism, R. uses Social-Darwinism, a doctrine that applies Darwin's theory of natural selection and the struggle for survival to human society, Malthusianism, and eugenics (a doctrine concerning the hereditary health of man and improvement of the human race), in order to prove the superiority of the hereditary qualities of the ruling classes over the working people and of certain nations and races over others. Fascism (q. v.), Zionism, and racial segregation (for instance, apartheid in the Republic of South Africa) engendered by monopoly capital are most dangerous results of this co-operation between R. and such conceptions. These and other types of R. are used to substantiate various nationalistic conceptions, aimed at producing national enmity, conflict and destructive wars. Thus, the theory of the exclusiveness of the German race was the chief argument German fas-

cism used to justify its aggression. It launched World War II and tried to materialise its insane idea of establishing a new world order under one "ruling nation", Germany. Zionism proceeds from the false, reactionary conception of a "world Jewish nation" claiming that the Jews of the world are a special extraterritorial nation chosen by God, with exclusive rights to the Promised Land. Zionism and fascism share the same misanthropic ideology and the same racist and militaristic policy. It is noteworthy that fascism and Zionism use anti-semitism, another kind of R., to sustain their reactionary ideologies and policies, while pursuing opposite aims; fascism strove to consolidate all Germans against the Jews (and other nations, as well); and Zionism strives to unite all Jews in the mythical "world Jewish nation", opposing it to all non-Jews.

R. is anti-scientific and reactionary in all its manifestations. Anthropology has ascertained today that all human races are divisions of a single species: *Homo sapiens*. This conclusion does not run counter to either the monocentrist or the polycentrist hypotheses of racial genesis. Even if the latter is one day confirmed by anthropological studies and new archaeological discoveries, the question to be dealt with will be the appearance of man as a species, absolutely and qualitatively differing from animals, at different times and in different places. The numerous discoveries of pre-historic species of man indicate that all people had human hands and a human mentality capable of infinite sophistication, despite the differences in the time they appeared on earth or their geographic distribution. The assumption that every race has followed its own independent line of development is erroneous, while the assumption of polycentrism in racial genesis is correct, for there are no "pure" lines in racial formation. The main feature of racial genesis is its capacity for adaptation. The original racial trunks of mankind, first, should be examined not for their various types of pre-historic people, but in different geographical zones and, second, it should be noted that branches from these trunks do not run straight or parallel, but constantly intertwine. This view is support-

ed by the conception of population according to which a race is not merely a given group of individuals sharing a similar morphology, but a population distinguished by historically-formed relations between a human species and the environmental conditions in different geographical zones. The evolution of races was influenced by natural and socio-economic factors. Anthropologists and ethnographers note that racial characteristics change both as a result of intermittance (at times threefold, as, for instance, of Negroes, Indians and Europeans in Latin America), and under the influence of new environmental and social conditions.

A new tendency in human development has been noted in many countries: acceleration of growth and early puberty, both of which are explained by a complex social environment. Such variable processes as the broadening and rounding of the head, the gradual change of the skull index (the relation of the width of the head to its length), and the decreasing in the width of face, the massiveness of the skull and bones which has also been observed of late, are all attributed to acceleration.

The majority of contemporary racists, failing to find corroboration for their biological or physiological inventions pertaining to the bodily structure of different races, frequently resort to psychoracism. They try to find the "inferiority" of a race or nation in its "specific morality" or "specific psychological mould". However, science unmaskes the racists in this respect as well. There are no "pure" races today, as there are no peoples or nations of a single racial stock. Mankind is a complex interlacing of races, their offshoots and mixed racial groups and sub-groups. New combinations of anthropological characteristics appear constantly. Mankind's progress proves that cultural and mental development, language, and nationality do not depend on a person's race. The achievements of the Soviet people and the peoples of the other socialist countries, as well as those of the developing countries with a socialist orientation prove that the socio-economic and cultural progress of a nation is determined by its social system and not by the racial composition of its population. Pro-

gressive mankind is opposed to the shameful ideology and social practice of R. The UN General Assembly adopted a resolution concerning the need to completely liquidate racial discrimination and R. The peoples building the most just of societies, communism, which is devoid of all manifestations of R., are in the vanguard of this struggle.

**Reformism** is a political trend within the working-class movement; it denies the need for a class struggle, political revolution and the political power of the working class, professes class collaboration and tries, by a series of reforms effected on the basis of bourgeois legality, to transform capitalism into a society of "general welfare".

R. appeared in the last quarter of the 19th century, when a number of Social-Democratic leaders (chiefly E. Bernstein), influenced by the successes of the working-class movement and the development of bourgeois democracy (see Democracy, Bourgeois), demanded a revision of Marxism (see Revisionism). They contended that society could be improved by reforms, not by revolutionary change. In the late 19th and early 20th centuries, R. became an international trend and the chief menace within the working-class and Social-Democratic movements. Despite the persistent, though not always consistent, struggle launched by the revolutionary and left forces of the European Social-Democratic parties against Bernsteinianism, R. became increasingly influential, obtaining a mass, though not always pronounced following. The Russian Bolsheviks, led by Lenin, were the only party that continued to pursue a revolutionary and internationalist line in the working-class movement.

After the Great October Socialist Revolution (1917), the struggle of R. against Marxism ceased to be a struggle within the political parties of the working class and became one between two political forces within the working-class movement: Communists and Social-Democrats. "Democratic socialism" (q. v.) is the official doctrine of present-day R., set forth in the declaration of the Frankfurt Congress (1951) of the Socialist International (q. v.) and is opposed to scientific communism and Marx-

ism-Leninism (q. q. v.). Advocates of "democratic socialism" deny revolutionary methods for influencing social development. Social reform (see Reforms, Social) as the antithesis of revolution continues to dominate the reformist platform. Reformists usually view socialism as an abstract ethical ideal expressed in the principles of freedom, humanism, justice and equality. They picture the realisation of this ideal on the condition that private property will be preserved within the framework of bourgeois democracy. This is a typical reformist attempt to make compatible the incompatible: private ownership and social justice.

It cannot be denied that reformist political parties and reformist trade unions have played a definite role in the struggle to improve the living conditions of the working class, and that, in many countries, they are supported by working people. Communist Parties criticise the activities and ideology of R., but stand for cooperation with workers' organisations influenced by R. (see Unity of Action of the Working Class). Anti-communism (q. v.) is the main obstacle to united action by the revolutionary and reformist wings of the working-class movement. Some leaders and ideologists of the right wing of international R. refuse to understand that anti-communism isolates Social-Democracy (q. v.) from today's progressive forces and drives it into the orbit of the reactionary bourgeoisie. There is only one way out of the dead-end in which social-reformism is being led by such a policy: rejection of anti-communism and a union with all the forces fighting for democracy and socialism.

**Reforms, Social** are a form of social change carried out from above, by the ruling circles, in order to resolve certain socio-political contradictions (or to create the impression of resolving them).

There are several types of R.S.: reforms, first and foremost, implemented by the ruling exploiting classes and aimed at strengthening and consolidating their positions and adapting to the changing conditions. Reforms usually follow a bourgeois revolution (see Revolution, Bourgeois) and are its logical and natural continuation. Another group of reforms consists of the ones the ruling, exploiting classes are compelled

to introduce under the influence of the developing revolutionary movement of the working masses or of the victorious revolutions in other countries. These reforms signify a partial capitulation of the ruling circles, which are no longer able to govern in "the old way", but must make concessions in order to preserve their supremacy. These reforms may also be extremely superficial, a means of deceiving the masses and distracting them from the revolutionary struggle; they may be radical, making way for progress and, at times, being a means for achieving certain revolutionary goals. The classics of Marxism-Leninism termed the latter type of social change "a revolution from above"; they also noted that the consequences of such reforms might be extremely contradictory. Thus, referring to the reforms in Prussia and Austria in the 1860s, Lenin said that they were carried out "...*regardless of the interests of the workers, in a form most prejudicial to the workers, retaining the monarchy, the privileges of the nobility, arbitrary rule in the countryside, and a host of other survivals of medievalism*" (V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 17, p. 235). Lenin gave a similar appraisal of the Peasant Reform of 1861 in Russia. In the 20th century, the bourgeoisie seeks to accomplish revolutions "from above" in a more flexible way in order to avert popular revolutions.

True revolutionaries, who consider a revolution to be the most effective means for resolving class contradictions are far from denying, however, reforms in principle and rejecting their progressive nature. Lenin often pointed out that reforms as a type of evolution are only "a by-product of the revolutionary class struggle" (*Collected Works*, Vol. 33, p. 54). He consistently criticised the various kinds of reformists who, "directly or indirectly, restrict the aims and activities of the working class to the winning of reforms" (*Collected Works*, Vol. 19, p. 372), and also noted that "unlike the anarchists, the Marxists recognise struggle for reforms..." (*ibid.*) (see also Anarchism).

Under present-day conditions, the ruling circles of the bourgeois states are trying to preserve their political power not only

by increasing fascist military trends (sheer violence, anti-labour laws, etc.), but also by conducting various reforms (in the economy, state administration, etc.) that do not affect the nature of capitalism, but, by fulfilling certain needs of the working people, meet current scientific, technological and social requirements. The ruling circles have to make certain concessions to working people under the impact of the successes scored by the socialist countries and of the class struggle, and in order to prevent an upheaval that might endanger the bourgeois system. In those capitalist countries where Communist Parties are sufficiently strong, Marxists call for reforms to be used as a means for bringing gradual and increasing pressure to bear on capital and for creating favourable conditions in the struggle for socialism. The reforms carried out in a number of newly-liberated countries with a socialist orientation (see Non-capitalist Path of Development) by the state in the interests of the people can lead to important socio-economic changes which, in some cases, create conditions for a transition to socialism.

After achieving a socialist revolution, the proletarian state, i.e., power of the people, introduces a series of reforms to guarantee the changes that have been brought about by the establishment of the political power of the proletariat (see Dictatorship of the Proletariat). Owing to the absence of class antagonisms under socialism, the qualitative changes that take place in all spheres are gradually introduced by the socialist state with the active participation of the masses.

Revisionism is an ideological and political trend hostile to Marxism-Leninism. R. appears within the working-class and communist movement under the guise of "criticising", "reconsidering", "revising" or even "developing" Marxist theory. R. is a type of opportunism (q.v.).

R. is engendered by the economic and socio-political conditions of imperialism (q.v.). The privileged section of the working class, the so-called "labour aristocracy" and "labour bureaucracy" makes up its social basis. R. is furthered by liberal methods and the policy of reforms employed by the ruling bourgeois parties. The

struggle between bourgeois and communist ideologies plays an important part in its appearance. On the one hand, every new success of Marxism-Leninism compels its enemies to adopt the mask of being Marxists and socialists, and, on the other hand, the participants in the communist movement who vacillate and are theoretically unprepared are not strong enough to withstand the pressure of bourgeois ideology. They eventually descend to revisionist positions. R. also appears as a result of major changes in the working-class and communist movement, when some Communists fail to understand new events and tactical changes of Communist Parties correctly. Nationalism (q.v.) is another source of R.

R. was launched by Bernstein in the late 19th and early 20th centuries. He called for a revision of Marx's teachings. R., which appeared in Germany, soon took root in France, Belgium, Russia and other countries. Revisionists revised Marxist philosophy, political economy, and the theory of scientific communism. They claimed, for instance, that materialism had long since been "refuted" by events and proposed a return to the idealism of Kant. They suggested that the revolutionary conception of dialectical development be replaced by an evolutionary conception. The revisionists demanded that amendments be introduced into Marx's political economy and came up with the theory of the "stability" of small-scale production, contending that monopolies eliminate economic crises. They also declared that class contradictions had been obliterated or mitigated and that bourgeois democracy (see Democracy, Bourgeois) and universal suffrage eliminated the need for a class struggle. Revisionists advocated the gradual growth of capitalism into socialism. This, however, denied the socialist revolution (see Revolution, Socialist) and the dictatorship of the proletariat (q.v.). They encouraged the working-class movement to embrace reformism, contesting that "the movement is everything, the final goal — nothing". Lenin persistently refuted the views of Bernstein and his adherents, pointing out the danger of R. and revealing its social roots and essence. In this struggle, Lenin defended the revolutionary essence of Marxism, reinforcing

and strengthening the revolutionary wing of the working-class movement.

In the late 1950s there was a certain revival of R. among some members of Communist Parties. On the one hand, the proletariat of the advanced capitalist countries, influenced by the successes of the working-class movement and the achievements of the world socialist system, managed to obtain an increase in wages, improved social security, etc., while, on the other hand, the pressure of bourgeois ideology became stronger in connection with the counter-revolutionary revolt in Hungary and the criticism of Stalin's personality cult by the 20th Congress of the CPSU. The revisionists tried to divert the Communist Parties and discredit the gains of socialism and the communist movement. They proposed an exclusively peaceful road to socialism, interpreting it in a typically reformist manner, demanding freedom for factions and groups and even the dissolution of Marxist-Leninist parties. A new revival of R. took place in the late 1960s, when the anti-socialist forces in Czechoslovakia attempted to divert the country from building socialist society. O. Sik, R. Garaudy and E. Fischer, revisionists who occupied a Right-opportunist position, proposed their own "models of socialism", repudiating the general laws of socialist construction. They ranted against the necessity of a socialist revolution, the dictatorship of the proletariat and the principles of proletarian internationalism (q. v.) and descended to anti-Sovietism. They regarded the scientific and technological revolution as a fetish and rejected the guiding role of the working class in the revolutionary movement, substituting for it a "new historical bloc" in which intellectuals and students play the leading role. The Communist Parties rejected these revisionist onslaughts most decisively.

The reactionary forces of the world place great hopes on R. They count on splitting the international communist movement, undermining the class struggle of the proletariat in the capitalist states and hampering the building of new societies in the socialist countries. Revisionist elements advocating Eurocommunism (Ellenstein and others) once again became active in the international working-class and communist

movement, again in the mid-1970s, when the ideological struggle was intensified by international detente and the US ruling circles launched a propaganda campaign in "defence of human rights in socialist countries". Revisionists came out against revolutionary theory and practice. They called for the terms "Marxism-Leninism", "proletarian internationalism" and "dictatorship of the proletariat" to be excluded from all Party documents and attacked real socialism in the USSR and other socialist countries.

The systematic revivals of R. confirm the Marxist-Leninist conclusion that, as long as imperialism exists, bourgeois and petty-bourgeois ideology will infiltrate into the communist movement in various ways, including in the form of R. That is why Marxist-Leninist parties constantly maintain the purity of their ranks and revolutionary ideology. The 25th Congress of the CPSU called on these parties to uphold the principles of Marxism-Leninism and proletarian internationalism. The Congress also noted that any concessions to opportunism would ultimately "harm the Party".

**Revolution, Bourgeois** is a way of transition from the feudal to the capitalist socioeconomic formation, carried out by means of a bitter class struggle for political supremacy between the reactionary ruling clique and the people.

Radical changes in the mode of production that take place within the feudal society (a substantial growth of the productive forces, a strengthening of the bourgeoisie's economic power, etc.) are an objective prerequisite for a R.B. The bourgeoisie increases production in order to reap new profits and therefore is faced with the necessity of gaining political power, which it later uses as a means for reorganising the entire social system in pursuit of its own interests. The more or less broad masses of the exploited, who have an objective interest in the establishment of a new social order that would provide more freedom and independence, join the bourgeoisie in preparing and conducting a R.B. The scope of the social and political changes in the course of a R.B. is determined, to a considerable degree, by the alignment of the forces inside the anti-feudal coalition: the

grater the participation of the oppressed masses — who advance and try to achieve their own economic and political goals — the more consistent and radical the revolution. If the lower strata manage to exert a strong influence on the course of events, the revolution acquires a truly popular nature. Such a R.B. is called bourgeois-democratic. Owing to the lack of political development and organisation among the working masses, which reflects the objective immaturity of existing social relations, however, the bourgeoisie, gradually and usually by means of terrorism, forces the popular revolutionary struggle into historical bounds that correspond to the epoch in which the events are taking place. Such a setback is an inevitable feature of a R.B. Marx wrote: "Bourgeois revolutions ... storm swiftly from success to success, their dramatic effects outdo each other, men and things seem set in sparkling brilliants, ecstasy is the everyday spirit, but they are short-lived, soon they have attained their zenith, and a long crapulent depression seizes society before it learns soberly to assimilate the results of its storm-and-stress period." (K. Marx, F. Engels, *Collected Works*, Vol. 11, p. 106.)

As a transition to a new formation, the R.B. occurs at different times in different countries, where the necessary conditions and prerequisites emerge. It is usually carried out as a chain of revolutions (sometimes quite removed in time from each other) and social reforms (see Reforms, Social), each of which, irrespective of inevitable zigzags and deviations, means an accelerated advance towards capitalism.

The first, and most undeveloped bourgeois revolutions occurred in Western Europe in the 16th century. The Peasant War in Germany (1525) was similar in nature to a R.B., but for a number of reasons (the weakness of the bourgeoisie being the chief one) this broad anti-feudal movement of working people did not grow into a political struggle for state power. In the Netherlands, as a result of the resolute struggle against foreign intervention, the Spanish invaders were driven out and the first bourgeois republic was established.

The R.B. in England in the 17th century heralded the advent of capitalism.

The immaturity of the revolutionary process and the socio-economic and political demands couched in religious trappings were specific features of this revolution. Its social essence was the struggle against political absolutism; its roots lay among the strata of working people and peasants who were impoverished and drawn from their land by landlords throughout the country.

The great French Revolution of 1789-94 was a classical R.B. (in the forms of struggle, the scope of events and the degree of participation by working people). It was a result and expression of the powerful popular anti-exploiter movements. That is why the big bourgeoisie, which came to power, was eager to "clamp down" on the masses after the first onslaught of the revolution. This urge was expressed in the Declaration of the Rights of Man and Citizen (1789), which proclaimed equality for all people, but sanctified the right to private property. The dictatorship of the Jacobins, the most revolutionary representatives of the bourgeoisie, was the pinnacle of the revolution. At its zenith, the revolution exceeded the limits of a bourgeois change, but the poor strata of the population were dissatisfied; the revolution was objectively unable to do away with the division of society into rich and poor; its slogan was the inviolability of private property. The French Revolution of 1789-94, despite its bourgeois nature and limitations, had a true progressive influence on history. It led to the establishment of bourgeois property relations and political freedoms in the Western leading countries.

Under the impact of the bourgeois revolutions of the 17th-18th centuries the absolutist authorities in a number of states were obliged to introduce reforms which, despite their half-way nature, still provided some opportunities for these countries to develop along bourgeois lines (the 1861 Peasant Reform in Russia, and others). This deterred the pace of the revolutionary process, for the bourgeoisie prefers compromise and achieves power gradually rather than ally itself with the radical strata of society. The revolutions in Germany and Austria in 1848-49, in a number of other European states and in some Asian coun-



tries were all of a half-way nature, as a result of the treachery and weakness of the bourgeoisie. Under these conditions, and especially in connection with the beginning of the epoch "of transition from its [bourgeoisie's] progressive character towards reactionary and even ultra-reactionary finance capital" (V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 21, p. 146), the role of leader has been played more often and more definitely by the proletariat (see Hegemony of the Proletariat) than by the bourgeoisie. This role as leader of the emancipation movement was clearly revealed during the Russian bourgeois-democratic revolution of 1905-07.

The hegemony of the proletariat in a R. B. radically changes the orientation and course of the political struggle: the necessity of transferring state power to the bourgeoisie comes into question. A possibility emerges for the R.B. to develop into a socialist revolution (see Revolution, Socialist) through various intermediate forms, in particular, a dictatorship of the working class and the peasantry. An alliance of the proletariat and all working and exploited masses, above all the peasants, and efficient guidance of them are indispensable conditions for such a development. A R.B. turns into a socialist revolution in different ways in different countries. In Russia it unfolded in the course of a political struggle that lasted from February to October 1917. It was accomplished in other distinctive forms in the countries of Eastern Europe and Asia at the end of and after World War II (see Revolution, Popular-Democratic).

At present, the existence of world socialism (see World Socialist System) exerts a special impact on the development of a R.B. The national liberation movements in many countries, which are actually R.B. in content, owing to their anti-imperialist orientation and the support they receive from the forces of socialism, show a tendency gradually to outgrow the framework of bourgeois changes (see Non-capitalist Path of Development).

**Revolution, National-Liberation** is an integral part of the single world revolutionary process, a specific type of social-class struggle. It is an important political

and social change in the life of the peoples of the dependent countries, colonies and semi-colonies, signifying liberation through revolution, and the future liquidation of all forms of social oppression, including capitalist (see World Revolutionary Process). The replacement of capitalism by socialism, as Lenin wrote, constituted an entire historical epoch embracing "a whole series of democratic and revolutionary movements, including the national liberation movement, in the undeveloped, backward and oppressed nations" (V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 23, p. 60).

The Great October Socialist Revolution of 1917 deeply undermined imperialism and initiated the crisis of its colonial system. That was a powerful spur to the growth of the national liberation movement. During the struggle against German fascism (q. v.) and Japanese militarism the national liberation movements throughout the world were constantly swelling, because, in the minds of the oppressed nations, the war against German fascism was inseparable from the struggle against colonialism and for the right to sovereign, independent development. All these processes, brought about the disintegration of the colonial system during the post-war period (see Disintegration of the Colonial System).

A R.N.L., irrespective of all its many forms relating to the specific conditions in each country, and to the varying degrees of maturity of the objective and subjective prerequisites for a revolution, is accomplished on the basis of the general laws governing the multistaged and complex transition from capitalism to socialism.

The first stage is characterised by a widespread anti-imperialist, anti-feudal and democratic movement of the masses for gaining political independence, restructuring the state machine, driving out foreign monopolies, creating a national industry, abolishing feudal orders and carrying out radical agrarian reforms on the principle: "The land belongs to those who till it." All these tasks are of a general democratic nature and are supported by a broad anti-imperialist front.

The peasantry (q. v.), which suffers greatly under the yoke of foreign monopolies, local landowners and usurers, is the

biggest mass force behind the revolutionary movement in the colonies and semi-colonies. During the first stage of a R.N.L. the peasantry participates in the anti-imperialist and anti-feudal movement as a united class.

The working class (q. v.) is the most consistent force in a R.N.L. and the most resolute enemy of all forms of national and social oppression. In a number of countries it played an outstanding role in the mass movement for national liberation, resorting at times to specific proletarian methods of anti-imperialist struggle: strike and armed insurrection. The success of a R.N.L. depends chiefly on the stability of the alliance between workers and peasants (see Alliance of the Working Class and the Peasantry), which is the nucleus of a broad national front, embracing, as well, the middle sections (q. v.), especially the progressively-minded intelligentsia (q. v.), representatives of liberal professions, office workers, the youth movement, officers, small-scale producers and other categories of the non-proletarian working people. The progressive section of the national bourgeoisie can also be included in the national front. Although the role of the working class is growing constantly, in many countries it is not yet sufficiently prepared in a political, ideological and organisational sense for leading a R.N.L., because of its insignificant numbers, scatteredness throughout small enterprises, and because of its fluctuations, migration, mass illiteracy, etc. That is why in the newly-liberated states, representatives of the middle social strata, revolutionary democracy (q. v.) which is mainly supported by semi-proletarian or non-proletarian masses of the working people both in town and country, advance in the political arena.

A modern R.N.L. does not deal directly with socialist tasks during its initial stage. Its main aim is liberation from colonialism and democratic change. At the same time, it goes beyond an ordinary bourgeois-democratic revolution. Given the growing superiority of world socialism over imperialism and the intensification of the anti-monopoly struggle in the capitalist countries, the R.N.L., while achieving democratic upheaval, creates the necessary pre-

requisites for an extensive social revolution of the working masses against imperialist and feudal oppression, the reactionary bureaucracy (q. v.), the anti-popular elite and big capital. The development of the R.N.L. into a national-democratic or socialist revolution is one of the characteristic features of the present stage of the general crisis of capitalism. Capitalism as a social system is no longer able to provide accelerated socio-economic development in the newly liberated countries or give solutions to such problems as the breakdown of the backward colonial structure of economy, gaining economic independence and greater well-being and cultural level for the people. These tasks cannot be achieved without anti-capitalist measures, which is why a modern R.N.L. reveals anti-capitalist tendencies even at its initial stage. As it develops, it inevitably turns into a struggle for a socialist orientation (see Non-capitalist Path of Development).

The evolution of a R.N.L. is subject to the same laws that govern the development of a bourgeois-democratic revolution into a socialist one. It may include periods of ebb and flow. At the same time, with the competition between the two world social systems and the growing influence of the scientific and technological revolution on economic and social development, the newly-free countries' advance to socialism acquires a number of new specific features. It may start without the hegemony of the proletariat (q. v.) or the direct guidance by a proletarian party (since the world socialist system, q. v., assumes the functions of the international proletarian vanguard in relation to the liberation movement), under the leadership of middle strata, the non-proletarian strata of the working people, revolutionary democracy. This means that the revolutionary development in the newly-liberated states may temporarily outstrip social and class differentiation. The forms of this process may vary greatly (it may be peaceful, armed, etc.), depending on the objective and subjective conditions in the given country, but in any case a decisive class struggle is inevitable between the forces of progress, which have embarked on the road of socialism, and the forces of reaction, which strive to di-

rect the country along the capitalist road.

**Revolution, Popular-Democratic** is a revolution that took place in some European and Asian countries at the end of World War II and shortly afterwards. The R.P.D. began as an anti-imperialist, anti-feudal or democratic revolution which while fulfilling the liberation and democratic tasks developed into a socialist revolution (see *Revolution, Socialist*) (this was favoured by certain international factors).

The R.P.D. took place under different historical conditions from those of the October Revolution of 1917 in Russia. Imperialism ceased to be an all-embracing system. The big bourgeoisie and landowners in Central and South-East Europe openly allied themselves with the nazis and permitted them to occupy their countries (either through direct aggression or in the guise of military treaties). Some nations were threatened with complete annihilation. The peoples of the occupied countries, inspired by the victories of the Soviet people in the Great Patriotic War, waged a struggle against the invaders and their allies: the big bourgeoisie and landowners who, in pursuit of their narrow class and mercenary interests, committed high treason. A broad coalition of class forces was created in the course of this struggle. It included, apart from the working class (q. v.) — the most consistent anti-imperialist force — the entire peasantry (q. v.), including its upper section, the urban petty bourgeoisie and some strata of the middle bourgeoisie that had been victimised by the aggressors.

These alliances formed blocs of parties and organisations to represent their various social strata. The patriotic forces they headed, composed mostly of the working class and the peasantry, took advantage of the favourable conditions created by the Soviet Army when it entered the territories of these countries and of the forthcoming crash of German fascism and Japanese militarism — the shock troops of world imperialism — and swept the anti-popular dictatorships out of existence.

The R.P.D. went through two stages. The first (in Europe, from the autumn of 1944 to 1947-48) dealt with the anti-fascist, anti-feudal, national and democratic

tasks. Fascism and its local agents were liquidated; a withdrawal from the Hitlerite axis and a transition to the anti-fascist bloc took place; war criminals were prosecuted; their property, as well as the property seized by nazi invaders, was nationalised; urgent measures were taken within the framework of an agrarian reform; mediaeval and feudal survivals were wiped out, and people's democratic states truly representing the people, were established. In the process of carrying out these measures, the alliance of the working class and the peasantry was consolidated and the influence of the Marxist-Leninist parties, the most faithful fighters against reaction, grew rapidly. The national bourgeoisie, which gave some support to the working class and the peasantry in carrying out the democratic tasks, nevertheless, pursued primarily its own class interests. It intended, with help from the West, and especially from US monopolies, to gradually direct the course of events along the usual bourgeois-democratic channels. That is why the revolutionary forces came up against increasing resistance from the bourgeoisie in the course of fulfilling their democratic and anti-imperialist tasks. The interests of the masses extended beyond the usual democratic changes and were directed at developing the democratic revolution into a socialist one.

During the second stage of the R.P.D., a re-grouping of class forces takes place. A struggle for nationalisation (q. v.) of the means of production, the final liquidation of the influence of foreign monopolies and the further democratisation of the state system is conducted during this period. In this struggle, the positions of the working class and of the forces grouped around it are consolidated; the influence of Marxist-Leninist parties becomes the dominant one, and various bourgeois strata are isolated. As a result, the working class proceeds to a socialist revolution and establishes its dictatorship in a popular-democratic form (see Dictatorship of the Proletariat).

The revolutions unfolded when the Soviet Union was using its increased might and influence to protect the People's Democracies from imperialist meddling, which

could cause civil war (q. v.) and intervention; it assisted them in overcoming their economic difficulties, on which the internal and foreign reactionary forces were playing in order to aggravate the situation and attack the democratic gains of the peoples.

The R.P.D. had specific features in each given country, determined by the economic level, the survivals of feudalism, the correlation of class forces, etc. These specific features were most distinct in the revolutions of the former Asian colonies or semi-colonies of major imperialist powers. In spite of all differences, the most typical features of R.P.D. in the majority of these countries are a broad social base and a gradual transition, mainly by peaceful means, from the democratic to the socialist stage.

**Revolution, Socialist** is the most radical social revolution in the history of class society, a mode of transition from the capitalist socio-economic formation to the communist formation. It is a gigantic leap in social development that includes a host of decisive, qualitative changes in the socio-economic and political structure of society: seizure of power by the working class (q. v.) in alliance with the other strata of working people; the breakdown of the old state machine and the establishment of a state of the dictatorship of the proletariat (q. v.); the introduction of public ownership of the means of production, the creation of a system of social regulation of economic and social processes; the abolition of all forms of exploitation and oppression; the elimination of class antagonisms; the development of socialist democracy (q. v.), and a cultural revolution (q. v.).

A R.S., unlike all the other types of social revolution that brought about a change in the forms of exploitation, but did not affect its foundation — private ownership of the means of production — puts an end to the exploiting regime. Marx regarded R.S. as the dividing line at the end of the mankind's lengthy pre-history so full of internal social cataclysms, and the beginning of consciously made history.

The conflict between the social character of production and the capitalist system of relations of ownership forms the

economic basis of a R.S. The rapid growth of the productive forces and their socialisation establishes close ties between the various enterprises, industries and economic systems of different countries. They do not, however, fit into the framework of capitalist relations of production. All attempts on the part of the monopoly bourgeoisie to encourage socialisation of production — with the aid of such palliative measures as state-monopoly regulation (see State-monopoly Capitalism) in order to avoid a transition to socialism are doomed to failure. The bourgeoisie's temporary tactical advantages only aggravate the chief contradiction of the capitalist mode of production. There is but one way to resolve this contradiction: a R.S., which is logically prepared by the development of capitalism itself.

The contradiction between the social nature of production and the private capitalist form of appropriation is a source of antagonism between labour and capital, the proletariat and the bourgeoisie. The working class, the chief productive force under capitalism, is integrally linked to large-scale socialised production. It plays a decisive role in creating material wealth and, at the same time, is deprived of the right to control its use. Owing to its position in the system of the relations of production, the working class acquires the role of the main motive force behind a socialist revolution. Working and living conditions under capitalism engender in the working class such qualities as staunchness, courage, organisation, solidarity, endurance, etc., i. e., the revolutionary qualities necessary for the successful liquidation of capitalism and for the building of a socialist society (see Historic Mission of the Proletariat). Monopoly capital exerts increasing pressure on the classes and social groups that are carried over from former socio-political formations: the peasantry (q. v.), artisans and craftsmen, as well as the new social groups [office workers (q. v.), engineers and technicians, small-scale employers]. Many of them occupy positions close to the working class and are thus able to become its allies in the struggle for a socialist reshaping of society. The alliance of the working class with the non-proleta-

rian strata of the working people is an imperative condition for the victory of a R.S. (see Alliance of the Working Class and Peasantry). The revolutionary political forces are formed on the basis of mass political experience. It educates them and rallies them around the working class. The revolutionary party of the working class cultivates a socialist consciousness in the working-class movement, educates, trains and organises the masses, works out its strategy and tactics (q. v.) for the class struggle and exercises political leadership of the revolutionary movement and plays a major role in preparing the subjective factor for a R.S.

The first act of a R.S. includes the seizure of political power by the working class and its allies, the destruction of the old state machine — an instrument of the political supremacy of the bourgeoisie — and the establishment of proletarian dictatorship. Experience has shown that this cannot be accomplished until the objective socio-political situation has stirred up the masses and brought about a crisis of the old power. A revolutionary situation (q. v.) is necessary if the working class is to seize power. The forms in which the take-over of power is accomplished may differ, depending on the specific situation. Lenin wrote: "Marx did not commit himself, or the future leaders of the socialist revolution, to matters of form, to ways and means of bringing about the revolution. He understood perfectly well that a vast number of new problems would arise, that the whole situation would change in the course of the revolution, and that the situation would change *radically* and *often* in the course of the revolution" (V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 27, p. 343).

The working class can win power by both peaceful and non-peaceful means. An armed seizure of power is necessary and justified when the ruling classes prevent the working class from drawing the majority of the population to the side of socialism peacefully and crush by means of arms the legal activities of the revolutionary vanguard. At the same time, an armed uprising (q. v.) may only hope for success under conditions of a national crisis, when it has the support and sympathy of the ma-

jority of the population. The working class may come to power by peaceful means when, owing to the unfavourable correlation of forces, the ruling classes cannot, or do not dare to resort to violence (q. v.) against the masses.

The transition from capitalism to socialism is a world-wide process stemming from the contradictions of imperialism (q. v.) as a world system. On the other hand, as a result of the contradictory, uneven development of capitalism, these contradictions increase at varying rates in different countries. The focal points of contradictions appear and, when supplemented by a certain degree of maturity of the revolution's socio-political forces, they become imperialism's weak points. This triggers a R.S. at different times and in different countries. It first triumphed in one separate country, Russia, which in the early 20th century was the weakest link in the imperialist system.

The Great October Socialist Revolution of 1917 was the first victorious proletarian revolution. It ushered in an era of transition from capitalism to socialism, and undermined the stability and vitality of the capitalist system. Capitalism entered a stage of general crisis embracing all its spheres: economic, political and ideological (see General Crisis of Capitalism). The world was split in two. The very existence of a new social order undermined the pillars of the exploiting society and revolutionised the working masses of all countries.

The international significance of the Great October Socialist Revolution lies not only in its direct influence on all countries, but also in the fact that it was the first to reveal the general laws of a R.S., which were later to take place in other countries, though in other, specific forms. The working class of Russia provided the world proletariat with the first political experience of achieving a R.S. Lenin said: "This experience will never be forgotten... It has gone down in history as socialism's gain and on it the future world revolution will erect its socialist edifice" (*Collected Works*, Vol. 27, p. 413). After World War II, another group of countries broke away from the imperialist system (see Revolution, Popular-Democratic). The Cuban Revolution was the first to triumph on the American

Continent.

As a world process the R.S. is both complex and drawn out; the actions of various revolutionary movements, diverse in content and character, are interwoven in this revolution. Some of them are not actually socialist but, by undermining the foundations of world imperialism, they objectively fit into the general revolutionary process (see World Revolutionary Process). Each link in this process has its own specific tasks, difficulties and problems; at the same time, the logic of historical development consolidates all revolutionary forces around the class that is at the centre of the present epoch and assumes the main burden of the struggle against imperialism and reaction — the international working class and its primary achievement, real socialism (see World Socialist System).

The problems of a R.S. are the focus of the ideological struggle by Marxist-Leninist parties against right- and "left"-wing opportunism (q. v.). Right-wing opportunism, on the pretext of the appearance of new conditions denies the key theoretical principles of the R.S. and glosses over the profound nature of the revolutionary leap from capitalism to socialism. "Left"-wing opportunism betrays the creative character of Marxist-Leninist theory with respect to R.S. and ignores the radical changes that are taking place today: the new conditions and possibilities of a transition to socialism. The Marxist-Leninist theory of R.S. is the chief means for unmasking anti-Marxist and anti-Leninist conceptions. Its further development helps to bring it into conformity with the practice of the world revolutionary movement. Today, the theory of R.S. is elaborated by the collective efforts of Marxist-Leninist parties and is expressed in the documents of the international meetings of Communist and Workers' Parties, in the Programme of the CPSU, the documents of the CPSU congresses and in the decisions of the congresses of the fraternal parties.

**Revolutionary Adventurism** is the theoretical and practical activities of political groups or individual historical figures, the result of ignoring the objective laws behind the people's emancipation, and the maturity

and readiness of the masses (plus the subjective desire for a revolution). As a rule, R.A. is characterised by vague programmes, a lack of theoretical principles, and voluntarism on practice. The R.A. of sincerely misled politicians must be distinguished from the connivance of various political dealers and rogues.

The historical source of R.A. is to be found in the uneven development of both the subjective and the objective factors in the revolutionary process. R. A. tries to impose on the masses forms of life and activity for which they are as yet unprepared and which they are unable to achieve. That is why revolutionary adventurists regard revolution as a combination of direct action by individuals or groups and not as a complex historical process embracing the activities of the masses and governed by definite laws.

The founders of scientific communism were opposed to declaring any spontaneous action by the masses against the ruling regimes as adventuristic, even when this action was doomed to failure; at the same time, they fought persistently against the various manifestations of R.A., whose advocates professed a blind faith in the power of immediate action or challenge, thus going against the true interests and needs of the revolutionary movement. Lenin described R.A. as "...a trend which is very revolutionary in words, but not in the least revolutionary as far as its real views and contacts with the revolutionary class are concerned" (V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 6, p. 286).

The predominance of revolutionary phrase-mongering is a standard feature of R.A. Lenin wrote: "Revolutionary phrase-making, more often than not, is a disease from which revolutionary parties suffer at times when they constitute, directly or indirectly, a combination, alliance or intermingling of proletarian and petty-bourgeois elements, and when the course of revolutionary events is marked by big, rapid zigzags. By revolutionary phrase-making we mean the repetition of revolutionary slogans irrespective of objective circumstances at a given turn in events, in the given state of affairs obtaining at the time. The slogans are superb, alluring, intoxicating,

but there are no grounds for them; such is the nature of the revolutionary phrase" (V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 27, p. 19). Ungrounded revolutionary phrasemongering is especially dangerous during the periods of setbacks, the ebb-tide of the revolutionary waves, when the masses are unprepared to militant political actions.

Typically, R.A. ignores the significance of theoretical work and propaganda activities of the Party.

R.A. is detrimental to the liberation movement. For instance, in 1866 in Russia, D. V. Karakozov, a subjectively honest revolutionary, attempted to assassinate Alexander II. This act of terrorism was actually an act of revolutionary adventurism which brought about a period of political reaction in the country. The revolutionary-adventuristic activities of S. G. Nechaev and his adherents was, in fact, provocative. The overcoming of R.A. in the Russian liberation movement was a difficult process.

A resolute struggle against R.A. was conducted within the international proletarian political movement. Marx and Engels often rejected exaggeration of the revolutionary maturity of the West European proletariat put forth by the petty-bourgeois parties and groups. Marx and Engels followed a straight course directed at combatting illusions of an easy socialist revolution (sharp polemics with the Willich-Schapper group, which advocated the idea of "exporting revolution" in the 1840s; denunciation of Bakunin's adventuristic actions in Spain and France in the early 1870s, etc.). Lenin criticised and denounced the various trends of R.A. in the Russian and international working-class movement (the adventuristic policy of Socialist-Revolutionaries on the eve of and during the revolution of 1905-07; the activities of the Otzovists and Ultimatists who proposed that legal forms of struggle be given up during the period of reaction; Trotsky's leftist adventuristic ideas; the mistakes of the so-called Left Communists during the period of the Brest Peace Treaty; the "left-wing" communism as an infantile disorder in the 1920s, etc.). In all cases concerning adventuristic groups Lenin noted the lack of a scientifically grounded

theory, a programme, and roots among the masses, and stressed that "...politics without the masses are adventurist politics..." (V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 20, p. 256).

Today R.A. is opposed to the policy of the Marxist-Leninist parties. It provokes ruling regimes to suppress the organised democratic movement. This, in turn, leads to a weakening of the revolutionary forces and undermines the prestige of Marxist theory, these adventuristic actions being carried out in its name.

Marxist-Leninist parties remember Lenin's behest "...to warn the people against the adventurism of high-sounding but absurd promises ... while at the same time ... propose changes that are really practicable at the present moment and really necessary for strengthening the cause of the revolution" (V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 8, p. 567), and are opposed to adventuristic illusions and actions. They strive to increasingly consolidate their ties with the masses.

**Revolutionary Democracy** is (1) politically active strata of the urban petty-bourgeoisie, the peasantry (q.v.) and the radical intelligentsia (q.v.), which support the anti-feudal, anti-capitalist and anti-imperialist struggle; (2) parties, organisations and groups expressing their interests. Lenin wrote: "If we do not employ the phrase 'revolutionary democracy' as a stereotyped ceremonial phrase, as a conventional epithet, but *reflect* on its meaning, we find that to be a democrat means reckoning in reality with the interests of the majority of the people and not the minority, and that to be a revolutionary means destroying everything harmful and obsolete in the most resolute and ruthless manner" (V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 25, p. 337). A revolutionary-democratic position is determined by its relation to the tasks of social development, put forth at certain stages of the liberation movement. For the sake of and in the interests of the majority of the people and, especially, the oppressed classes, R.D. proclaims war against all that is obsolete and reactionary. The social consequences of this may, however, differ greatly and depend on the historical epoch, the cultural and

technical level, the balance of power in the world and within the country, etc. In late 18th-century France, the actions of Jacobin revolutionary democracy with respect to the obsolete feudal system cleared the way for a bourgeois state, made the bourgeoisie the dominant class in the nation, and made it possible to change over to free peasant land-ownership. Capitalism, a social order that matured economically under those conditions, was thus consolidated.

In the present historical epoch, the significance of which is expressed in the transition from capitalism to socialism, a revolutionary-democratic solution of urgent historical problems is achieved in the struggle against the monopoly bourgeoisie and imperialism and signifies either a direct step towards socialism or socialist-oriented social development. Lenin wrote: "We cannot be revolutionary democrats in the twentieth century and in a capitalist country *if we fear* to advance towards socialism" (V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 25, p. 360).

Experience has proved that, in developed capitalist countries, a petty-bourgeois democracy, even when it comes to power, does not venture to break with the monopoly bourgeoisie or to deprive it of its privileges. In this case, only the proletariat, fighting actively against the supremacy of capital and capable of leading the masses, expresses the interests of the majority of the nation. In the developing countries (q. v.), for a number of reasons (a multi-structural economy, the great proportion of small-scale production in the economy, the widespread pre-capitalist forms of wage labour, etc.), the R.D., supported by the peasant masses, the petty-bourgeoisie, the semi-proletarian urban strata and radical intelligentsia, usually assumes the leading role in all progressive movements. The logic of the struggle against imperialism and traditional social institutions that hamper the further development of society compels the R.D., despite all its petty-bourgeois prejudices and wavering, to seek an alliance with the socialist countries (see *World Socialist System*). The development of industry and progress in agricultural production resulting from the latest achieve-

ments of science and technology urge the R.D. to carry out radical social and economic reforms: a radical agrarian reform, nationalisation (q. v.) of the chief branches of the economy, centralised state ownership of the bulk of the surplus product of society, regulated consumption, etc. These revolutionary measures are, as a rule, clearly anti-capitalist. That is why R.D. is attracted by the ideology of socialism in its various forms and versions. The successful advance towards progressive social changes (see Non-capitalist Path of Development) depends greatly on correct political leadership in a given country and, in particular, on the attitude of S.D. to the working class (q. v.). Under present-day conditions R.D. must strengthen its alliance with the working class of its country and with the socialist states, for the working class and the Communist Parties form the nucleus of any anti-capitalist democracy. At present the historical fate of a democratic or revolutionary movement is determined by the struggle and the balance of power between capitalism and socialism on a world-wide scale.

**Revolutionary Situation** is an objective political situation preceding a revolution. It is a criterion of the imminence of the objective conditions under which power can be seized by an advanced class.

The following features are characteristic of a R.S. First, a "crisis of the upper strata", i. e. the inability of the ruling classes to preserve their supremacy in an immutable form. This crisis causes a breach through which the discontent and indignation of the oppressed classes breaks. Lenin stressed that, for a revolution to occur, it is usually not enough for the lower strata to refuse to live as they did; it is also necessary for the upper strata to be unable to go on as they did. Second, an increased social antagonism between the ruling class and the oppressed masses. This can be ascribed to the denial of social rights to the working masses under capitalism and to the deteriorating economic conditions of the working class and other strata of the population. It can also be brought about by the mass democratic movement directed against the power and



arbitrary sway of monopoly capital and the struggle against a foreign yoke and for national liberation. Third, the considerable growth of the political activity of the oppressed classes which, during such periods shake off the passivity and sluggishness typical of periods of "calm" development, and become literally possessed by politics.

The conflict between the productive forces and relations of production is the underlying basis for the appearance of a R.S. The time of its appearance, and the form and rate of its development depend, however, on a complex system of socio-political and class relations, the condition of the state machine, the power of the revolutionary class and its links with the other classes, the political experience of the past, etc.

The ideologists of anti-communism (q. v.) try to prove that a R.S. does not stem from the internal contradictions of the capitalist system, but is imported from without and is engendered by wars. Wars do, indeed, exert an impact on the contradictions of capitalism and, thereby, on the evolution of a R.S., but wars are not an external factor in relation to capitalism: they are brought about by this system and become, in turn, the catalyst of its contradictions. Capitalism engenders contradictions and conflicts, which undermine its foundations and create the socio-economic prerequisites for the appearance of a R.S.

Once created, the R.S. goes through a number of stages from the almost imperceptible signs of a rising mass excitement to a national crisis evolving into revolution. The higher the stage of the R.S., the greater the role in its further development of the subjective factor, the ability and readiness of the advanced classes to engage in a political struggle against the powers that be. At the time of a national crisis, the subjective factor assumes the decisive role. If, owing to certain circumstances, the progressive classes are not yet prepared for a revolution, the development of the R.S. comes to a standstill, and the mass revolutionary excitement dies down.

To pinpoint the signs of the emerging R.S. is of great significance for the Marxist-Leninist parties in working out their

strategy and tactics (see Political Strategy and Tactics). The revolutionary classes cannot be oriented towards seizing power if there are no signs of a political crisis. Attempts to overthrow the government of the ruling classes, in spite of the objective socio-political situation, end in failure. Another mistake is a temporising policy under conditions of a rapidly developing R.S. The art of political leadership lies in the ability to take prompt notice of the first important changes in the objective situation and, by actively mobilising the masses, further the evolution of the political crisis.

Nowadays, owing to the strengthening of the forces of socialism and democracy, opportunities for attacking the chief positions of monopoly capital on the part of the working class even in the absence of a R.S. have appeared in a number of capitalist states. The working class of these countries has organised a broad alliance of democratic forces to take part in the struggle to limit the power of the monopolies, to drive them gradually back from the key positions they hold without waiting for a R.S., but by using, to this end, every critical situation that arises in any sphere of social life. At the same time, the activities of the progressive forces, in confronting monopoly rule, become an important factor aggravating existing socio-political contradictions. Naturally, no matter how gradually the monopolies are divested of their power, a qualitative turning point is inevitable: the transfer of all power to the working class and its allies. This can only be achieved in a situation of national upsurge capable of crushing the resistance put up by the ruling class and of paralysing its attempts at armed violence. No matter how specific the approach and transition to a revolution (see Revolution, Socialist) in a given country, the turning-point at which all power is seized by the revolutionary class is always preceded by a national crisis. Lenin defined this truth as a basic law of revolution.

**Right of Nations to Self-Determination** is the sovereign right of any nation to free separation from other national or multinational communities and to formation of its own state; the right of a nation to de-

termine its fate in accordance with its freely expressed wishes and aspirations. It is the right to make free use of its natural wealth and to free socio-economic and cultural development.

The right of nations to self-determination was defended by Marx and Engels. They said that a people who enslaves another people forges its own fetters. "A people who oppresses others cannot emancipate itself. The power which is needed to oppress other peoples will, in the end, turn against that people itself" (K. Marx, F. Engels, *Werke*, Bd. 18, S. 527).

The national question became especially acute in multinational exploiter states in the epoch of imperialism (q. v.), when it grew into a question of liberation of colonies and became the national-colonial question. The working class then took the lead in putting forward the general democratic principle of self-determination of nations and, in 1896, the London Congress of the Second International (q. v.) declared this right in a resolution. True, the leaders of the Second International soon downgraded it to "cultural-national autonomy" within the framework of existing states and became social chauvinists when the First World War broke out.

On Lenin's insistence, the principle of self-determination of nations was included in the Programme of the Russian Social-Democratic Labour Party in 1903. Both right- and "left"-wing opportunists opposed the principle. The former referred to the progressive nature of having large multinational states and called for them to be maintained under any circumstances and thus, in fact, failed to support national liberation movements. The latter asserted that under capitalism this right was unattainable and under socialism unnecessary.

The working people know and appreciate the advantages of large states under capitalism but, if the national oppression and friction between nations made it unbearable for different nations to live together, the people work for separate states. Under socialism, national oppression is out of the question, while the interests of the working people call for a close rallying of all nations, rather than separation. For some time, however, national alienation and mis-

trust remain as legacy of the capitalist past. The right to self-determination must be granted to all nations when the proletariat comes to power in order to overcome this mistrust, especially that felt by formerly oppressed nations of formerly oppressing nations. Consequently, Marxist-Leninists call for recognition of the right of nations to self-determination in the interests of the class struggle: under capitalism, particularly at the stage of the bourgeois-democratic revolution for ensuring equality of nations and democratisation of the country and, following the triumph of a socialist revolution, as a demand for socialist democracy (see Democracy, Socialist), as a prerequisite for an equitable solution of the national question.

In the period when capitalism establishes itself, self-determination of nations is anti-feudal and, in the period of transition from capitalism to socialism, is anti-capitalist. In the latter case, the socio-class content of self-determination is the fight against internal class enemies, who can no longer represent the interests of the nation as well as against national oppression from outside.

By putting forward the demand for self-determination, Communists are not calling for a separation of nations. Lenin wrote: "We demand freedom of self-determination, *i. e.*, independence, *i. e.*, freedom of secession for the oppressed nations, not because we have dreamt of splitting up the country economically, or of the ideal of small states, but, on the contrary, because we want large states and the closer unity and even fusion of nations, only on a truly democratic, truly internationalist basis, which is *inconceivable* without the freedom to secede" (V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 21, pp. 413-14). Recognition of the right of nations to self-determination does not imply that any nation should cede at any time. This demand should facilitate the cause of peace, democracy and socialism and, ultimately, unification rather than separation of nations. So Marxist-Leninists want nations to use this right for the benefit of working people. The right to national self-determination is not, contrary to anti-communist allegations, replaced by the right to self-determination for the working class

or working people alone. Although, as Lenin wrote, any democratic demand (including self-determination) for conscious workers is subordinate to the interests of socialism and the class struggle of the proletariat, "to reject the self-determination of nations and insert the self-determination of the working people would be absolutely wrong, because this manner of settling the question does not reckon with the difficulties, with the zigzag course taken by differentiation within nations" (V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 29, p. 173). Even when the will of the nation was expressed by the ruling classes, the granting of the right to self-determination, going as far as state separation, was regarded by Lenin as a political gain for the sake of future co-operation between peoples. When the Finnish Sejm adopted the declaration on Finland's independence on December 6, 1917, the Council of People's Commissars of Soviet Russia recognised Finland as a sovereign state in the same month, in sharp contrast to the annexing policies of tsarism and the bourgeois Provisional Government of Russia that came to power in February 1917 and was toppled by the proletarian revolution in October 1917. Today, imperialism has to make concessions but, in essence, opposes the right of nations to self-determination and strives to distort it and subvert the sovereignty of newly-liberated countries by imposing colonial oppression on them in modern guise.

The right of nations to self-determination is a constitutional norm in the USSR and a principle of the foreign policy of the Soviet state which came into existence "...as a result of the free self-determination of nations and the voluntary association of equal Soviet Socialist Republics" (*Constitution of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics*, Art. 70).

This right underlies the solution of the national question in other socialist countries that build their relations with all states and nations on the basis of national independence and sovereignty, of socialist internationalism (q. v.).

## S

**Scientific and Technological Revolution**, a qualitative leap in the structure and dynamics of the evolution of the productive forces, a radical transformation of the technological foundations of material production. S.T.R. is a complicated social phenomenon and a prolonged historical process characterised by a number of features, such as a global, international nature, since it embraces the whole world; a universal nature, since it influences all spheres of social life; and a comprehensive nature, since the revolutionary changes taking place in science and technology, which were formerly in no way connected, are organically fused and interacting within it. The priority development of science and its transformation into a direct productive force, and of production itself into a systematic technological application of modern science, are central in S.T.R. Scientific knowledge is being materialised and embodied in the material elements of the productive forces (in hardware and technology) and in the corresponding organisational forms of production; they are being increasingly drawn upon by workers in production as they fulfil their labour functions; science is becoming the theoretical basis of all production processes. S.T.R. entails a qualitative change in the technological base of production, implements and means of labour, methods and objects of processing; it exerts an influence on the organisation of labour, production and management; brings in its wake a substantial change in the place and role of man in the production process and the workers' functions; and essentially spells a transition from extensive to intensive development of production.

S.T.R. develops differently in the capitalist and the socialist countries in terms of its objectives, forms, stimuli, motive forces and main tendencies, causing basically opposite social consequences.

Under capitalism, it changes the existing trade, professional and qualification structure of the working population, leading to a numerical growth of the army of wage labour; it further polarises the classes and increases the proportion of mental workers,

while deepening the gap between mental and physical labour (q. v.), intensifying exploitation (q. v.), increasing part-time employment and causing a rise in unemployment. S.T.R. accelerates the capitalist integration of production, the bankruptcy of small enterprises and formation of large monopolies. As a result, the intrinsic instability of capitalism is enhanced, its inherent contradictions are aggravated, and the emergence of the prerequisites for a socialist revolution (see Revolution, Socialist) is promoted.

Under socialism, on the other hand, there are a number of conditions making it possible for S.T.R. to unfold successfully, such as ownership of the means of production by the whole people, the absence of antagonistic contradictions, scientific management of society (q. v.), planned development of the economy, broad participation by the working masses in the management of production, satisfaction of the people's growing material and cultural needs, full employment and systematic pursuance of a concerted state technological policy, etc. Hence the importance and historical significance of combining the achievements of S.T.R. and the advantages of the socialist economic system and enhancing the forms, inherent in socialism, of linking science with production. Comprehensive and accelerated scientific and technical progress is indispensable for building communism, since the only possible material base for it is high technology produced by drawing on the latest scientific discoveries (see Material and Technical Base of Communism). While radically changing society's productive forces, S.T.R. influences production relations. In a socialist society, scientific and technical progress is accompanied by, and closely interacts with, social progress; the social consequences of S.T.R., its impact upon the social structure and the working people's intellectual development are extremely diverse. It works profound changes in the social division of labour and its conditions, nature and structure, and makes higher demands on the workers' qualifications. The share of mental labour in the sum-total of labour expended increases both in the economy as a whole and in individual en-

terprises, which causes progressive shifts in the social structure of production collectives. The proportion of workers engaged in hazardous manual labour is shrinking and the sphere of application of unqualified manual work narrows, while the numbers and share of highly-skilled labour grow. Trades rooted in outdated technology are dying away, with new, sophisticated types of labour taking their place. The application in production of the labour of engineers and technicians is increasing, and the introduction of automation (q. v.) makes it necessary to employ workers thus released in other sectors of production, which often involves them in being retrained. The content of labour becomes richer, all its major types assume creative features, thus making it a primary vital need of every man and woman; this is also promoted by the change in the proportion and structure of embodied and live labour, and of working and free time (q. v.). S.T.R. serves as a powerful factor in overcoming the fundamental distinctions between mental and manual labour, and between town and country (see Overcoming Differences Between Town and Country), inasmuch as it accelerates the transformation of agricultural work into a variety of industrial labour; thus it serves as a lever for creating a socially homogeneous society and establishes the conditions needed for the complete, harmonious development of the working people, who are its principal productive force (see Harmonious Development of the Individual). As was stated at the 25th CPSU Congress: "The scientific and technical revolution acquires a true orientation consistent with the interests of man and society only under socialism. In turn, the end objectives of the social revolution, the building of a communist society, can only be attained on the basis of accelerated scientific and technical progress" (*Documents and Resolutions, XXVth Congress of the CPSU*, pp. 56-57). S.T.R. sets up the conditions within the world socialist system (q. v.) for evening out the economic, scientific and technical development of the socialist countries, while socialist economic integration helps promote the process (see Integration, Socialist). S.T.R. does not unfold in the socialist

countries on its own, spontaneously, but in a planned way, and the active, conscientious activities of the working masses led by the Party and the state play a major role here.

In spite of their outward variety, bourgeois concepts regarding S.T.R. are aimed at creating a theoretical alternative to communism and substantiating the futility of social revolution, whose objectives they allege can be attained through S.T.R. They reduce social to technical progress, and in fact play up to the theories of "convergence", "post-industrial society" and "technetronic era".

**Scientific Communism**, (a) in a broad sense, Marxism-Leninism (q. v.) as a whole, as a comprehensive (philosophical, economic and socio-political) substantiation of the inevitable collapse of capitalism and the triumph of communism, a scientific expression of the radical interests and objectives involved in the struggle of the working class (q. v.); (b) in a narrow sense, one of the three component parts of Marxism-Leninism, providing the most direct and pertinent socio-political substantiation of the working-class's historical mission and the means and ways of carrying it out; the science dealing with general socio-political laws and patterns, ways, forms and methods of changing society along the communist lines (see *Historic Mission of the Proletariat*). S. C. is the science about the proletarian class struggle and the socialist revolution (see *Revolution, Socialist*), about the socio-political laws behind the building of socialism (q. v.) and communism (q. v.), and about the world revolutionary process (q. v.) as a whole.

S. C., as a component part of Marxism-Leninism, is organically linked with Marxist-Leninist philosophy and political economy and rests directly on their methodological, general-theoretical foundation. As Engels put it, the emergence of S. C. became possible solely owing to the two greatest discoveries made by Marxism: the materialist interpretation of history and the theory of surplus value. S. C., in turn, is the logically consistent continuation, development and consummation of Marxist-Leninist philosophical and economic teaching, which expresses most directly its goals and ideals, and its practical and po-

litical effectiveness. As distinct from historical materialism, S. C. does not study the general-sociological laws operating under all or many socio-economic systems, but only the specific laws inherent in the communist system, its emergence, consolidation and development. As distinct from political economy, S. C. concentrates on the political, rather than the economic, relationships characteristic of socialism and communism, and on the patterns inherent in their development. It is the general theory of the building of socialism and communism, providing the methodological base for particular social sciences and empirical social studies of isolated phenomena or comparatively narrow spheres of the life of society.

As a science in its own right, S. C. has its own laws and categories, reflecting the basic aspects of the revolutionary transformation of capitalist into communist society. Among these laws there is that of the carrying out of the socialist revolution and establishment of a dictatorship of the proletariat (q. v.) in the transition period from capitalism to socialism (see *General Laws and Specifics of the Transition to Socialism*). These laws are neither general-sociological nor economic by nature, but precisely socio-political ones, expressing the essence of S. C. in the most graphical way. They are general laws, since they operate in all countries where society's life is being reconstructed along the communist lines and since they deal with society as a whole, and not just with one of its spheres. Still, the laws and categories of S. C. are more particular and concrete than those of historical materialism.

S. C. is a science about the guidance of the proletarian class struggle and about the major principles according to which the policies of the working class, Marxist-Leninist parties and the socialist countries are implemented. Compared with the other component parts of Marxism-Leninism, S. C. is the most closely and immediately connected with the practical revolutionary struggle and scientific guidance of the building of socialism and communism. It expresses the laws of development and essential features of the active, operative aspect of humanity's historical transition from capitalism to communism. This objective, na-

tural historical process is regarded by S.C. in close connection with the operation of the subjective factor, and primarily from the angle of fulfilment of the world-historical mission of the proletariat, led by the Communist Party. The founders of S.C. characterised it as the theoretical expression of the proletarian movement, as its theory and programme.

As distinct from historical sciences, which analyse the specific course of social development, S.C. expresses it in a theoretically generalised form.

In conformity with the main stages of the struggle for society's socialist and communist transformation, S.C. generalises the practice of: (a) the international working-class and the entire liberation movement in the setting of the proletariat's struggle for power; (b) the building of socialism in the transition period from capitalism to socialism; and (c) the evolution of socialist society and its gradual development into communist society.

S.C. sees it as its goal to discover and substantiate: the historical need for, and inevitability of, the collapse of capitalism and the triumph of communism; the prerequisites and conditions needed for a revolutionary transformation of capitalist into socialist society; the world-historical mission of the working class and the place and role of the non-proletarian masses led by it in revolutionary struggle; the laws, ways and forms of the proletarian class struggle and the socialist revolution; the essence and role of the national liberation and other democratic movements in the world revolutionary process; the historical need for, the role of, and principles for establishing the dictatorship of the proletariat; the laws, ways and means of building socialism; the main principles and features of the socialist and communist organisation of society, the laws and ways of promoting socialism and building communism; the chief lines in and principles for the activities of Communist and workers' parties at all stages of the struggle to attain communism (see *Political Strategy and Tactics*). After the triumph of the socialist revolution in the USSR and the emergence of the world socialist system (q. v.), the issues involved in building socialism, which became, for the

first time ever, those of immediate practice rather than only of theory, assumed especially great importance alongside the problems of the world revolutionary and liberation movement. Now that developed socialist society (q. v.) has become a reality and the building of communism is under way in the USSR, while mature socialism is being successfully attained in many other socialist countries, the study of the problems pertaining to the scientific guidance of the evolution of a socialist society and its change into a communist society is becoming particularly important. The range of problems with which S.C. is concerned and its coverage as a subject are steadily expanding as revolutionary practice is enriched.

S.C. is internationalist in its very essence. It studies the experience gained in any one country from the angle of the general and specific features characterising the way the dictatorship of the proletariat is established and socialism and communism are built. S.C. therefore rules that the national-specific features of each particular country manifested in its concrete approaches to the general, international task of a communist transformation of society should be taken into account. The great variety of the concrete-historical experience, specific forms and methods, and tactical moves in the activities of Communist parties places special emphasis on the importance of S.C. as an internationalist doctrine. All attempts at artificially dismembering the theory of S.C. into isolated national or regional "varieties" inevitably amount to a revision of its main principles and are detrimental to the working-class cause.

S.C. is a living, creative doctrine, incompatible with dogmatism and stagnation in thinking. The dynamics of life, the practice of the revolutionary struggle and the building of socialism and communism are crucial for creatively developing the theory of S.C. The Communist parties are making their contributions to the common treasury of S.C., in the first place on the basis of the scientific generalisation of their immediate practical experience. At the same time, they are actively participating in the joint elaboration of general theoretical

problems, thus enriching the theory of S.C. with new fundamental theses and conclusions. S.C. is a profoundly partisan science, directly expressing the socialist interests and communist ideals of the working class. As these interests and ideals largely coincide with the requirements of social progress, the partisanship of S.C. makes for its genuinely scientific, objective approach to problems involved in the world revolutionary process, and the building of socialism and communism. To develop S.C. in a creative way implies an active onslaught against the ideology of anti-communism (q. v.), against the ideas of revisionism (q. v.), which is in fact contemporary reformism (q. v.).

**Scientific Management of Society**, a conscious, purposeful impact made by the people upon the social system as a whole or upon its separate spheres or elements (social life, branches of the economy, production associations, enterprises, etc.), which ensures that they function in an optimal way and evolve on the basis of the objective laws and trends inherent in socialism.

Management has been an intrinsic feature of society at all stages of its development; this is explained by the social nature of labour, and the need for communication in its process and for the exchange of its products. Production activities are impossible in society without organisation, order, division of labour, and each person is being allotted a certain place and certain functions in that process. Management serves as a means for establishing and maintaining this order and organisation. People's social behaviour, in general, not only their production activities, also calls for regulation. The history of society has seen two types of regulatory influence exerted on the social system as a whole: spontaneous and conscious. In the former case, regulation is implemented as a result of the collision, intertwining, and intercrossing of different forces, which are often opposed to one another, and of single, accidental acts. It comes out as a general trend in the blind play of chance, occurs automatically by force of its own nature, and does not imply human intervention. Such, for example, is the market, which is the principal

regulator of the capitalist economy. The element of the market, the accidental pattern of numerous acts of sale and purchase on the capitalist market, which tends to be governed by the law of value, is the chief force behind production under capitalism, a means for regulating the social division of labour, establishing certain proportions in the economy, which are constantly being disrupted and emerging anew, also in a spontaneous way. The fact that, under the impact of the specific features of modern production and the scientific and technological revolution (q. v.), the state-monopoly programming and regulation of the economy has been widely applied in the capitalist world today, does not change the crux of the matter, for they are only able to weaken and slow down the regulatory impact of the market element, not eliminate it.

The conscious forms of management, connected with the purposeful activities of the people and implemented through special social institutions, have existed at all stages of society's development. The limits of man's conscious impact on the social system and its various elements, and its content and goals depend on the nature of society and its economic and socio-political system. As society developed, conscious forms of management underwent radical changes, from management by means of empirical traditions and customs acquired through immediate experience and passed from generation to generation in primitive society, to scientific management of society under socialism.

As public ownership of the means of production dominates in socialist society, market relations, anarchy and competition — those spontaneous regulators of production and the entire life of society — cease to operate. They are replaced by the conscious, purpose-oriented activities of a system of governmental and non-governmental institutions and organisations, functioning as the chief regulator of production and socio-political and cultural life. This system is led by the Communist Party and is the subject of society's management. Scientific management is not just its conscious form; it is a form of management under which its subject relies on scientifically-cognised laws of social de-

velopment and takes into account their specific manifestations in a given situation. To manage society in a scientific way, is to reveal progressive trends in its evolution and channel it in accordance with these trends, bringing to light, in due time, and solving contradictions in social development and ensuring the structural and functional unity of the social system. The principal goal facing the scientific management of society is to make the people's subjective activities conform to the objective laws and use the objectively existing conditions to the greatest advantage. The general aim of managing socialist society is to ensure optimal utilisation of socialism's economic laws, and organise and mobilise labour, material and financial resources in order to build communism. The major principles of socialist management are as follows: a systematic, comprehensive approach, which requires a close interconnection in the tackling of economic, socio-political, and ideological problems; unity of economic and political guidance; democratic centralism (q. v.), which makes it possible to couple planning and centralism in management with broad democracy and the use of initiative displayed by the masses and advanced collectives; partisanship; a scientific, objective and concrete approach, which requires that objective patterns and their specific manifestations under particular historical conditions be taken into account; determination of the main link, the basic task among the aggregate, the solution of which would provide the key to the entire complex of managerial problems; the territorial and departmental principle, which calls for a combination of an administrative-and-territorial approach with consideration of the interests of different branches, etc. In accordance with these principles, managers have to satisfy the following chief demands: be competent and business-like, combine a scientific with an administrative approach, ensure consistency and good organisation, etc. Managerial activities are of a genuinely democratic nature under socialism: ever new mass contingents of the working people will become involved in the management of production and all social affairs as society advances towards communism.

Managerial problems concern not only a narrow circle of managers and experts, but all Party, Soviet and economic organisations, and all collectives of the working people. The guidance of the people and collectives is the most important component of the social system. To guide the people in socialist society means to organise their economic life, labour, and public activities in an optimal way, and to educate them in the spirit of communist ideals. As science and technology score new successes within the framework of the scientific and technological revolution, the importance of management also increases, becoming more sophisticated and changing in quality, with man's creative activities coming to the fore. The problem of organically combining the achievements of the unfolding scientific and technological revolution with the advantages of socialism, the transition of the national economy to a new stage of development, at which quality will take priority, and the intensification of social production require a rationalisation of managerial activities. The principal directions for improving them in developed socialist society (q. v.) are promotion of the theory and practice of planning, improvement of the organisational structure of administration, enhancement of the impact of economic stimuli, their correct interlink with moral ones, and broad application of computer technology, automatic systems and up-to-date scientific methods, as well as the involvement of an ever growing number of working people in managerial activities.

**Second International (1889-1914)**, an international association of the socialist parties that continued, under new historical conditions, the cause initiated by the First International — that of the workers' international unity. During World War I it sustained an ideological and political defeat as a result of its opportunist leaders' defence of the imperialist policies of their bourgeois governments.

As Marxism won ever new positions in the working-class movement in Austria, Denmark, Germany, France, the Netherlands, Spain, Switzerland, the USA, Belgium, Britain, Norway, Sweden, etc., Social-Democratic parties (see Social-Democracy) began to emerge in the last third



of the 19th century. The exchange of opinions among these parties and the elaboration of a joint position on the current issues of the class struggle became a priority; as a result, S.I. was created.

The First Congress of the S.I. was held in Paris on 14 July 1889. It became clear that, while the First International had to fight mainly against ultra-left trends, S.I. was largely opposed by right-wing elements. In fact, S.I. had no leading centre, printed organ, rules or programme, and that weakened the international solidarity of the working class. At the Second Congress (Brussels, August 1891) a heated debate arose with right-wing elements on the question of labour protection and labour legislation. The Congress rejected the reformist draft resolution and emphasised that the workers should exercise their political rights in their struggle to attain economic liberation and do away with the class domination of the bourgeoisie. Social-Democracy's political tactics was discussed at the S.I. Third Congress (Zurich, August 1893); the resolution stressed that the workers should take part in the struggle to democratise the electoral system and participate in legislative and executive bodies; it also renounced compromises on matters of principle. Sharp conflicts with the anarchists occurred at both the Third and the Fourth (London, August 1896) congresses, particularly on the issue of political struggle.

In the late 19th and early 20th centuries, the Social-Democratic parties came under the growing influence of reformism, which tried to disguise its actual surrender of class positions with Marxist phraseology. The S.I. Fifth Congress (Paris, September 1900) showed that the influence of the right wing in the working-class movement had increased. Millerand's entry into the French reactionary government was a central issue at the Congress. The behaviour of Millerand, who was a member of the Party of Independent Social-Democrats, was not censured; that was the first major defeat sustained by the revolutionary wing of S.I.

At the Sixth Congress (Amsterdam, August 1904) Bernstein's revisionism (q. v.) was discussed. The revisionists suf-

fered a serious blow at the Congress and had to retreat, but the victory won by the Marxists was shortlived; a new danger, centrism, characterised by a conciliatory attitude towards opportunism (q. v.), began to take shape. At the same time, the early 20th century saw the emergence of the Leninist Party of Bolsheviks (see Communist Party of the Soviet Union), which was radically opposed to both opportunists and reconciliators, as well as the left elements in the international working-class movement. They studied and disseminated the experience gained during the 1905-07 revolution in Russia, that of the proletariat's armed struggle. In August 1907, the S.I. Seventh Congress, in which Lenin took part, was convened in Stuttgart. The issue of the impending war was in the limelight; after heated debates, the Congress adopted August Bebel's resolution, with substantial amendments by Lenin, which emphasised that the crisis caused by the war should be used to overthrow capitalism. Following the Stuttgart Congress, the International Socialist Bureau, with Lenin as a member, stepped up its activities. On its initiative, the proletariat launched several international actions in defence of peace; it rendered assistance to the proletariat of various countries in staging major actions, and demanded that decisions adopted by international socialist congresses be carried out. At the same time, under the influence of right-wing elements, most of its members showed leniency towards opportunists, who continued to consolidate their positions within the Social-Democratic movement. At the S.I. Eighth Congress (Copenhagen, August-September 1910), fierce skirmishes flared up between the opportunists and the revolutionary wing, with the Bolsheviks led by Lenin making up the latter's core. In view of the growing threat of war, the Congress again passed an anti-war resolution and renounced the reactionary policies pursued by the imperialist powers. It also adopted a resolution on co-operatives, which was correct on the whole, but contained some elements of the reformist idea of "growing into socialism" by expanding co-operation. The Ninth (Extraordinary) Congress (Basle, November 1912) was specially convened to fight against the

threat of war. It unanimously adopted an anti-war Manifesto, urging that a revolutionary struggle be organised against the threat of imperialist war. But this single-mindedness was only superficial, as subsequent events showed. Neither the right wing, nor the centrists wanted war, of course, yet they wanted a revolution even less. On the eve of World War I, S.I. consisted of 27 Social-Democratic parties from 22 countries; they were backed up by the votes of about 12 million people. Approximately 9 million were members of co-operatives led by Social-Democrats. This gigantic force was paralysed, however, as the majority in the most influential parties of S.I. consisted of centrists and right-wing elements; when faced with the real ordeal caused by World War I, S.I. collapsed. The Social-Democratic faction in the German Reichstag voted in favour of war credits, and the socialist parties of Austria, Belgium and France followed suit. They approved of the policies pursued by "their own governments", and that spelled the end of S.I., which collapsed owing to its leaders' change over to social-patriotic, chauvinist positions. The only party that retained its revolutionary positions was the Party of Bolsheviks in Russia.

The fact that S.I. failed, does not cancel out the positive aspect of its activities. It added to the scope of the organised working-class movement and wrested quite a few concessions from the capitalists, thus improving the workers' living and working conditions. "The Second International did its share of useful preparatory work in preliminarily organising the proletarian masses during the long, 'peaceful' period of the most brutal capitalist slavery and most rapid capitalist progress in the last third of the nineteenth and the beginning of the twentieth centuries" (V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 21, p. 40).

**Social Activity**, an aggregate manifestation of the vital activity of various social groups and, under certain conditions, of society as a whole, in satisfying their demands and realising their interests, as well as an aggregate manifestation of the vital activity of an individual, which expresses his or her striving to serve corresponding public interests. Subjectively

S.A. is viewed as realisation of socially meaningful behavioural motives and, objectively, as fulfilment of certain actions required by a given social group.

In the broad sense, S.A. embraces manifestations of socially useful human activity in all spheres of society's life — economic, social, political and intellectual. Each of these spheres is filled with a specific kind of human activity: working, cultural, political. In the narrow sense, the term S.A. is used when speaking of "social and labour activity" or "social and political activity" in a social sphere. S.A. in the narrow sense means those manifestations of socially useful activity in a class antagonistic society that are directed at consolidating the unity and cohesion, mutual assistance and solidarity of a specific social group (class, etc.), protection of its members' common interests, a strengthening of the group's position in society (and weakening of that of opposing groups). Given the absence of antagonistic classes, S.A. finds its highest expression in strengthening the unity and solidarity of all society, of the ties between its communities, as well as between society and the individual.

There is a substantial difference between S.A. in a class antagonistic, particularly capitalist, society and in a socialist society, devoid of class antagonisms. Under capitalism, as under any social order based on private property and exploitation of man by man, the range of socially useful activities is rather narrow. This is primarily because the most important human activity — labour activity — cannot be an expression of S.A. there, since the labour of a wage worker is private in nature and carried out for the benefit of the exploiter. The S.A. of the masses comes down almost exclusively, therefore, to activity in the social and political spheres, where it has — and this is the second most important characteristic — quite different and even opposing goals and contents in different classes, strata and groups. The S.A. of the ruling classes and strata is aimed at preserving and strengthening their privileged position, their power and existing conditions. It manifests itself in the activity of various political and public organisations — from those of the most reactiona-

ry, fascist-type to liberal, philanthropic ones. The S.A. of the working class and other oppressed classes and strata is aimed at securing their rights and interests; in its most developed form it is directed against the existing social order. At the same time, the ruling bourgeoisie resorts to all sorts of lures and means of political and ideological influence to hinder the development of the S.A. of the oppressed masses or channels it in the wrong directions. The all-round development of the S.A. of ever broader masses of the working people, based on the awareness of their real interests and goals and leading to their emancipation, which thereby orients this S.A. in the right direction, is a major task for the forces struggling against capitalism and for democracy and socialism, above all for the Communist Parties in capitalist and developing countries.

Socialism creates conditions for the full development of S.A.: in labour (for labour acquires a directly socialised character and provides the main field for the best social qualities in man to be realised), in cultural creativity (for all intellectual values are placed at the service of the working masses), and in all other spheres of the life of society. Since the working people become the sole, wholly legitimate masters of society, they enjoy broad opportunities for developing their S.A.—participation in various activities of political and public organisations created by them, in the management of production and in all other affairs of society and the state. Under socialism, there are no classes or other social groups with mutually opposed interests. The S.A. of all people acquires essentially the same direction, one that coincides with the interests of society as a whole. In other words, this S.A. can only be directed towards strengthening and improving socialism as a social order. S.A. aimed against socialism (for example, by certain renegades), cannot be rated as social at all, because it does not express the interests of any social group and is legitimately curbed by society, as is any other manifestation of antisocial activity.

The Communist Parties of the socialist countries actively promote the S.A. of the masses, this being a source of strength in

socialist society. This is achieved by means of both educational work and certain organisational and economic levers which help arouse people's interest in social tasks and affairs and a desire to give society their time and talents. The S.A. of the working people contributes to the success of building socialism and communism and to the progressive development of the human personality for nothing elevates a person so much as an active stand in life.

**Social Consumption Funds** are the fraction of the national income in the socialist countries that is used to satisfy the material and intellectual needs of the members of society and is distributed chiefly, over and above wages and independently from labour contribution. Like payment for labour under socialism S.C.F. are a form of the necessary product intended for the reproduction of the labour force in social production. In the USSR, S.C.F. amounted to a quarter of the national income in the late 1970s. The need for S.C.F. was foreseen by Marx. Speaking of the distribution of the gross social product in the society of the future, he described a fund "*intended for the common satisfaction of needs*, such as schools, health services, etc.", which will grow in proportion as the new society develops, and also a fund "*for those unable to work*" (K. Marx, F. Engels, *Selected Works* in three volumes, Vol. 3, p. 17).

Bourgeois ideologists try to represent S.C.F. as something similar to the appropriations made by bourgeois states for social and cultural needs in order to make the bourgeois state look like a supra-class machinery supposedly looking after the needs of the working people. The truth is that the free services and payments that some workers receive in capitalist countries constitute an unwilling concession forced on the ruling class in response to the stubborn class struggle waged by the proletariat and other strata of the working people. Always and everywhere the bourgeoisie resorts to all kinds of gimmick to curtail, if not eliminate, those gains of the working people. One such technique is the tax system, whereby the bourgeois state takes more from the incomes of the working people than it gives them in various services and payments.

Only social ownership of the means of production (see Social Socialist Property) makes it possible to establish and continuously increase S.C.F. Their share in the total consumption of the Soviet population amounted to a third by the late 1970s.

S.C.F. include society's outlays on paying for pensions, various social security benefits, scholarships, the provision of free education and refresher training, free medical service, free or subsidised accommodation passes to holiday homes and sanatoria, the upkeep of nurseries and kindergartens, paid holidays, etc. Depending on their formation, distribution, and degree of socialisation S.C.F. are classified into three main groups: centralised, those of state enterprises and organisations, and those of collective farms and co-operatives. The first group accounts for most of the funds. They are formed by budget appropriations for social and cultural measures, are the greatest in amount, and cover the entire population. The S.C.F. of state enterprises and organisations (chiefly funds for social and cultural measures and housing construction) are formed from their profits and distributed among their personnel. The size of S.C.F. depends on the economic activity of the enterprises, so they act as a collective incentive to improve its performance. The S.C.F. of collective farms and co-operatives are formed from their profits, and those of collective farms are distributed, according to their rules, in compliance with the decision taken by the general meeting of its members.

S.C.F. take two forms, various payments and free privileges and services. The former include pensions, benefits, holiday pays, scholarships, etc., which directly increase the population's cash incomes. In the USSR these account for about half of all S.C.F. Free privileges and services, such as free education and free medical service relieve the population from expenses involved in various important requirements. A major part of the S.C.F., about a third of the total in the USSR, is spent on the upbringing and education of the younger generation. The S.C.F. also serve as a tool for the directed regulation of social proportions, the resolution of major social problems,

the reduction of differences in family incomes, and the elimination of socio-economic, cultural and domestic differences between town and village, and the substantial differences between mental and manual work, etc.

The distribution of the S.C.F. agrees both with the principles of distribution according to work done and the principle of distribution according to requirements. Thus, pensions and sick benefits are assigned in proportion to wages. On the other hand, primary and secondary education and medical service are provided as required. The application of the principle of distribution according to requirements in the distribution of the S.C.F. gives an insight into the future, communist distribution. With the advance to communism, the rate of S.C.F. growth will increasingly exceed that of individual labour remuneration. Thus, from 1970 to 1980, the average monthly wages of workers and other employees grew by almost 40 per cent, payments to collective-farm members by 90 per cent, while per capita payments and services from the S.C.F. almost doubled. The fraction of payments and services in the framework of the S.C.F. in family incomes has been growing continuously. This is an objective law of the development of distribution relations, which manifests itself especially clearly in developed socialist society (q. v.). The consistent expansion of the range of needs satisfied by the S.C.F. in developed socialist society is a major prerequisite for the evolution of the system of requirements that facilitate the formation of the comprehensively developed individual.

In the USSR, the S.C.F. provide the material basis for realising the right of citizens to maintenance in old age and in the case of disability, to education, to health protection and other rights, provided for in the 1977 Constitution of the USSR.

**Social-Democracy** is a trend adhering to reformist (evolutionary) socialism in the international working-class movement today. Characteristic of S.D. are recognition of the exceptionally peaceful and gradual, i.e. reformist (see Reformism) methods of social action, a striving to replace class

struggle by class collaboration, the notion of the "supra-class" nature of state and democracy, the conception of socialism as a moral ethical category ("ethical socialism"). S.D.'s ideological and political principles are opposed to revolutionary, proletarian socialism, to the theory of Marxism-Leninism (q. v.).

The term S.D. appeared when socialist workers' parties were being formed in Europe, in the last third of the 19th century. At that time, these parties usually called themselves Social-Democratic and took a revolutionary, Marxist stand. The vehicles of opportunistic trends were individual groups within these parties: Lassalleans in Germany, Fabians in Britain, Possibilists in France, etc. The growing bourgeois influence in the working-class movement in the period when the capitalist countries passed from pre-monopoly to monopoly capitalism stimulated the appearance of revisionism (q. v.), whose spokesman in the late 19th century was Eduard Bernstein. Right opportunism (q. v.), gradually growing in strength, prevailed in Social-Democratic parties and took in social-chauvinism during the First World War. At the same time, S.D.'s ranks split into rightists, centrists and lefts. The Great October Socialist Revolution of 1917 gave a further impetus to this split by initiating an international communist movement which attracted the finest, revolutionary elements of S.D. Social-Democracy became synonymous with opportunism and reformism.

The revolutionary crisis in Europe from 1918 to 1923 caused disarray in Social-Democratic parties. Extreme right-wing elements, such as Scheidemann and Noske joined the counter-revolutionary camp and, moreover, took an active part in suppressing the proletariat. The centrist leaders (Kautsky and Co.) continued manoeuvring in an effort to keep the revolutionary masses to conciliatory politics. In 1919-20, the centrist Social-Democratic parties left the Second International (q. v.) and formed their own, "Two-and-a-Half International". In 1923, the two Social-Democratic centres fused to form the Socialist Workers' International (see Socialist International). The parties that

comprised it had some 6.5-7 million members in the mid-20s and were supported by some 25 million electors. During the temporary stabilisation of capitalism, the Social-Democrats joined the governments of a number of European countries, and in Britain, Germany, Sweden and Denmark they headed them for some time. Once at the helm of state administration, the S.D. leaders considered themselves physicians by the bed of sick capitalism. The policy of class conciliation and anti-communism (q. v.) resulted in the bankruptcy of S.D. in the face of the fascist threat. The Social-Democratic Party of Germany was routed in 1933 and the Socialist Party of Austria a year later. Though, in some countries, the Social-Democratic parties agreed to act in union with the Communists, on the whole the right S.D. leaders rejected the call of the Seventh Congress of the Communist International to set up a united front against fascism (q. v.) and world war. The growth of the working-class and democratic movement in the West European countries resulting from the defeat of nazism in the Second World War helped S.D. to increase its influence. During the period of the cold war policy proclaimed by Winston Churchill in March 1946 in Fulton (USA), which was aimed at aggravating and maintaining international tensions, under pressure from rightist forces, S.D. adopted an openly anti-communist and anti-Soviet stand, and completely broke with Marxism. Most Social-Democratic parties both actually and formally denounced Marxism as an integral scientific-methodological and world-view theory, and embraced eclectic, "pluralistic" ideology by proclaiming "democratic socialism" (q. v.) as their ideological platform.

Both in power and in opposition, Social-Democratic parties have a tangible opportunity to secure certain reforms that meet the working people's interests. Yet nowhere has S.D. ever ventured to use the power of the organised working class to launch an offensive on the foundations of capitalism. Its opportunistic time-serving has ultimately made it dependent on the capitalist system. Where the Social-Democrats have managed to head governments, sometimes even for long periods, the main

levers of economic and political power have remained in the hands of big capital, which keeps the "reformist" activity of Social-Democratic governments within strict bounds.

S.D. holds a dual position in the socio-political system of the West. On the one hand, it merges, to some extent, with state-monopoly capitalism (q. v.), while on the other it is linked with the working-class movement, with trade unions (q. v.) and other mass democratic organisations, is pressurised by the working people's demands and is forced to head them in its policies. This is what distinguishes S.D. significantly from openly conservative and reactionary bourgeois parties. For all its contradictions and weaknesses, S.D. remains a considerable socio-political force, connected with the working-class and democratic movement in the developed capitalist countries.

Since the late 60s, the Social-Democratic movement has become more differentiated, and this has affected its leadership. Under the influence of changing international situation, most Social-Democratic parties were forced to adjust their foreign policy substantially and come out in support of detente and peaceful coexistence (see Detente; Peaceful Coexistence of States with Different Social Systems). In the 70s, West-European S.D. made a certain contribution to the development and consolidation of detente, promoted the improvement of East-West relations and favoured military detente, a cessation of the arms race, and disarmament. Some S. D. parties established and developed official inter-party ties with the Communist Parties of the socialist countries.

S.D. policies are seriously affected by the sharp exacerbation of the general crisis of capitalism (q. v.). In the context of the growing popular discontent, the Social-Democrats, especially under the impact of their left wings, are compelled to make certain adjustments in their programmatic principles, electoral slogans and practical activities, to advance projects and demands meeting at least half-way the working people's anti-monopoly aspirations. S.D. is also forced to reckon with the growing national liberation movement, the

intensified struggle of nations for economic independence, against imperialist interference, neocolonialism, racism and fascism (qq. v.), to declare its solidarity with this struggle, and to support the just demands of the peoples of the developing countries (q. v.) of Asia, Africa and Latin America. At the same time, S.D. policies also feature negative trends stemming from its basic ideological and political principles: propaganda of the "third way", opposition to the spread of Marxist-Leninist ideas, efforts to hinder the growing influence of Communists, defence of the imperialist and neocolonialist positions of the capitalist West.

While strongly censuring the manifestations of anti-communism and anti-Sovietism in S.D.'s activities and criticising inconsistencies and contradictions in its ideology and politics, Communists favour co-operation with Socialists and Social-Democrats on a vast range of questions meeting the interests of the working class and all working people. "Certainly, there can be no question of any ideological convergence between scientific communism and the reformism of the social-democrats," noted the 25th CPSU Congress. "However, we can be and are united with social-democrats, conscious of their responsibility for peace, and all the more with social-democratic workers, by a common concern for the security of the peoples, a wish to contain the arms race, and to repulse fascism, racialism and colonialism" (*Documents and Resolutions, XXVth Congress of the CPSU*, pp. 38-39).

**Social Experiment** is a method of scientific research and an element in the management of social phenomena and processes; it is implemented in the form of a controlled influence on these phenomena and processes and is aimed at revealing possibilities for achieving the new results planned.

S.E. is an important means for improving the forms in which the life of society is managed, and those in which it is organised in accordance with the objective laws of its development; it makes it possible, to a certain extent, to ascertain the expediency and effectiveness of various innovations under specific conditions, before

introducing them in practice. Experiment helps reveal new opportunities and reserves for enhancing labour productivity, developing social relations, making the working people more active, and encouraging them to take a greater part in production management. S.E. usually follows the following scheme. First, the target orientation (hypothesis tested in the experiment) is formulated, e. g., the influence of the system for labour remuneration and the granting of bonuses, depending on the final results of production (harvest, sold output of a given enterprise, repairs of buses with a guaranteed period of exploitation on routes, etc.), on the growth of labour productivity and attitude to work. Experimental and control (for comparison purposes) objects are then found, the variables significant for the final result are identified (e. g. the level of technical equipment or plan indicators) that must be constant in the course of experiment, time intervals determined, periodic measurements of experimental variables made, etc. Prior to the experiment, the social organisations concerned should explain their aims and conditions. Since a S.E. is conducted amidst the people's actual everyday activity, it must not be carried out where it may be detrimental if the hypothesis proves wrong or inflict moral harm on its participants. The aim of an experiment is educative, as well as being oriented on production effect and enhancement of the social activity of its participants. Experiments of this type are often carried out during the preparation and realisation of the social development plans of work collectives (see Social Planning) and are closely linked with the creative activity of working people. They are only possible in a socialist society, where the means of production and state power are in the hands of the people, led by the Communist Party. Social experimenting by such predecessors of scientific communism as Robert Owen and Charles Fourier was utopian and did not justify itself, for the reason that it was based on attempts to build islands of socialist production relations within the framework of an antagonistic class society, in order to change this society by force of example (see Utopian Socialism; Commune).

S.E. as a method of scientific study differs from the aforementioned experiment as an element in managing social processes by the way the tasks are solved and by the fact that the experimental activity is carried out by the experimenting scientist. Those tested are not supposed to know about the experiment, since such knowledge may affect the result. Scientific social experiments are actively conducted in pedagogics, social psychology and other social sciences. Their sphere is usually limited to a small group and their aim is to study the mechanism and factors influencing the moulding of the personality and his education in a collective.

Today, when stricter demands are made in the socialist countries on the level of social management (see Scientific Management of Society), social experimenting is growing in scale and scope. All this makes it necessary to improve the methods and forms of S.E. still further. One promising method is an experiment on a model, preceding a real one, and making it possible to study and evaluate the various changes in the object with no detriment to it and in a short period of time. The most effective here is the man-machine modelling system in which some parameters of the object are formalised, while others are not and are represented in particular as conceptions, scenarios, and human value orientations in interaction with the formal parameters in a dialogue regime. Model experiments make it possible to define the strategy for the real experiment more exactly, but cannot replace it. Genuine knowledge of the effectiveness of the hypotheses verified can only be obtained through an experiment on the object itself.

**Social Forecasting** is a form of scientific foresight, one of the fields of micro-sociological studies, centred on the prospects for social processes. In the broad sense, it encompasses all phenomena in the so-called socio-sphere, i. e., those that are linked directly with the vital activity of society, are amenable to social management and form part of the social sciences (as distinct from the natural and technical sciences, e. g., forecasts of the weather, harvest, earthquakes, incidence of disease, re-

gime of a mechanism's work). S.F. includes the prospects for the development of the economy, population, social and national relations, settlement, education, culture, the state and law, home and foreign policies, international relations, military science, and also the social aspects of the further development of science and technology, public health and physical culture, conservation of nature, exploration of the Earth and outer space. Similar distinctions are drawn between the corresponding forecasts as branches of S.F. In the narrow sense, S.F. is usually identified with sociological forecasts, i. e. studies of the prospects for the social relations proper.

Forecasting, like analysis or diagnosis (description, explanation, foresight) is a necessary function of any scientific discipline. Social forecasts made in various social sciences are closely interlinked and, together with prognostics, the science of the laws governing the drafting of forecasts, form an intricate mesh of a special science that has been rapidly progressing in recent decades.

In the social sciences, where the object of a forecast can change fundamentally as a result of decision-based action taking forecasts into account (which brings about "self-implementation" or "destruction" of forecasts), the latter must not come down to the attempts to make unconditional forecasts of the future state of an object; they must take the form of (1) search and (2) normative R.&D. What is meant in the first case is conditional extrapolation into the future of observed tendencies with a view to bringing out the optimal methods for solving social problems by means of control and, in the second case, determination of the desirable state of the object according to the stated criteria, so as to find the optimal ways for solving problems. Both directions run parallel to goal-setting, planning, programming, designing, and managerial decision-making in general, i. e. they precede them, evaluate the course and consequences of their implementation (or non-implementation as the case may be), point to fields not amenable to them, and aim to enhance their effectiveness by working out scientific recommendations from comparing search and

normative data. In practical S.F. this yields a considerable economic, social and political effect.

In the general form S.F. comes down to the following operations:

*Pre-forecast orientation* — definition of the object (on which the research is centred), the subject-matter (what is specifically studied within the object), the problem a research must solve, the aims and tasks, working hypotheses that a research is to confirm or refute, the time of justification and anticipation (for how many years the requisite material is known for making a forecast and for how many years it is planned to "look into the future"), the structure, methods and organisation of research.

*Building of the primary (base) model* of the object of research by a system of mathematical equations (ideally) or, in practice, by a set of qualitative and quantitative indicators forming a dynamic series of forecast justification.

*Building of the forecasting background*, i. e., the set of external factors determining the development of the object through identifying the necessary minimum number of background indicators correlated with the profile ones; these data cannot be obtained independently owing to their vast numbers, so they are taken from the available literature, requested from the competent institutions or assumed constant (or having changed, according to the specific criteria).

*Building of the search model* — extrapolation of initial dynamic series to the forecast's lead time, taking account of the forecasting background data.

*Building of the normative model* — normative development of primary dynamic series, account being taken of the forecasting background data.

*Verification* (checking on authenticity) of search and normative data, usually through polling of experts.

*Drafting of recommendations* for making management more effective by comparing search data and normatives.

S.F. is divided into current (operative), short-, medium-, long-, and super-long-term (distant). In the first case, studies are made of the prospects over the time during



which insignificant partial changes in the object are expected, in the second considerable quantitative changes; in the third considerable quantitative and partly qualitative changes; in the fourth considerable qualitative changes if qualitative valuations are possible; and in the fifth, such substantial qualitative changes that only crude qualitative estimates are possible. The length of any series of S.F. depends on the features of the object and differs in different branches. In practice, S.F. series are adapted, for the sake of convenience, to economic and social planning. In the USSR, current S.F. normally covers the coming year or season; short-term — the next five-year period, medium-term — the five-year period following it; long-term — one or two more five-year periods; and super-long-term — the much longer periods.

Scientists have suggested many (150 or 200) S.F. methods, but in practice not more than 15 or 20 methods are used, including the direct and indirect, individual and collective polling of experts, extrapolation of dynamic series and forecast modelling (in a broad sense, including scenarios and matrices). Several methods are grouped into a methodology, with several expert pollings and the use of various models.

S.F. is carried out in special scientific institutions by special research groups, including computer-equipped specialists.

Modern S.F. must be regarded in the context of the history of scientific prevision preceded by a thousand-year prehistory (religious and eschatological, utopian and idealistic notions of the future which were held by philosophers and historians and which have survived in part to this day and play a certain role in the modern ideological struggle). The appearance of Marxism marked a revolution in notions of the future and the beginning of scientific foresight proper, in the course of which Marxism-Leninism took its stand against idealist conceptions and also positivism, which rejected the possibility of scientific foresight. In the latter half of the 19th and the early 20th centuries, this struggle led to the publication of books on the development prospects for certain social phenomena (town-building, means

of transport and communication, public health, culture, rest and leisure, international relations, etc.). The victory of socialism in the USSR and the Soviet Government's decision to draft a long-term plan for the country's development added a new dimension to the discussion on the possibility of scientific foresight and were responsible for the appearance of a vast literature of the future in the 20s and early 30s. From the mid-30s to the late 40s this theme was relegated to the background because of the Great Patriotic War, but later it was revived and, from the 50s to 70s, the number of books on the theme grew considerably. In the late 70s, the "overflow effect" was reached and the growth rate slowed down. This growth was caused by the conception of the scientific and technological revolution and its socio-economic consequences, which started in the late 40s and aroused interest in assessment of expected and desirable changes. The invention in the late 50s and early 60s of search techniques and normatives made it possible to obtain great profit from optimising decision-making, with account being taken of the results of forecast R.&D. and led, in the West, to a "forecasting boom", i.e. the appearance of hundreds of specialist scientific institutions engaged in S.F. Ideologically, this resulted in the appearance of bourgeois futurology, which, since the late 60s and early 70s, has been in a constant state of crisis because of the untenability of optimistic socio-economic and political forecasts and the extremely grave global problems that cannot be solved under capitalism. In the USSR and other countries of the socialist community, S.F. has been developing since the mid-60s owing to the need to raise the standard of justification of the planning and management of social processes, to expand the planning range (the broader inclusion in it of social, ecological and town-planning aspects, as well as economic ones), and to increase the plans' lead time (up to 20 years or more). Today S.F. in these countries is conducted by hundreds of scientific institutions, their work being co-ordinated, as a rule, by academies of sciences (in the USSR such a co-ordinating centre is the Scientific Council of the USSR Academy of Sciences

on the Problems of Scientific-Technical and Socio-Economic Forecasting, the work of which is promoted, on a voluntary basis, by the Committee for Forecasting Scientific and Technological Progress under the All-Union Council of Scientific and Technical Societies, which has a special commission on socio-economic forecasting). The development of S.F. is instrumental in enhancing the level of the scientific management of society (see *Scientific Management of Society*).

**Social Information**, knowledge, communication, data, primarily concerning relations among people, their reciprocal actions, requirements, interests, etc. This kind of information bears the deep imprint of class, national and other relations, as well as of the needs, interests and psychological make-up of a certain collective. The principal types of S.I. are: economic, socio-political, natural-scientific, technological, aesthetic and ideological.

S.I. is the highest, most sophisticated and multifaceted type of information. People utilise it to exert a purposeful impact on nature (through labour) and society (through the government of society, which is the highest type of government). No other type of information (biological information included) undergoes such a profound and multifarious processing and has such variegated forms as S.I. It discharges communicative (ensuring communication among the people), managerial, scientific and cognitive, educational, and propagandist functions.

The informational processes under way in society and the increase in the volume and diversity of information are determined by the system of social relations, above all by the development of production. It is difficult or even impossible to set quantitative ratios; a causal connection does exist here, nevertheless, as well as a feedback impact of information on production and the system of social relations. The informational interaction among various spheres of social life, classes, social groups and individuals is an important and specific form of social interaction. Advances in production, science, technology, culture, and society as a whole hinge largely on the effectiveness and rational organisation of

that interaction. The smoothness and effectiveness of informational interaction is an important index of social progress. Informational processes, i.e. those involved in the movement of information, imply the existence of an object (source) of information, its consumer, and the channels of communication between them. To receive, reflect, fix, multiply, process and transfer information, numerous technical means are employed today, with computers playing an ever increasing role.

Society's impact on informational processes is clearly seen in the class approach to information we observe in a class society. Society is far from indifferent to information, its content, objectives and use. The attitude of different classes and society to various types of information is not the same, of course. Natural-scientific and technological information, for example, is not characterised by openly class motivations; its class thrust is manifested in a mediated way, through the goals it is used to pursue. Under capitalism, science and technology, and scientific and technical information correspondingly, are primarily used to get capitalist profit. In socialist society, their aim is to satisfy the requirements and develop the endowments of the working people. Socio-political and ideological information is of an explicit class nature. It synthesises the most variegated data according to a preset programme. A "pure fact" taken from the sphere of social life has actually been carefully selected from class positions and expressed in a corresponding form. In socialist society, S.I. must display a partisan, class approach, it must be science-based, truthful and convincing, full and precise, useful and novel, operative and relevant.

Information, if it is carefully selected and aimed at a specific goal, exercises a great power of conviction and can radically change the way of thinking and opinions of individuals, and of public opinion as a whole; moreover, it can shape the people's views and behaviour in conformity with social requirements. Informational links, informational interaction, i.e. the constant exchange of information, of knowledge on various phenomena and processes in order to control numerous objects

of the surrounding world, to govern oneself and the people's collectives, are indispensable for the functioning and evolution of society and for the existence and development of every individual (see also Mass Information and Propaganda-Media).

**Social Organisations under Socialism** are voluntary, self-governing associations of citizens that protect the interests of social, professional, and socio-demographic population groups, or pursue certain goals. Under socialism S.O. are fundamentally different from those under capitalism, though some progressive S.O., in particular those of different strata or groups of the working people or consisting largely of them, are set up under capitalism. Even if they do not aim for radical changes in the social system, their contribution to the preparation and subsequent materialisation of this change should never be underrated. Bourgeois ideologists and public figures of the reformist-opportunistic variety have always advocated the need that S.O. should stay away from the political struggle, be "non-partisan" and "independent" of partisan influence or guidance, implying, of course, revolutionary parties. In reality, S.O. and their membership are bound to be under some partisan, or political influence and contribute to the pursuance of some policy.

Under socialism, the profoundest changes occur in the position and role of social organisations of working people. The split between the workers', youth, women's, and other movements that existed under capitalism is overcome; united socio-politically oriented organisations of each type are set up to act under the guidance of the Communist Party, the policy of which determines the entire life of society under socialism. Because, under socialism, the working people become masters of their own lives, unprecedented opportunities emerge for the development of their socio-political activities (see Social Activity) and, consequently, so do incomparably more favourable conditions for their work and for the existence of S.O. as an organisational framework for such activities. For this reason, the membership of S.O. sharply increases. Some S.O. specific to the conditions of capitalism, have no basis under

socialism and so cease to exist. On the other hand, many new S.O. emerge, as do voluntary societies and creative unions that are basically a kind of S.O. The expansion of the network and membership of S.O. are at their peak under mature socialism; in the USSR practically the entire population belongs to them.

Under capitalism, the social role of S.O. is to protect the rights and interests of their members against the reactionary policies of the ruling exploiters and their state power. Under socialism, the role played by S.O. changes radically, in accordance with their changed objective position. Under socialism, S.O. are organisations of the ruling working class and its allies. They therefore support and strengthen state power. Furthermore, they take over some functions in the management of society and state, chiefly in conjunction with state bodies. In co-operation with them, the ruling Party and state bodies adopt many important normative acts. Some state functions are transferred to S.O.; thus, in the USSR and certain other socialist countries, the trade unions manage the state social insurance budget, exercise safety engineering control and labour protection, and run sanatoria and resorts. Because they share, to some extent, in the management of society and state, the S.O. become elements of the political system of socialism (q. v.); to be more precise, their functioning intertwines with that of the system as do trade unions or the Young Communist League.

Under socialism, the purpose of S.O. is to protect the rights and interests of their members and of the social groups they represent from possible infringements by individual officials or organs of the state and economic apparatus; this is especially the case with trade unions. The most important aspect of their activity is, however, to mobilise the working people for building socialism and communism, educate them in the spirit of collectivism, communist ideals, and comprehensively develop their social activities.

The S.O. have an important role to play in resolving the diverse tasks involved in the building of socialism and communism, economics, social, political, cultural and

educational tasks, those in the construction of the material and technical base of socialism and communism, in the formation of socialist social relations and their growth into communist ones, in the education of the new man and a new way of life. Thus, trade unions contribute to the development and implementation of state plans for economic and social development (both of society as a whole and its subdivisions or units), to the management of production and labour organisation, run socialist emulation (q. v.), tackle numerous aspects of socio-cultural services and improvement of the well-being, working conditions, everyday life and leisure of the working people, etc. Many of these aspects are handled by communist youth organisations (such as the Young Communist League in the USSR), which play a very significant role in the political, labour and moral education of the younger generation. Co-operatives are an efficient tool in the social transformation of the way of life, mentality and the joint work of millions of small producers and, at a later stage, a school of communism. Various problems involved in building socialism and communism are tackled by other S.O. and voluntary societies in accordance with their specifics. The S.O. contribute tangibly to the international policies of the Communist Parties of the socialist countries, to a strengthening of the international links within the socialist community, of fraternal friendship between peoples and progressive forces in all countries, peace and international security. In addition to this work of all S.O. that strengthen their ties with kindred organisations abroad, there are special societies for friendship with peoples of other countries.

The increase in the activity and membership of the S.O. is especially important for laying the groundwork of future communist social self-government.

**Social Planning** is a sphere of planning activity in socialist society the object of which is various aspects of the social development of collectives. Since collectives differ in their degree of community (ranging from society as a whole to the work collective or family), S.P. may be carried at different levels.

The highest and most general level is the planning by the Party and the state of the development of social relations throughout society. The economic development plans (annual, five-year and long-term) drafted at this level contain indicators for the development of such spheres as science, culture, education, the medical services, social security, as well as economic indicators (the level, rate and period of the development of production, its various branches, etc.). These plans also provide for the solution of social problems proper: promotion (on the basis of economic development) of the growth of people's well-being, and thus an advance to social equality; a further overcoming of the social distinctions between town and country, between mental and manual workers; consolidation and development of the alliance of the working class, peasantry and intelligentsia, a strengthening of friendship among peoples, etc. Economic development plans are made more concrete at less general levels, their final subjects being enterprises (industrial, agricultural, cultural, domestic services, etc.).

Plans for the social development of work collectives began to be drafted in the USSR in the mid-60s (at several Leningrad enterprises). S.P. has now become widespread. It involves drafting measures covering such spheres of the social development of enterprises as transformation of the social structure of the work collective (change in its socio-demographic structure, improvement in the workers' education and qualifications, regulation of their movement within enterprises with due account especially for the social consequences of the scientific and technological revolution (q.v.); scientific organisation of labour (lightening of the people's work load, removal of arduous and exhausting manual operations, mastery of advanced methods and skills, creation of favourable sanitary-hygienic and aesthetic conditions for work, elimination of professional diseases and industrial traumatism, rational alternation of work and rest, etc.); communist education (q.v.) of the working people, development of their social activity (q.v.), expansion and development of socialist

democracy (q.v.), involvement of all members of collectives in managing production and social affairs (improvement of the functioning of social institutions in enterprises, such as permanent production conferences, economic analysis social bureaux, design and technological bureaux, scientific and technical societies, development of socialist emulation, q.v., etc.), enhancement of the working people's well-being (improved work remuneration, with due account being taken of qualifications, education, fulfilment of output quotas or fixed assignments, distribution of incentive funds, improvement of housing, cultural and domestic conditions, public catering, rational utilisation of free time (q.v.), development of material facilities for socio-cultural measures and rest and leisure). Until recently, social planning in work collectives was often divorced from economic planning. Unlike production indices, social plan indices were not binding instructions, and their fulfilment was the function of trade unions, rather than the management. Realisation of social measures was not always substantiated economically or supported materially, financially. Meanwhile, economic planning is the key to managing the development of social relations. All social measures must be substantiated economically, otherwise voluntarism and project-mongering are inevitable. That is why many Soviet enterprises include social development programmes as an integral part of their production plan. As a result, S.P. becomes binding for the collective, rather than "voluntary" or "social". Being incorporated in the general plan of enterprises, points bearing on social development acquire the force of law. All sections of the plan are organically dovetailed with one another and with the corresponding indices of the enterprise's work; social measures are being supported by the necessary financial, material, technical, and manpower resources. Such a general socio-production plan is a potent stimulating force, since the resources assigned for social development depend directly on the efficiency of production, and concern for better technico-economic indicators becomes concern for an increase in social,

domestic and intellectual benefits.

S.P. in the development of regions and cities in the USSR is gaining currency today, and summary plans for the social development of rural areas are being drafted. The social measures on the scale of the enterprise, town, region or republic will eventually be components of a single plan for the socio-economic development of society as a whole.

**Social Policy** is a component of the general policy conducted by a party or government to embrace the solution of a fairly broad circle of social problems conforming to the party's or government's class essence and objectives.

Under capitalism, S.P. is, above all, the sum total of measures pursued by the bourgeois state in relation to the people. Though S.P. is presented as concern for the people's needs, in fact it is an addition to coercion. S.P. includes legislative measures to regulate the workers' labour conditions and settle labour conflicts, provide social security (i.e. security through society's resources accumulated by the state) for the unemployed, aged and other non-able-bodied, large low-income families, and, in certain cases, some form of housing, medical aid, etc. for the poor. The state's S.P. also includes activities presented by bourgeois politicians and ideologists as being aimed at satisfying the common requirements of all members of society, such as the organisation of public education, campaigns against social pathology (crime, drug addiction, prostitution, etc.), and, in recent years, environmental protection. Contrary to the demagogic assertions that accompany such activities the latter are in reality by no means an expression of the "supra-class" nature of the bourgeois state, its alleged mission to "serve the interests of all citizens", let alone those of the working people. This S.P. largely arose as an adaptive reaction by the ruling, exploiting class, out to retain its privileges, to the mounting struggle of working people, as a "preventive exhaust valve" for decreasing the pressure of the class struggle. The most that can be secured through this policy is some mitigation of working people's hardships, which cannot

be eliminated under capitalism, and an improvement of some aspects of the people's life. Needless to say, bourgeois S.P. cannot remove the class struggle of the proletariat and other sections of the working people against the system of capitalist exploitation, and this struggle is steadily mounting.

The S.P. pursued by the Communist Parties under capitalism is radically different from bourgeois S.P. It is a component of their general policy, which is revolutionary in essence and in its ultimate objectives. While aiming to change the social conditions radically, as long as capitalism exists, the Communist Parties also fight to wrench as many concessions as possible from the ruling class and its government in order to satisfy the vital social needs of working people. Contrary to the assertions by various left-ist elements, this in no way contradicts the ideals of the revolutionary renovation of society, provided, of course, that a distinct awareness is retained of the unavoidable limitation of any social improvements under capitalism.

The working class's take over of state power (see Dictatorship of the Proletariat) creates the objective conditions for a consistent solution of a wide range of social problems involved in meeting the working people's interests: abolition of the exploitation (q.v.) of man by man, a sharp improvement in the people's living conditions, the creation of the prerequisites for their all-round development, their involvement in different forms of social creativity for building the new, truly humane way of life (see Socialist Way of Life), and establishment of social equality (q.v.). Attainment of these goals determines the content of the social policy of the Marxist-Leninist party which directs the process of socialist construction and consequently the S.P. of the socialist state it leads. The specific content of the S.P. tasks and the extent to which they are fulfilled in a consistent and profound way are changing as the transition is made from the initial stages of building socialism to more mature stages.

The content of socialist S.P., aimed at the all-round improvement of the working

people's living conditions, is most fully brought out at the stage of mature socialism (see Developed Socialist Society). It is quite natural, therefore, that in the USSR, where it was built for the first time, exceptional attention was focused on this aspect of political leadership in the documents of the 24th, 25th and 26th CPSU congresses and in the 1977 Constitution of the USSR. The 24th Party Congress pointed out that "*in the sphere of social policy* the Party line is a line designed further to strengthen the unity of Soviet society, to bring still closer together the classes and social groups, all the nations and nationalities that make up Soviet society. It is a line for the consistent development of socialist democracy and the enlistment of increasing numbers of people for the management of public and state affairs; it is ... a line for raising the communist consciousness of all working people, for all-out development of science and culture, for further intellectual development of the Soviet man, for asserting a moral and political atmosphere in the country in which people would find it easy to breathe, joyous to work and peaceful to life". (24th Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, March 30-April 9, 1971. Documents, 1971, p. 334.) The 26th CPSU Congress adopted a broad programme for a further rise of the Soviet people's well-being for the 11th five-year plan period (1981-1985) and the 1980s as a whole. "This programme calls for improving all aspects of the Soviet people's life — consumption and housing, cultural and recreational facilities, working and living conditions... Concrete concern for the concrete person, for his needs and requirements is the alpha and omega of the Party's economic policy" (Report of the Central Committee of the CPSU to the 26th Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, pp. 58-59, 65). Similar social tasks are also being tackled in the other CMEA countries, which take account of the maturity of socialism there (see World Socialist Community).

Taken in their generalised form, these tasks can be classed as three basic complexes. The first is provision of increasingly favourable conditions for the people in

all spheres: improvement of material well-being, advance of socialist culture and development of democracy. The second group of tasks concerns the moulding of the people's requirements in conformity with rational criteria. Here also belongs the formation of life orientations that impel people to put their strength and abilities in the service of social welfare, development of social activity, formation and strengthening of the new, socialist way of life. Fulfilment of these two groups of tasks represents two aspects of regulation of the same complex of social relations, those between socialist society as a whole and its members or, in other words, between society and the individual. Under socialism, these relations are built on the principles "Society for man, man for society", and "Concern of all for the welfare of each and concern of each for the welfare of all". S.P. takes account of the specific features of various socio-demographic groups (young people, women, the aged, etc.).

An independent group of S.P. tasks consists of regulation of the complex of social relations between the labouring classes and sections, i.e., improvement of the social structure of society (see Social Structure of Socialist Society, the). S.P. promotes progressive development of processes such as strengthening of the alliance and friendship between the working class, the peasantry and the intelligentsia, the gradual overcoming of the differences between them and thus a consistent consolidation of social unity in society. These aspects of S.P. pursued by Communist Parties and governments in socialist society are closely interconnected. They are different aspects of accomplishing one multifaceted task carried out in the course of building socialism and communism, viz. the restructuring of the system of social relations on collectivist principles. This is expressed both in the consolidating unity of the convergent labouring classes and sections, and in society's growing concern for each of its members and their reciprocal concern for the common welfare.

Implementation of all S.P. tasks directly concerns the individual, his social status,

the conditions and content of his vital activity, formation and realisation of his requirements and abilities is aimed at harmonious development of the individual (q.v.). Solution of the pertinent problems calls, as a rule, for comprehensive utilisation of widely differing financial, technico-economic, organisational, educative and other means and measures, specifically material resources, transformations in technical facilities and the organisation of production, the activities of political, cultural and educational institutions, etc. Insofar as these means and measures directly serve the attainment of social objectives, they act as levers of S.P. Utilisation of these various levers is provided for in the social programmes adopted by the CPSU and the Communist Parties of the fraternal socialist countries.

**Social-Political and Ideological Unity of Society** means the qualitative state of society marked by a unity of classes, social groups and sections, by the common interests of all the working people in building developed socialism and communism.

The founders of Marxism-Leninism foresaw that social disunity would be replaced by unity of all members of society possessing common interests, a common will and acting according to a single plan. "Capitalism deliberately splits the population. This split must disappear once and for all, and the whole of society must become a single workers' co-operative" (V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 28, p. 333).

The prerequisites for the social unity of society form once the proletariat takes political power, during the period of transition from capitalism to socialism (q.v.). The revolutionary transformation of the mode of production and accomplishment of the cultural revolution (q.v.) help consolidate the alliance of workers and peasants, to which intellectuals increasingly adhere. The basic material and intellectual interests of workers, co-operated peasants and intellectuals coincide, and this ensures the unity of the entire people. Socialism is a society in which all classes, social sections and groups are united. Their friendship and co-operation are manifested in all spheres of social life and grow stronger as society

moves forward to communism, though they take peculiar forms in various social spheres. This feature, typical of socialist society, has been tested by the historical experience of the USSR and other fraternal socialist countries. It was especially evident during the Great Patriotic War waged by the Soviet people against Nazi Germany (1941-45), when the monolithic unity of the Soviet people thwarted the aggressors' plans and led to the defeat of German fascism and Japanese militarism.

The people's unity is based on their socio-economic unity, because the main reasons for the emergence, development and strengthening of the friendship of classes, social sections and groups are rooted in the radical change in property relationships. The emergence and development of social socialist property (q. v.) ensured the correspondence of the new, socialist relations of production to the character of the productive forces, which made a constant and firm unity of the whole people possible. Socialist property served as the basis for changes in the organisation of production management and distribution of the national income. Workers, co-operated peasants and intellectuals have become the genuine masters of the public means of production and base their activities on uniform socialist property. Each person's labour for society is, at the same time, labour for himself. The socialist principle of distribution according to work done combines in an integral whole the social and personal interests of workers. This is the basis on which best interests of the members of society coincide. All members of society have a vital interest in the development and consolidation of socialist production and the growth of public property, since this serves to consolidate the country's economic potential and improve their own well-being. Since the basic economic interests of the various groups of working people coincide, society has been developing on the basis of cohesion of its members, rather than a class struggle.

The economic unity of workers, co-operated peasants and intellectuals has determined their intellectual, ideological unity. Socialist ideology as a working-class

ideology (see Marxism-Leninism) has gradually become the ideology of the entire people, while retaining its class, Party character. Socialist culture has become one for the entire people.

The economic and ideological unity finds its concentrated expression in social-political unity, in the country-wide political organisation of society. As socialism became consolidated and developed in the USSR, the Soviet state acquired more features of the state of the whole people, with the result that the state of the dictatorship of the proletariat gradually developed into a country-wide political organisation of socialist society. The state of the whole people (q. v.) as an organ expressing the interests and will of all social groups at once retains its class character, and the direction of its activities is determined by the interests and aims of the working class.

The unity of political interests and actions determined the moulding of the new ideological and political make-up of the Soviet people, typified by loyalty to communism, political activity and unanimous support for the Communist Party. The people's social-political unity is embodied in national-political unity, in relations of equality, brotherhood and friendship of all nations and nationalities. The Soviet people (q. v.) is a fundamentally new socio-class and international community of people, the unity of all working people forming the basis of the multinational state of the whole people. The nations and nationalities have united into a single socialist homeland (q. v.) and each people enjoys constantly the support and assistance of all the others in its economic and cultural development.

The unity of society is a great advantage of socialism over capitalism. It forms the basis of the internal stability of socialism and promotes the concentration of all forces, and their purposeful, effective use.

The highest expression of the social unity of the working people and the nucleus of the political system of Soviet society is the Communist Party, which determines its main course of development, and unites the activities of all state bodies and social



organisations. The close unity of the Party and the people is a source of the further growth and deepening of socialist democracy, of all of Soviet successes and victories, and guarantee of the building of communism.

The social-political and ideological unity of socialist society is both a national and an international phenomenon, inherent in both the internal development of the socialist countries and the world socialist community (q. v.). The international nature of unity is determined by objective factors: the common vital interests of the socialist countries in endeavouring to attain a single goal — the building of communism; the dominance in them of social ownership of the means of production, which determines their mutual assistance and co-operation in all fields of social life, rational international division of labour and co-ordination of their economic plans. The unity of the socialist countries makes their joint action in the world more effective, and enhances the importance of exchanges of experience among them in solving the various economic, scientific, technical and cultural problems (see World Socialist System; Integration, Socialist).

**Social Structure of Socialist Society**, is the totality of friendly classes, social sections and groups whose interrelationships are determined by the social ownership of the means of production, the same basic interests and common Marxist-Leninist ideology.

The main cause of the change and development of the social structure of society at some stage of its development and of its individual elements are the dominant relations of production. While changing under the influence of the respective mode of production, the social structure is, at the same time, relatively stable and independent.

A distinct place in the social structure of society is held by its class structure, the aggregate of social classes and their specific ties and relations. Lenin said that the main social division is "the class division of modern society" (V.I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 2, p. 468). The class structure is directly linked with property relations and expresses the social sta-

tus of people, determining the character and essence of social, political, legal, moral, aesthetic and religious relations.

Socialist society is a complex formation with its own inherent ties and relations. The important features of its social structure are the absence of exploiting classes, the social-political and ideological unity of society (q. v.), the consolidation of the alliance of workers and peasants, of the social sections of the working people, and the convergence of all social communities.

In the USSR, this social structure had already taken shape by the late 1930s with the victory of socialism, and has undergone profound changes since that time.

The basic element of the social structure of mature socialism is the working class (q. v.) as the leading force of socialist society, and its allies, the co-operative peasantry (q. v.) and the people's intelligentsia (q. v.). The alliance of the working class, peasantry and intelligentsia constitutes the social basis of society.

The victory of socialism in the USSR changed the position and role of classes in society, the nature of their activities, their socio-economic and socio-political make-up. Much has been done to obliterate differences between the workers and peasants. Socialism has abolished private ownership of the means of production, and done away with the division of people into those who own the means of production and those who do not. At the same time, the working class and the co-operative peasantry differ in their relation to the means of production, this stemming from the existence of two forms of socialist property, that of the whole people, and collective-farm and co-operative property. This accounts for differences in the social organisation of labour, in the forms of receipt and the share of the social wealth, while observing the single socialist principle of distribution according to work done.

The social structure of mature socialism (see Developed Socialist Society) includes classes, social groups and sections. Judging by their place in the social division of labour, a distinction can be drawn between the urban and rural population, manual and mental workers, executors and

executives. Intellectuals and office workers (q. v.) constitute a large and rapidly growing group. In developed socialist society, under the scientific and technological revolution (q. v.) now under way, great changes are taking place in the structure of the intelligentsia, its working conditions and social make-up, and it is coming to play a greater role in all social spheres. The process of overcoming the essential differences between physical and mental labour (q. v.) is continuing steadily.

In socio-demographic terms, the social groups include young people, women and pensioners. The development of the social structure of socialism is directly linked with the younger generation beginning its labour career. The progressive drawing together of the classes, social groups and sections involves, above all, young people. The CPSU points to the need to take a differentiated approach to youth, and to draw young men and women in the life of society on a wider scale (see Youth and Youth Movement). Women in socialist society hold a position equal to that of men, but they also largely perform functions bearing on the upbringing and education of children in the family and keeping house. So their social status has certain specific features. Consequently, they are set aside as a separate group (see Women's Question). Pensioners also constitute a special socio-demographic group in society. They are partly engaged in production, but largely enjoy well-earned rest and leisure and concern themselves with socially useful activity in various social organisations. The proportion of older people is growing in developed socialist society because of the greater life expectancy resulting from the favourable conditions for the people's work and leisure. The pensionable age in the Soviet Union is the lowest in the world. Government and Party organisations choose the most useful forms of work with pensioners, in order to make a more effective use of their experience and energy in social and labour activity.

The social sections differing primarily in character and content of labour represent a further gradation of classes and social groups. The social structure of developed socialism also involves vocational

and qualification structure. It would be wrong both to confuse social groups and sections with trades, professions and qualifications, and to set hard and fast lines between them. Occupational and qualification divisions are interrelated aspects of the division of labour. Profession or trade shows what specific occupation a worker is engaged in, while qualifications show the degree to which he has mastered the given profession. The same profession or trade includes workers of different qualifications, this being expressed in their grouping according to wage-rate categories. It would be wrong to assert that the workers' division according to professions and trades bears no relation to the class division. Of course, it is not a person's profession that determines his inclusion in a certain class. At the same time, classes as the main structural groups in society, affect the type and nature of activities and determine the type of profession and trade concerned. Typical of the working class, for example, are industrial trades, and of collective farmers — agricultural ones.

The social structure of socialism is expressed through a system of work collectives — the main cells of society (see Socialist Collective). People's relations in work collectives are determined by production relations and characterised by the workers' co-operation and mutual assistance for the benefit of production. Work collectives play a signal role in the life of mature socialist society, for it is in them that workers carry out their economic, social and political functions, that they receive social recognition of their work, are closely linked with other people, and develop their civic qualities. Relations of friendship, comradely co-operation and support also take shape in the collectives, thereby ensuring the primacy of social interests over personal ones.

According to the Constitution of the USSR, work collectives take part in the discussion of, and decision-making on, various issues involved in state and social administration, such as the planning of production and social development, the training and placement of the personnel, etc. The Party and the Government have worked out and are implementing a system of

measures to develop democratic principles in managing production and enhancing the role of work collectives, which increases the social homogeneity of society.

**Socialism** is a social system that replaces capitalism and is marked by social ownership of the means of production, absence of exploitation of man by man and by social production planned on a country-wide scale; the first stage of the communist socio-economic formation.

Insofar as S. directly follows capitalism (q. v.) in the course of historical development, and sometimes takes shape even under earlier economic structures in a country, it carries the marks of the old society and uses some socio-economic forms that evolved at preceding stages of social development (see Period of Transition from Capitalism to Socialism). With the development level of the productive forces and public property typical of S., the old division of labour and distinctions between mental and manual labour and between town and country are not fully overcome (see Overcoming Differences Between Town and Country; Physical and Mental Labour). Under S. there remain commodity-money relations and certain social differences between workers, peasants and intellectuals, and, in the political field, the state.

At the same time, S. differs radically from capitalism. Abolition of private ownership of the means of production and establishment of social socialist property transform the society economically, socially, and politically. Production is geared to the maximum satisfaction (given the level of the productive forces) of the material and intellectual requirements of society's members, rather than the pursuit of profit. Income is no longer derived through exploitation by means of capital and everyone is obliged to work according to the principle "he who does not work, neither shall he eat". The previous antagonistic society becomes one of the working people bound by the community of their vital interests.

The social socialist property (q. v.) of the means of production substantially changes the character of production. Commodities are produced by work col-

lectives that operate state- or collectively-owned means of production. Production is run according to a state plan. Planning is a major economic feature of socialism, for social ownership of the means of production not only makes it possible to develop the national economy according to a plan, but also necessitates planning, and gives rise to the objective economic law of planned, proportionate development of the economy.

Individual workers and teams are encouraged to take an active part in production by material incentives and various forms of distribution according to work done, elaborated on the basis of the principle, "from each according to his abilities, to each according to his work" (see Basic Principle of Socialism, the).

In social respect, S. represents a society of two friendly classes, the working class and the peasantry (qq. v.), who produce material values in industry and agriculture. The numerical strength of the intelligentsia (q. v.), a social section engaged in skilled mental work, the development of science, technology and culture, is constantly growing. There is also a section of people engaged in the services sphere. Because of the absence of antagonistic classes in socialist society, socio-political and ideological unity is established in it, and all class and social differences are gradually obliterated.

In the political field, S. is marked by a consolidation of the state, especially its economic organs, and the development of socialist democracy (see Democracy, Socialist). The rise in the working people's cultural and ideological levels, in their socio-political activity, the educational and organising role of the Marxist-Leninist party, trade unions and other social organisations determine the essential features of this process. The political system of socialism (q. v.) is peculiar in each particular country because of the historical features of building socialist society, national and other distinctions, yet, at the same time, it has some common features: the leading role of the working class, of the Marxist-Leninist party, the combination and interaction of state and social organisations, and involvement

of the masses in governing society and the state.

In the intellectual life of society, the socialist revolution ushers in a democratisation of culture, accelerated growth in the educational standards of the masses, a rapid increase in the people's intelligentsia and the utmost development of science, literature and the arts (see Cultural Revolution). Capitalist culture is replaced by socialist culture, which is a logical stage in the development of human culture in general.

"...In reality *only* socialism," Lenin said, "will be the beginning of a rapid, genuine, truly mass forward movement, embracing first the *majority* and then the whole of the population, in all spheres of public and private life" (V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 25, p. 477). S. is marked by accelerated economic, social, political and intellectual development, this constituting its major advantage over capitalism. This is, above all, conditioned by the new social relations of production, which enable the modern productive forces to develop apace. The purposeful activity of the socialist state, of the Marxist-Leninist party and other social organisations, which accumulate popular energy and enthusiasm, also accelerate social development.

A major source of development of socialist society is its objectively contradictory position as a society that emerged in the womb of capitalism, a society in which the inherited past is intertwined with the arising new and is therefore marked by sharp struggle between the old and the new (see *Survivals of the Past in the People's Minds and Behaviour*). The need to solve non-antagonistic but sometimes very acute contradictions engenders various forms for overcoming them, particularly criticism and self-criticism (q.v.). The inner contradictions of socialist society include, above all, that between the advanced social relations of production and the rather low material level of production and people's culture inherited from the past which is aggravated in some socialist countries by difficulties caused by the historical conditions of their emergence and development (war,

destruction of the productive forces, blockade, etc.). While overcoming this contradiction, S. passes through various stages of development until it reaches the stage of mature socialism (see *Complete and Final Victory of Socialism; Developed Socialist Society*). The second group of contradictions, which are external to socialist society, stem from the struggle between the two social systems (q.v.)—S. and capitalism—on the international scene.

**Socialist Collective**, a cell of socialist society, in which individual and social interests are combined; a relatively stable community of people united by a specific type of socially necessary activity and relationships of co-operation, mutual assistance and mutual responsibility formed in the course of this activity, as well as by common requirements and interests expressed in the socio-psychological form of value orientations, principles and norms of behaviour shared by the majority of its members. S.C. emerges following the victory of a socialist revolution (q.v.). Some of the prerequisites necessary for its formation take shape at earlier stages of social development, first and foremost on the basis of joint labour and the struggle to do away with exploitation. But only a socialist revolution creates the objective conditions—the dictatorship of the proletariat (q.v.), social socialist ownership (q.v.) of the means of production, domination of socialist ideology, etc.—for the establishment of S.C. as a social cell of a historically new type. As socialist society develops, the function and structure of S.C. undergo certain changes, evolving from initial to more mature, communist-type forms.

Developed socialism is characterised by an integral system of various collectives, corresponding to concrete types of activity: labour, socio-political, military, educational, communal, sport, amateur art, etc., including virtually the entire population of a country, with a considerable part of it, consisting of its most active members, participating in several collectives simultaneously. The principle of collectivism (q.v.) has become one of the most important principles of the

socialist way of life. The priority place in the system of socialist collectives belongs to labour collectives. Work collective, a major component of socialist society and an integral part of socialist society's economic, political and social system, occupies an important place within the system of socialist collectives. The 1983 Law on Work Collectives and Raising Their Role in Managing Enterprises, Institutions, and Organisations spelled out the powers of work collectives, including the planning of economic and social development; ensuring the safety of socialist property; using rationally the material resources; organising, rating, and remunerating labour; distributing and using funds for economic stimulation; training and placing personnel, ensuring labour discipline; and improving working people's social, cultural, and living conditions. The new law grants work collectives the opportunity to discuss draft laws and resolutions of a local Soviet of People's Deputies affecting the interests of work collectives, it also stipulates for the need for administrative bodies to take into account the suggestions and recommendations of work collectives when making decisions concerning the activity of corresponding enterprises, institutions, or organisations.

S.C. discharges the following basic functions: (1) target-objective, (2) socio-integrational, and (3) administrative-educational. The extent of their realisation is expressed in the corresponding criteria of the collective's effectiveness. The target-objective function consists in carrying out a particular socially useful activity, for which the given collective was established and exists. The socio-integrational function consists in ensuring the fullest possible accord between the interests of society and those of the collective members, which is necessary mainly for carrying out the target-objective function, and for tackling a number of other tasks society sets the collective. Public ownership, which makes it possible in principle to harmonise the interests of society, the collective and the individual, forms the material base for discharging the target-objective and socio-integra-

tional functions of S.C. The depth and concrete character of such an accord, however, depend largely on the way the system of collectives is administered, and on the collectives themselves. Hence the third function of S.C.—the administrative-educational function—which ensures the discharging of the first two. It consists in the regulation of all the collective's structures and processes in accordance with the needs of the evolution of society and the collective itself, taking account of the individual features of its members. The extent to which this function is implemented depends on the vigour of the members of the collective and on its governability as a whole. The unity of the individual and S.C. is not absolute and does not embrace all aspects of the former's activities. As a rule, the individual belongs to several collectives simultaneously (labour, sport, community, etc.), his various gifts being developed each in a particular collective. The versatility of the individual is a requisite for his relative freedom of behaviour as a member of a particular S.C. Being influenced by society as a whole, the individual sometimes understands the tasks facing S.C. better than most of its other members. In this case it is his right and duty to come out against the majority of the collective's members but in the interests of society at large and, in the final analysis, in the interests of the collective itself. The governability of S.C. as a criterion for the fulfilment of its administrative-educational function reflects the correspondence between the two subsystems of the collective—the one that governs and the one that is governed. The administrative bodies of S.C. are faced with making it more governable; the processes under way in S.C. thus increasingly correspond to the demands made on it by society.

The three basic functions determine the existence of three types of S.C. structure. The first is the target structure, which provides for the implementation of the target-objective function. It is formalised in relevant regulations and is therefore often called a formal structure. For example, the collective of an enter-

prise is subdivided into collectives of auxiliary sections, shops, offices, shop sections, teams, laboratories, etc. The second type, the social structure of the collective proper, corresponds to the socio-integrational function; it is made up of social groups, its elements being of a class, professional, qualification, demographic, and socio-psychological (non-formal) nature. And finally, the administrative-educational function is formalised in the organisational structure of its administration, consisting of two major types of administrative body: the administrative-purposive and the socio-political. The former are built in accordance with the demands presented by the management of some particular type of activity, which comprises the target-objective function of a given collective, and the latter reflect the role played by S.C. in the socio-political organisation of socialist society. Thus, work collectives enjoy the right to nominate deputies to the elected bodies of Soviet power, to hear reports by deputies about discharging their duties, etc.; within these collectives, primary party, trade union, Komsomol and other mass organisations are established, the result being that S.C. functions not only as the object, but also as the subject of administration. All these bodies interact with and mutually complement one another, making up an integral system of administration and self-government of S.C., with the Party organisation at the head. The various types of structure may be well-coordinated, which markedly raises the effect of the S.C.'s activities; or they may fall into discord, as a result of which this effect is lowered. As personal relations between people affect their behaviour, their attitude to work included, the officially established optimal ratio between the formal and the socio-psychological, non-formal, structures is of considerable importance.

All functions and criteria of the S.C. effectiveness are interrelated and form an integral system that evolves as the whole of society develops. During the scientific and technological revolution (q. v.), when the rates of the economic, social and cultural development of society and its basic cells sharply increase, this mutual

interconnection is expressed in dynamism, which is a specific criterion of the S.C. effectiveness reflecting the rates and ratios of the changes that occur in all spheres of its vital activity. S.C. is a highly-dynamic system, involving complex processes; those characterising the target-objective activity of a collective (e.g. labour) affect all social processes, first and foremost the formation and development of the value orientations of its members. The former are meticulously planned and standardised, while the latter occur largely spontaneously, of themselves. The adoption and implementation of an administrative decision occupy a prominent place among the S.C. administrative processes; there are also communicative and normative processes (the action of the set of stimuli and sanctions ensuring that the members of the collective abide by its accepted norms). There are also group processes, such as guidance and leadership in primary collectives, their consolidation and dissociation, the individual's inclusion in or exclusion from a group, etc., which occur within the framework of various social groups in S.C. The way S.C. fulfils its functions is summarily expressed in the processes characterising its genesis. According to their thrust, they fall into progressive (S.C.'s inception, growth and purposeful reorganisation) and regressive ones (retarded development, crisis, collapse). The intensity of the changes that occur in S.C. during the scientific and technological revolution makes genetic processes particularly important. S.C. is a complex social cell, oriented not only on the implementation of its target-objective function, but also on its own development as a social community, coinciding with the interests of socialist society as a whole. This is manifested most graphically in the wide spread of social planning (q. v.) as a new, democratic method of accelerating S.C.'s evolution towards higher, communist forms.

**Socialist Community** — see World Socialist Community

**Socialist Consciousness** is the sum total of the various forms of social consciousness characterising the intellectual life of socialist society during its emergence,

establishment and further development. S.C. contains both the systematised theoretical views and ideas of the working class and its vanguard, the Communist Party (see *Communist Ideology*), and the people's ordinary views, notions, feelings and moods that arise in everyday life, i. e. social psychology.

S.C. takes root deep within capitalism and expresses a spontaneous protest against exploitation (q. v.). But we can only speak of S.C. proper once the scientific concept takes shape about the fundamental interests and role of the proletariat (see *Historic Mission of the Proletariat*). This concept does not arise directly from the class psychology of the proletariat fighting against the bourgeoisie. Spontaneously, Lenin showed, the proletariat can only produce a trade union consciousness, that is awareness of the need to fight for an improvement of their economic position still within the capitalist framework. S.C. emerges from a scientific analysis of social relations, critical reassessment of the intellectual legacy of the past and, above all, represents a revolutionary scientific theory. This theory is Marxism-Leninism (q. v.).

S.C. is active in the life of society. Taking hold of the masses, it organises them in a bid to overthrow the bourgeoisie and build socialist and communist society. S.C. is introduced into the working-class movement and the midst of the working people by the Communist Parties, and not only in the abstract, theoretical form, but, above all, in the form of ideas directly linked with the practical interests of the working people. This process unfolds in a sharp struggle against the bourgeois and petty-bourgeois ideology imposed on the working people by the conditions of life in an antagonistic class society and by bourgeois propaganda.

In socialist society, S.C. is comprehensive in nature, incorporating all forms of social consciousness (political, legal and philosophical views, morality, science and art), except religion, which is a "vestigial" form of social consciousness that fails to conform to the objective conditions of the life and development of socialist society. Unlike the social conscious-

ness in antagonistic formations, marked by polarisation of and struggle between opposite class ideologies, S.C. is inherently integral.

S.C., like social consciousness in general, is relatively independent. This is expressed, in particular, in the specific action of two opposite tendencies: its lag behind social being, on the one hand, and its anticipation of the latter, on the other. Survivals of the past in the people's minds and behaviour (q. v.), revived and supported by bourgeois ideology, the persistence of the "birthmarks" of past ages in the economy and everyday life, and certain shortcomings and difficulties in society's development affect the general level of S.C. It is therefore necessary for the vestiges of the past to be fought comprehensively and for the Party to show a constant concern for promoting the people's readiness, will and ability to build communism.

Since developed socialist society (q. v.) was built, the tendency for S.C. to reflect reality in advance has been gaining momentum, this reflection being based on scientific foresight of the course of events. The subjective factor is coming to play a growing role not only in revolutionary periods, as was the case under the earlier socio-economic formations, but also during the entire period of the building of the new society, when conscious and planned development increasingly replaces the spontaneous historical process. On the basis of a knowledge of the laws of social development, the 1977 Constitution of the USSR notes that the Communist Party guides the entire process of building communism, making it organised and planned.

S.C. as a vital social phenomenon develops and improves, eventually growing into communist consciousness. The formation of communist consciousness is a long and complex process based on the creation of the material and technical base of communism (q. v.), the development of socialist social relations into communist relations, and systematic work involved in the communist education (q. v.) of the working people through a comprehensive approach to education.

**Socialist Emulation** is a form of the manifestation and development of the working people's creative initiative and democracy in a socialist society. S.E. is expressed in the working people's the effort to fulfil commitments to attain higher results in production, improve socialist social relations, and raise the people's cultural and intellectual levels. Emulation is a social relation of competition, in which workers display their energy and creative abilities.

Some form of emulation is inherent in any form of people's joint activity. Marx wrote: "...mere social contact begets in most industries an emulation and a stimulation of the animal spirits that heighten the efficiency of each individual workman" (K. Marx, *Capital*, Vol. I, p. 309). Any form of emulation reflects social relations that take shape in the labour process. Under capitalism, emulation takes the form of competition in the pursuit of profit, expressed in a striving to outmatch the rival in the life struggle, at any cost.

Unlike capitalist competition, which disunites and opposes people, isolating them from one another, S.E. objectively unites them in joint labour activity to attain common objectives. In the USSR, S.E. has passed through several forms in its development, from communist subbotniks (voluntary work on days off) to the movement for a communist attitude to work. The types of S.E. are many: efforts to become the best worker, to raise labour productivity, to ensure smooth production, to combine trades and professions, to improve qualifications, etc. Various initiatives have become widespread, such as the team contracting method, personal efficiency accounts, and so on.

S.E. is a powerful lever for economic and social progress, a school of political, labour and moral education for working people. Its main function is an economic one, i.e., to raise the efficiency of social production, attain the best economic results, higher productivity, a scientific organisation of labour, etc. S.E. orients the workers on producing more and of better quality. At the same time, it helps form people's creative abilities and is instru-

mental in eliminating essential differences between mental and manual labour, in making labour a primary vital need. The 1977 Constitution of the USSR regards S.E. as a factor promoting the growth of labour productivity, increasing production efficiency and improving the quality of work.

S.E. helps improve socialist relations of production and is an important means of moulding the new man; it educates people in the spirit of a communist attitude to work and public property, develops their initiative, and stimulates their production and social activity. An indispensable element of S.E. is mutual assistance. At the same time, it does not rule out healthy competitiveness, which is a must in emulation, and involves a striving to prove one's merits through work.

Lenin considered the organisation of S.E. a task of state importance and formulated a number of principles on which it must be based: publicity, comparability of results, and the possibility of the practical application of advanced experience. An important role in the organisation of S.E. at all stages of socialist society has been played by the CPSU, the trade unions and the Young Communist League. Trade unions, together with the management, are direct organisers of S.E.

S.E. must be strictly differentiated, taking account of the specific features of different categories of working people, their interests, requirements, ambitions and qualifications. The drafting and adoption of socialist commitments must proceed from the aims and tasks set for enterprises and industries for a given period of industrial development. S.E. is organised well when socialist commitments are economically justified, i.e. when a number of economic and technical measures have been worked out to ensure their fulfilment. Improvement of the organisation of S.E. must consist in strengthening its democratic principles, developing publicity of it, involving more emulators in the discussion and adoption of commitments, utilising continuity, accumulated experience and innovation, making more concrete points in commitments, developing contractual principles (bilate-



ral and multilateral commitments), and improving control over the fulfilment of commitments. It also requires more exactness in awarding the titles of collectives and workers of communist labour, as well as improvement of material and moral incentives. Special attention is focused in the organisation of S.E. on moral incentives, the proportion of which is growing during the building of communism.

At the current stage in the development of socialist society in the USSR, S.E. is acquiring qualitatively new features. S.E. today is inseparable from the scientific and technological revolution (q.v.). Its character in the period of developed socialism is determined by the changes that have taken place in the economy, the tremendous increase in its scale, its more intricate structure, the efforts to raise production efficiency and improve its quality. All this requires a more organic combination of state planning and initiatives from below, at the grassroots level. Under contemporary conditions, S.E. must help increase the rate of scientific and technological progress and create an atmosphere of a massive creative search and intolerance towards technical and scientific conservatism in every work collective. "To work without lagging behind" is one of the slogans at the present-day stage of S.E. It is becoming increasingly popular to work out socialist commitments to bring out and utilise internal reserves concurrently with drafting plans, as well as to include commitments in production programmes and advance counter-plans. S.E. has become truly country-wide, embracing all spheres of the Soviet economy. The social composition of emulators has also become all-embracing. S.E. has acquired international character within the CMEA framework (see World Socialist Community). All this requires a scientific approach to the organisation of S.E. and guidance of its development.

**Socialist International** is an international association of Social-Democratic parties pursuing a reformist line in the working-class movement. As of November 1977 it is consisted of 38 parties, plus 16 parties with an advisory status (of which nine

are "parties in exile", the Bulgarian, the Czech, the Latvian, etc.), and also two "fraternal organisations" (International Council of Social-Democratic Women and Union of Socialist Youth) and nine associated organisations (International Jewish Labour Bund, the International Union of Social-Democratic Teachers, etc.). Typical of the S.I.'s ideological and political platform is reformism (q.v.) (see also "Democratic Socialism"), a policy of modernising and "refurbishing" capitalism, rather than accomplishing a socialist revolution.

The First Congress of S.I. (Frankfurt on the Main, July 1951) proclaimed the liberal-democratic programme of "refurbishing" the capitalist system as the basis for the activities of Social-Democracy (q.v.) and rejected the Marxist teaching of socialism. By discarding the principles of proletarian solidarity, the Congress in fact joined the foreign political strategy of imperialism. It adopted a declaration entitled "Aims and Tasks of Democratic Socialism", and a S.I. Charter. The S.I. leaders insist that S.I. does not determine the policy of Socialist parties, but merely registers it. The resolutions passed by S.I. congresses are therefore binding only on those parties that vote for them. Subsequent congresses of S.I. have interpreted Social-Democracy's political positions on the topical problems of the day. They devote considerable attention to international issues, the discussions showing that the S.I. usually follows in the trail of imperialist policies, actively supporting the system of military blocs. The resolutions on the colonial question and the situation in the Third World countries testified that the S.I. was attempting to channel the national liberation movement towards reformism. The S.I. leaders also took an extreme anti-communist stand in their attitude to the international communist movement and to the socialist countries during the discussion of the "Hungarian question" and the "Czechoslovak question". They tried to prove that only democratic socialism could make man free, although the Social-Democratic governments themselves abolished neither capitalist exploitation nor monopoly

oppression. Despite the S.I. leaders' assertions that they continue the traditions of the First International (q. v.), they failed to refute the fact that the whole history of reformism is one of departure from Marxism, which culminated in its transition to the anti-Marxist stand.

In recent years, S.I. activities have featured new trends reflecting the collapse of the rigid anti-communist course pursued by Social-Democratic leaders. They have also betrayed contradictions between a striving to take a realistic approach to the problems discussed (the general situation in the world, Social-Democracy and the developing countries, disarmament) and traditional anti-communism (q. v.), which blocks the way to political realism, to the unity of action of all working-class detachments. The latest congresses of the S.I. (in Vienna in 1972, in Geneva in 1976 and in Vancouver in 1978) showed, in particular, that on major foreign political issues Social-Democracy is evolving in a positive direction. There have also been changes in its relations with Communist Parties. Whereas, earlier, any form of co-operation with the latter was resolutely condemned, today it is recognised that S.I. parties are "free to decide" on establishing contacts with Communists. In general, however, the S.I. keeps to right-wing opportunist, reformist positions.

**Socialist Internationalism** is a principle in international relations that characterises the solution of international, inter-state problems in the socialist world. It is a continuation and development of proletarian internationalism (q. v.). The main distinctive feature of S.I. is that its sphere is the socialist world and the inter-national and inter-state relations taking shape within it, as well as the conception and formulation of the principles and norms of these relations. S.I. is a major part of the Marxist-Leninist theory on the international position and the international role of the socialist countries (see World Socialist System) in the working people's struggle for emancipation, on the correlation of the national and the international under socialism, on the essence of inter-relations between socialist nations, nation-

alities and countries, and the principles and norms that should be followed in building and developing these relations. The essence of S.I. as a guide to action is a series of fundamental principles stemming from an internationalist approach to socio-political reality and realised in practical measures. In this respect, S.I. incorporates more concrete principles, such as that of united action, all-round co-operation, gratuitous assistance, mutual support and fraternal mutual assistance, joint defence of socialist gains, and others.

S.I. arose as a phenomenon and category from the working class's seizure of power, the establishment of real socialism and the development of socialist relations between nations, nationalities and countries. S.I. went through its initial stages of development in post-revolutionary Russia when, with the establishment of the dictatorship of the proletariat (q. v.) in the form of Soviet power, fundamentally new relations began to take shape among nations and nationalities and among the independent Soviet republics. When the Soviet Union came into existence in 1922, S.I. was further developed in the relations between republics and nations within the Soviet state. As the new system transcended the bounds of a single state and, eventually, as the world socialist system took shape, a new stage set in in the development of S.I.: internationalist relations arose in the inter-national communications inside the socialist countries and between them.

The objective bases of S.I. are rooted in the fundamentally new social relations endemic to the socialist world, as well as in large-scale industrial production and the consequent internationalisation of the economy and the entire life of society, and in their specific manifestations under socialism. Specifically, reference is made to the common political system as the power of the working class and, eventually, as socialism has been built, the common social-political system; the common fundamental interests of the working class wielding power in the respective countries and, eventually, the common fundamental interests of the socialist nations. To this

must be added the common nature of the main adversary, imperialism (q.v.), as long as it exists alongside the socialist world; the common nature of the principal allies, the revolutionary forces in the non-socialist world; the common problems being tackled in building the new society, and the ultimate objective of the struggle, the building of communism (q.v.). These and other circumstances make S.I. the internationalism of a socialist nation that is being or has been formed, the internationalism of the entire people. In power, the working class has qualitatively new objective opportunities and international obligations: both it and the entire nation must be ready to take all types of united action with the revolutionaries of other countries, must be ready to render material, military and any other assistance to the peoples of these countries waging liberation struggles, for internationalism means that "a nation which is achieving victory over the bourgeoisie should be able and willing to make the greatest national sacrifices for the overthrow of international capital" (V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 31, p. 148).

S.I. is an objective necessity in the relations between the socialist countries. The history of the socialist world has provided numerous irrefutable examples of how mutual assistance, disinterested support, fraternal co-operation and united action on the basis of the principles of S.I. have promoted the fulfilment of socialism's tasks in individual countries and in the world socialist community as a whole. It would be wrong to believe, however, that fraternal co-operation on the basis of S.I. is only directed at solving problems arising in the socialist world. Bourgeois and opportunist ideologists today falsify the essence of S.I. in an attempt to divorce it from and oppose it to proletarian I., presenting it as a principle that "disciplines" special regional relations within the socialist world, allegedly "closes in" on its own problems and thus isolates the Communist and Workers' Parties in the non-socialist world. Such assertions have nothing in common with reality. S.I. as realisation of proletarian I. under socialism retains its general

essence intact, viz. the struggle for the ultimate objectives of the international revolutionary working-class movement. Possessing the new potentialities, the working class and all the working people of the socialist countries make a decisive contribution to this struggle. Socialist internationalism is high responsibility for the destinies of socialism not only in one's own country, but in the entire world. It means the highest respect for the national and historical features of the development of each country and determination to render the broadest support to one another. It means the profound understanding of the historic role played by the socialist countries in the world revolutionary process, in the support of the liberation, anti-imperialist struggle of nations.

**Socialist Orientation in the Developing Countries** — see the Non-capitalist Path of Development

**Socialist-Oriented Developing Countries** — see Non-capitalist Path of Development

**Social Socialist Property** implies social ownership of the means of production; it is the core of the economic system of socialism and is the expression of the relations between the members of socialist society in joint, collective appropriation of the material conditions for social production. Public ownership of the means of production is the cornerstone of socialism and the main source of its progress.

The types of property change in the course of historical development. This change is ultimately dictated by the level and nature of the material productive forces. Historically, the first type of property was social in its simplest communal form. This situation came about as a result of joint labour and the low level of the productive forces in the primitive-communal system. The evolution of labour implements, labour experience and knowledge led to the emergence of private property, which dominated the slave-owning, feudal, and capitalist societies. Under capitalism, private property reaches its apex. The social nature of production under

capitalism comes into conflict with the private capitalist form of appropriation and creates the conditions for eliminating private property. This conflict is resolved by socialist revolution, which establishes S.S.P.

S.S.P., in its content, essentially differs from all preceding types of property. It unites people, eliminates the antagonism of classes and exploitation (q. v.) of man by man, and establishes relations of comradesly co-operation and socialist mutual aid. It entails a radical change of society's economic system: the goal of production and the means to achieve it become different; it creates both the possibility of and the need for planned, balanced development of the national economy; the nature of labour, forms of distribution and exchange are transformed; a new economic mechanism is established.

The domination of S.S.P. in the means of production generates common interests not only in social production but in all other aspects of social life as well. Friendship and co-operation between nations replaces strife and hostility, characteristic of capitalist society. The economic causes of wars between states disappear. The drive to conquer and enslave other peoples is alien to socialist society. S.S.P. helps people liberate themselves from a private property-oriented mentality and acquire a communist ideology (q. v.).

In developed socialist society (q. v.) that has been established in the USSR, S.S.P. exists in two forms, state (public) and co-operative and collective-farm. In addition, S.S.P. also includes the possessions trade unions and other social organisations require for performing their functions as specified in their rules. Personal property (q. v.) is also preserved. The existence of the two forms of S.S.P. is attributable to historical conditions. In the proletarian revolution, the working class cannot take the same view of different forms of private property. Big private, mostly capitalist property is expropriated and transferred to the socialist state (see Nationalisation). This leads to the emergence of a socialist state and public property. The small private prop-

erty of peasants and artisans cannot be expropriated, so another form of socialisation is used — co-operation (see Agricultural Co-operation). The basic means of production of small peasants are united and socialist collective-farm and co-operative property emerges. These forms of social property determine both the nature of the Soviet economy and the division of Soviet society into two friendly classes — workers and peasants.

The state and collective-farm and co-operative forms of property belong to the same type. State enterprises and collective farms rely on socialised means of production and collective work, preclude exploitation of man by man, do business in a planned way to satisfy the constantly growing needs of working people, and implement the socialist principle of distribution according to work done.

On the other hand, there are certain differences between these forms of S.S.P., chiefly in the degree of socialisation, specifics of management, planning and marketing of output, remuneration of people engaged in production, etc. State property is the main, leading one. It accounts for over 90 per cent of fixed assets in the national economy. In the course of the evolution of socialist society and the building of communism, the state and the collective-farm and co-operative forms of S.S.P. converge and, at a certain stage, will merge into one communist property (see Convergence and Fusion of the Forms of Socialist Property).

The question of property is the subject of a fierce ideological struggle. The extensive development of the state form of capitalist property in the modern capitalist world has inspired numerous theories on the "transformation of capitalism". Bourgeois ideologists assert that, under contemporary conditions, a "property revolution" takes place, leading to property "scattering" or "diffusion". In reality, no such revolution occurs. The numerous corporate societies where some stocks are purchased by workers do not cancel out private property. The workers still do not own means of production and are still exploited by capitalists. Private property is being centralised by an ever smaller

group of monopolists. Some bourgeois ideologists and reformists formulate a proposition to the effect that the nature of property in the means of production is the same under both socialism and capitalism, on the grounds that any state property is socialist. In reality, only under socialism is state property socialist, whereas in bourgeois society, state, or, to be more precise, state-monopoly property does not change its nature; its class essence remains that of private capitalist property. Right-wing revisionists view state property under socialism as "indirectly public" or even state-capitalist, while group property is declared as "directly public". This, in point of fact, is an anarcho-syndicalistic idea. Group property is socialist in nature only if the decisive means of production are public, socialist property. "Left" revisionists deny personal property as well as the socialist nature of collective-farm and co-operative property. All these assertions conflict with Marxism-Leninism and are refuted by the practice of building socialism.

**Socialist Way of Life**, the forms of human activity inherent in socialism and dictated by the conditions of life within the framework of the first phase of communism. S.W.L. is directly opposite to the bourgeois way of life, chiefly because of the fundamental difference in their economic bases. Private ownership of the means of production generates exploitation (q. v.) of man by man; the division of society into antagonistic classes pursuing different ways of life estranges people and results in the most harsh competition between them under capitalism. Social socialist property (q. v.) unites people through relations of comradesly co-operation in socialist mutual assistance and eliminates social antagonisms and competition between people. Consequently, a certain mode of production is also "...a definite form of activity of these individuals, a definite form of expressing their life, a definite *mode of life* on their part. As individuals express their life, so they are. What they are, therefore, coincides with their production, both with *what* they produce and with *how* they produce. Hence what individuals are depends on

the material conditions of their production" (K. Marx and F. Engels, *Collected Works*, Vol. 5, pp. 31-32).

In any society, including a socialist one, the main forms of human activity are their work and use of their working time, their activity at home, their socio-political activity, their activity in the sphere of intellectual culture, and, consequently, the way they use their free time (q. v.), and also the interrelationships between people, characteristic of the particular society, everyday habits and rules of behaviour. The essence of and relations between these forms of activity are radically different under socialism and capitalism. This does not eliminate certain common features such as in the way working activities are organised, in types of housing, communications, etc., which are directly attributable to the level of the productive forces, science and technology. Even these common features dictated by the modern scientific and technological revolution (q. v.) take different shapes in different societies. The way of life is a social rather than a technological concept; its decisive features are dictated by the system of relations of production.

In the sphere of work, S.W.L. implies, first of all, emancipation of labour from exploitation and work becoming a universal duty of the members of the society and an instrument of individual development. Labour becomes a criterion of man's value and determines his position in society. Under capitalism, working time is, as it were, taken away from the worker. In Marx's words, "The worker ... only feels himself outside his work, and in his work feels outside himself. He feels at home when he is not working, and when he is working he does not feel at home" (K. Marx and F. Engels, *Collected Works*, Vol. 3, p. 274). This is a property of alienated labour, which creates an antagonistic opposition between working time and leisure time. But the very existence of this opposition is a characteristic feature of the proletarian's way of life when work is imposed on him and becomes only a way of earning a living. Elimination of this opposition is a characteristic feature of the way of life

under socialism. Marx noted that, in bourgeois society, live labour serves only as a tool for increasing accumulated labour, whereas in communist society, on the contrary, "accumulated labour is but a means to widen, to enrich, to promote the existence of the labourer" (K. Marx and F. Engels, *Collected Works*, Vol. 6, p. 499). Under socialism the content of the labour process becomes richer and richer and normal working conditions are ensured. On the other hand, the S.W.L., under which economic work incentives for each individual and legal norms that regulate labour are still necessary, is different from the communist way of life in the future, when labour will become the primary vital requirement for all members of society. As the advance to communism continues, labour and leisure time will be used increasingly to ensure the well-being of the entire society and the comprehensive development of the individual. A characteristic feature of the socialist (and, even more so, communist) way of life is collectivism (q.v.) as opposed to bourgeois individualism. Socialist society is true collectivism, unlike the apparent collectivism under capitalism. This true collectivism is not opposed to the development of individuality; rather, it creates realistic conditions for this development. It is only in a collective that an individual can develop all his gifts and talents. Collective and individual features are combined in all spheres of the life of socialist society. Thus, in the sphere of the economy, public ownership of the means of production is combined with personal property (see Personal Property under Socialism).

Humanism (q.v.), concern of society or a collective for man, is a characteristic feature of the S.W.L. Under capitalism, a working man is merely an object of exploitation, he is essentially depersonified. For socialist society man is the ultimate value. Its motto is "everything for the sake of man, for the benefit of man". The working man has become the master of all the country's riches and the bearer of political power. The inter-relationships between the individual and society are not antagonistic; on the contra-

ry, they become increasingly harmonious. A combination of the interests of society and the individual is a principle of S.W.L. Implementation of this principle demands that society care for the individual, create the conditions for his comprehensive development and that the individual care for society, and understand the primacy of social interests. Neglect of society's interests, as occasionally manifested today, is a legacy from the bourgeois and petty-bourgeois ways of life, a result of the contradictions that remain because of the insufficient development of productive forces and social relations during the first phase of communism. Vestiges of the past in people's minds and activities are gradually overcome as communism is built.

S.W.L. is imbued with a spirit of internationalism. In socialist society, nations are equal in fact, as well as in law, in their economic, political, and cultural development; on the one hand, the conditions have been created for the comprehensive development of each nation or nationality and, on the other hand, for them to draw together, for exchange of material and cultural values, and for fraternal mutual assistance. In this respect, S.W.L. is opposite to the bourgeois way of life, for under capitalism nations are inevitably divided into oppressing and oppressed, developed and developing, while nationalism (q.v.) and chauvinism are essential ingredients.

The fundamental features of S.W.L. are common to all countries where socialism has triumphed. This does not, however, eliminate certain specifics in the way of life of peoples, caused by the remaining differences in their levels of development and in the specifics of the sectoral structures of their economies, by national traditions and habits, and by forms of national culture. The widespread concept of the Soviet way of life chiefly coincides with that of S.W.L., though the latter is a more general concept embodying the characteristic features of the way of life not only in the USSR, the first socialist country that has advanced to the stage of mature socialism, but also in other socialist countries which are still engaged in building mature socialism.

A characteristic feature of socialist

countries is the social-political and ideological unity of society (q.v.), but full social homogeneity has not been achieved. Substantial differences remain between town and country, between mental and manual workers, and social and class distinctions still exist. All these differences affect the way of life. Further increase in the uniformity of the living conditions and ways of life of all social groups is a major task involved in the building of communism.

S.W.L. incorporates truly democratic norms that have become rules of behaviour in society, where man is no longer guided by the old watchword "the devil may care" but by the new one "I care about everything". This way of life encourages the individual's activities in both the sphere of labour and that of socio-political life (see Social Activity; Individual under Socialism).

In advanced capitalist countries great riches have been accumulated but they serve only the wealthy minority. The working people have an insecure future; unemployment is a constant threat. S.W.L. gives people confidence in their future; this confidence relies on the actually exercised right of citizens to work according to their abilities and receive remuneration according to its quantity and quality. Under socialism, there is no unemployment; the economy is managed in a planned way. The way of life is a broad sociological category, only some aspects of which are covered by such concepts as "the standard of living" or "the quality of life". The standard of living is an economic category measurable chiefly in terms of quantitative indices, such as real family or individual incomes, the quantity of consumer goods per capita, etc. The concept "quality of life" cannot be treated separately from quantitative indices as bourgeois economists and sociologists sometimes try to do (see Quality of Life Concepts). Quantitative and qualitative indices, treated together, reveal both the basic advantages of S.W.L. over the bourgeois way of life and the problems to be resolved for its further improvement, for its growth into the superior, communist way of life

**Soviet People**, a new historical, social and international community of people that arose in the USSR thanks to the victory of socialism, the overcoming of class and national antagonisms, the drawing closer together of different classes, social groups, nations and nationalities as a result of the building of developed socialism (see Developed Socialist Society) and establishment of a close, unbreakable unity of all classes and social strata, all nations and nationalities and of harmonious relations among them. It is a socialist union, a kind of social alloy of all the working people of the USSR, which forms the social basis of the Soviet multinational state of the whole people (see State of the Whole People). An important feature of developed socialism is the formation of the historically new social and international community, the S.P. This means that the common features of Soviet people that do not depend on their social and national distinctions are becoming decisive in their behaviour, character and world outlook.

The economic basis of the S.P. is social socialist property (q.v.) and a planned national economy. The economy of the USSR is a single, highly developed economic complex, a stable material basis for the further strengthening of the social and international unity of the S.P. The S.P.'s features stem from the single type of the social structure of developed socialist society and its steadily growing social homogeneity (see Social Structure of Socialist Society). The political basis of the S.P. is the united Soviet socialist multinational state of the whole people, the socialist homeland (q.v.), which is common for all Soviet nations and nationalities. The Soviet federation, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, embodies the state unity of the S.P. and serves as its constitutional form. Soviet people of different nationalities, as well as members of different classes and social groups, are united in a new community by Marxist-Leninist ideology, the socialist content of their national cultures, and the common aims and ways of social development, the building of communism.

The formation of the S.P. has been a

long, complex and multifaceted process including two main stages, the period of transition from capitalism to socialism (q. v.), during which the major prerequisites for and foundations of the new historical community were laid, and the period of building developed socialism, when this community took shape. At different stages of Soviet society, the concept of the S.P. has had different contents. Prior to the victory of socialism, it mainly reflected the state unification of the working people in the USSR, within the framework of Soviet government and on the basis of its principles, a unification that rested primarily on the political consciousness of advanced workers, led by Communists. The victory of socialism laid the foundations for the unity of all society, for this concept came to denote a working people's society consisting solely of socialist classes and nations of the same type. Under developed socialism, the S.P. constitutes a historically new community of people. This reflects a qualitatively new level in the unity and cohesion of Soviet society, when the common features of Soviet people that do not depend on their social and national affiliation gain steadily in importance.

The S.P. are a historically new type of community of people because, first, this community is, by its nature, socialist, having arisen as a natural result of the socialist transformation of all classes and nations, all aspects of social life on the principles of collectivism (q. v.) endemic to socialism. Second, the S.P. are a broader community than a separate class or nation, i. e. an inter-class and inter-national (multinational, international) community. Third, the S.P. are marked by unprecedentedly deep and stable social (inter-class, inter-national and interpersonal) ties, determined by the unity of the basic aims and interests of the classes, nations and people forming this community. Fourth, the S.P. are a qualitatively new stage in the implementation of the communist ideal of an integrated mankind with no class or national distinctions.

The S.P. are an organic unity and harmonious combination of the general, mass, international, and the particular, specifically class and national, with the

general Soviet, international element playing the leading role. It would, therefore, be incorrect to consider the formation of this community as the disappearance of classes and the achievement of complete social homogeneity of society or as fusion of nations and formation of a "single Soviet nation".

The formation and development of the S.P. results from the interaction of the two main processes in the social development of socialist society — the free and all-round development of each class, each nation and their increasing convergence. The general Soviet and class, international and national elements are by no means opposed in the S.P.; rather they supplement and mutually enrich each other.

The most important and general feature in the development of the S.P. is a further strengthening of its social and international unity. This process is based on a steady convergence of all classes and social groups of Soviet society and its increasing social homogeneity (see Obliteration of Socio-Class Distinctions; Social-Political and Ideological Unity of Society) and internationalisation of all aspects of the life of Soviet nations and nationalities (see National Relations under Socialism; Friendship among Peoples).

Internationalisation of all aspects of the life of Soviet nations and nationalities is a logical, progressive process stemming, above all, from the material conditions under which socialism and communism are built in a multinational country. The huge volume of tasks tackled in this process, the rapid growth of the productive forces, which increasingly spread beyond the bounds of individual national regions, the unprecedented scale of building projects, the socialist division of labour, and other factors determine the objective need for a deepening and expansion of co-operation and mutual assistance between all Soviet nations and nationalities, the pooling of their constructive efforts, material and manpower resources in tackling the countrywide tasks. The growing migration results in diverse multinational composition of the population in all Soviet republics and regions.

Loyalty to the cause of communism,



Soviet patriotism and socialist internationalism (q.v.); a high degree of labour and socio-political activity, socialist collectivism and comradely mutual assistance; irreconcilability towards exploitation and oppression, national and racial enmity, towards the foes of peace, friendship and freedom of peoples; class solidarity with the working people of all countries — these are just a few of the common features characterising the intellectual make-up of Soviet people. The feeling of national pride is not alien to them, but this feeling is not limited to the narrow framework of some single nation. It is much broader and deeper, for it includes, above all, a feeling of love for and pride in the multinational socialist homeland.

The history of the formation and development of the S.P. shows the laws behind and the ways taken by the gradual obliteration of class and national distinctions. The way to a single classless and nation-free communist society is not to mechanically discard class and national forms of social life, but to make full use of their potentialities, to ensure the all-out unfolding and synthesis, at a higher level, of all the finest and most progressive characteristics of each class and nation. This process has nothing in common with either social levelling or denationalisation of social life, as is often alleged by bourgeois and revisionist propaganda. The S.P. is a transitional community of people on the way from class and national communities to the future worldwide, overall human community under communism. The 26th CPSU Congress put forward the proposition that, by and large, a classless social structure is established within the historical framework of developed socialism.

Soviets are government bodies in the USSR, elected by the whole people, the most representative and mass organisations, combining features of state bodies and social organisations; the fullest embodiment of the democratic nature of the socialist state.

The S. (councils) appeared in 1905 as organs of armed insurrection (q.v.), formed by the revolutionary endeavour of the popular masses, "as a product of the native genius of the people, as a mani-

festation of the independent activity of the people" (V.I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 10, p. 243). In their development, the S., which came into being from among the most revolutionary class, the proletariat, relied on ever broader sections of the population to become an organisation of the entire working people. The S. are an organisational form of the alliance of workers and peasants (see Alliance of the Working Class and the Peasantry) at all stages of its development; they are also an organisational form in which the socio-political and ideological unity of the Soviet people has been consolidated.

After the proletariat won power the S. became a state form of the dictatorship of the proletariat (q.v.). Being the most democratic, representative institutions of the working people, the S. established a new state machinery on the ruins of the old one. They acquired a new quality of being both state and social organisations. Once the tasks of proletarian dictatorship had been fulfilled the S. formed the basis of the state of the whole people (q.v.).

A new historical community of people, the Soviet people, has taken shape thanks to the powerful development of the productive forces, the mature socialist relations of production, the drawing together of all classes and social sections, the legal and actual equality of all nations and nationalities, and their fraternal unity in developed socialist society. For this reason, the 1977 Constitution of the USSR defines the political basis of the USSR as Soviets of People's Deputies through which the people exercise state power.

The main feature of the S. is that they are both bodies of state authority and the most mass-scale social organisations. The democratic state principle is here combined with the potent principle of self-government. Thus, the S. embody the abolition of antagonism between society and the state and consolidate their unity.

The S. are the only and sovereign bodies of authority in the USSR. They comprise a single system both in the centre

and at the local level, the Supreme Soviet of the USSR being the highest body of this system and the effective vehicle of the people's sovereignty. The supreme bodies of authority in the USSR and the Union and Autonomous republics form organs of state administration: the Council of Ministers of the USSR, the Councils of Ministers of Union and Autonomous republics. The local Soviets form executive committees. The bodies of state administration are fully responsible and accountable to the bodies of state authority. The S. as organs of power are structured on the principle of democratic centralism (q.v.). The S.'s activities are regulated by the Constitution of the USSR and other state acts of law.

The S. are the fullest expression of socialist democracy (see Democracy, Socialist). The building of communism is marked by a further democratisation of the S., by developing the principles of self-government in them, above all, the democratic principles of electivity, replaceability, accountability and publicity.

Unlike bourgeois parliamentarianism, based on the principle of division of power, the S. as bodies of state authority are both legislative and executive. Lenin saw this feature of theirs not only in the executive bodies of all links being formed by the respective S. and being fully accountable to them, but also in the fact that the deputies themselves must both discuss and adopt laws and decisions, and execute them. Lenin foresaw that "the further development of the Soviet organisation of the state must consist in every member of a Soviet being obliged to carry out constant work in administering the state, alongside participation in meetings of the Soviet..." (V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 27, p. 155). The enhancement of the deputies' role and enervation of their activities is an important line in the further democratisation of the S. It is expressed in the deputies making more regular reports to their electorate, in the electors' right to recall their deputies before the expiry of their term of office if they fail to satisfy the electors' confidence, in

the systematic renovation of S. membership, etc.

The main forms of deputies' activity are S. sessions and work on sectoral standing committees. Standing committees are now gradually becoming executive and administrative bodies. In some regions, towns and districts, certain functions of executive committee departments have already been assigned to standing committees. The S.'s right to set up standing committees was fixed in the 1977 Constitution of the USSR. This enabled the S. to assume more directly administrative functions in various spheres of the life of society, as well as general leadership, and to pursue the principle of accountability of executive bodies to the representative ones more consistently, etc.

The S. are the most all-embracing, mass and genuinely internationalist organisations, they unite and represent the entire people, the whole of the adult population, while all other organisations incorporate only some citizens. "The Soviets, which combine the features of a government body and a mass organisation of the people," says the Programme of the CPSU, "operate more and more like social organisations, with the masses participating extensively and directly in their work" (*The Road to Communism*, p. 548). The S. are the centres around which various local community organisations (q.v.) take shape; the numerous members of these form the basis and reserve of the S.'s work.

**State Capitalism**, an economy managed by the state on the principle of private capitalist enterprise, either jointly with private capital, or without it. S.C. as an economic system exists in the capitalist countries, where it currently constitutes a component part of the system of state-monopoly capitalism (q.v.), and in the developing countries (q.v.) which are going over to socialism.

The role and objectives of S.C. in economic life are determined by the interests of the class the state represents. A bourgeois state establishes S.C. largely in the interests of the monopoly bourgeoisie. Still, under certain circumstances, S.C. can serve to weaken private monop-

olies, which is why the Communist Parties are working to expand the democratic nationalisation of private capitalist enterprises.

S.C. is of particular importance for the developing countries, as it makes them less dependent on neo-colonialists and helps raise employment and living standards. It also accelerates their economic development by drawing on the state budget and enhances production concentration and elements of planning, thus increasing the rates of economic development. Under certain conditions, S.C. can also be instrumental in democratising social life (see *Non-capitalist Path of Development*).

During the transition to socialism, the main thing about S.C. is not that it is capitalism, but that it is a smoothly functioning system of state regulation of private capital, used to establish the material and technical base of socialism. In this context to channel private capital into the framework of S.C. is to wage a struggle against private-capitalist and petty-bourgeois elements, to promote concentration of production, and prevent the rapacious accumulation of private capital, the uncontrolled exploitation of workers and the enslavement of small-commodity producers. S.C. should be ousted from sectors where it is harmful and applied where it is useful. Capitalist enterprises can be made the property of a proletarian state either by confiscation or redemption, either by a single act, or by stages. S.C. can assume a great variety of forms in the transition period from capitalism to socialism: all kinds of contractual economic links between the state and private enterprises both in the sphere of circulation (state purchases of capitalist production output, state raw material supplies to private enterprises, the crediting of capitalists, etc.) and in the sphere of production (the leasing of state enterprises and concessions to capitalists, the setting up of mixed state and private enterprises). When socialism is being built in a peaceful way, such mixed enterprises can be used to change the socio-economic nature of capitalist enterprises. Profit in state-capitalist enterprises is

undergoing gradual change, too, part of it assuming the form of state revenue. The workers' role in managing enterprises is steadily growing. Once capitalist property has been completely transformed into the property of the whole people, state-capitalist relations are abolished, some of the former owners turning into specialists employed by the proletarian state.

The spread, methods and forms of S.C. are determined by the concrete historical conditions obtaining in a given country, the assistance rendered by the other socialist states, the economic development level, the share of the socialist sector in the economy, the working class's political awareness and cultural standard, the resistance put up by the bourgeoisie, etc.

In the USSR, the first state-capitalist enterprises appeared early in 1918. From 1922 to 1927 the Soviet government concluded some 160 contracts on concessions, receiving about 45 million roubles in profit. The lease of state enterprises to private persons was practised on a wider scale. By January 1923, some 4,500 local enterprises had been leased, 31 per cent of them to their former owners, 21 per cent to other individuals, and 37 per cent to artels. Because of the bourgeoisie's refusal to co-operate with the state and the unfavourable international situation, S.C. was not applied on a wide scale in the Soviet Union.

In several People's Democracies, however, S.C. was spread on a wider scale, primarily in those countries where there were many small and medium-scale capitalist enterprises (their immediate nationalisation would have retarded economic development and aggravated the class struggle). S.C. was also relevant where a generally backward economy, or its postwar dislocation made it necessary to encourage small and medium-scale private enterprises in order to satisfy the demand for consumer goods in the shortest possible time. State-capitalist enterprises helped win over to the side of the socialist state those capitalist elements who were prepared to co-operate with people's power. From 1945 to 1948 S.C. existed in

Bulgaria, Poland, Czechoslovakia, Hungary and Romania. From 1956 to 1972, a specific form of S.C.—mixed, semi-state enterprises—existed in the GDR.

S.C. was also widespread in some Eastern countries where socialism was being built (e.g. the Socialist Republic of Vietnam). There the national bourgeoisie, who had taken part, together with the working people, in the national liberation struggle did not oppose the introduction of S.C.

**State-Monopoly Capitalism**, a form of monopoly capitalism characterised by the merger of monopolies with the bourgeois state.

As monopolies emerge, serious disproportions and contradictions appear in the economies of the leading bourgeois countries (see Imperialism). These contradictions cannot be resolved by private capitalist enterprise and competition. It becomes necessary to regulate the economies of the capitalist countries from a single centre, i.e. state intervention in the process of capitalist reproduction becomes a must.

The development of S.M.C. is connected with exacerbation of the contradictions inherent in capitalism in the era of its general crisis, when it is no longer the dominant and the only social system (see General Crisis of Capitalism). Under these circumstances, monopoly capital has to accelerate economic development by making use of the state in every possible way. At present, the working-class movement in the capitalist countries is rather strong and the proletariat has the example of the socialist countries to follow; this impels the bourgeoisie to resort to manoeuvring and making concessions to the working people, drawing on the assistance of the state, which sets the wage minimum and the working hours, pays unemployment allowances, and maintains social insurance. The state is also instrumental in suppressing the working-class movement. The state's growing role is connected, too, with the development of the national liberation movement (see Disintegration of the Colonial System; Neocolonialism). Monopoly capitalists are also forced to rely extensively on the state machine because of the intensification of inter-imperialist contradictions; they draw on the

state in their struggle to divide up world markets in their own interests. At the same time, the financial oligarchy tries to unite imperialist countries in face of the growing strength of the world socialist community (q. v.) and the emergence of a large group of young national states. Economic factors are added to political ones, for, as they develop, modern productive forces enhance the world division of labour, while production and capital assume an increasingly international character. As a result, various political and economic groupings of imperialist countries appear, and global forms of state-monopoly capital take shape (see Integration, Capitalist).

The merger of the financial oligarchy with the state may proceed in different ways. Representatives of the largest monopoly groups, who occupy high government posts, pursue their policies in the interests of the monopolies. The unions of industrialists that usually express the interests of major monopoly bourgeoisie groupings also play a major part in the interaction between monopolies and the state and in determining the policy course, including in the economic sphere.

Today there are different forms of state-monopoly intervention in the economy. An important place in the system of S.M.C. in the West European countries belongs to state property in the sphere of production: the state controls almost all railway transport and a large share of the civil air lines; the public sector also prevails in electric power engineering and in extractive industries (coal-mining, iron ore extraction, etc.). Major banks in the West European countries are also, as a rule, in the hands of the state. In many of these countries public property was formed as a result of the nationalisation of certain industries; the struggle waged by the working class, which demanded that capitalist property be turned over to the state, was of great importance. The monopoly bourgeoisie, however, managed to limit the scale of nationalisation and use its results in their own class interests by extorting huge compensation, setting low prices and tariffs on the output of state enterprises, etc. (see Nationalisation). Redistribution of a considerable part of

the national income through the budget is used widely in the system of S.M.C. In the USA, Britain, West Germany and France, for example, 30 or 40 per cent of the national income is redistributed through state financial bodies, both central and local. Concentration of enormous means in the hands of the bourgeois state enables it to exert a powerful influence on the economy. At the present time, the state in the capitalist countries is a major consumer of the output produced; the increase in state consumption is largely due to the militarisation of the economy. The state makes large investments in the economy; in fact, it invests capital not only into state-owned, but also privately-owned enterprises.

Diverse measures of economic and administrative regulation of the economy must also be listed among the forms of S.M.C. The policy of accelerated depreciation, which enables monopolies to avoid paying taxes on some profits and, at the same time, speeds up to some extent technical progress in industry, is widespread in many capitalist countries. During a crisis, the state offers favourable credit terms by lowering the bank rate in government institutions, in order to stimulate investments. State measures applied to regulate relations between labour and capital are, as a rule, administrative in character, e. g. the policy of wage freezes resorted to in the capitalist countries in order to step up the exploitation of the working people. Over recent years, S.M.C. has been using planning to optimise economic development. France was one of the first to work out a long-term economic development programme; somewhat later, similar programmes were drawn up in the Netherlands and Norway, and then in Italy, Belgium, etc. As a rule, these programmes contain economic forecasts and have little in common with the economic development plans in the socialist countries.

The state's growing economic role exerts an impact on the economic development of the capitalist countries, and on the capitalist cycle, too. After World War II, it made for an increase in the capitalist economy's development rates, smoothed over its cyclic vacillations, and

made it possible to modernise some industries and launch new ones. Yet S.M.C. has not eliminated the fundamental contradictions inherent in the capitalist system, and in many cases has even aggravated them.

In the mid-1970s, a deep crisis broke out in the system of state-monopoly regulation, which became particularly acute during the 1974-75 world economic crisis. The ramified system of state-monopoly regulation could not prevent production cuts and soaring unemployment, coupled with unprecedented inflation. The world capitalist economy was shaken by monetary, energy, and raw material crises. The crisis of state-monopoly regulation was precipitated by a sharp growth in the internationalisation of the capitalist economies and their increasing interdependence, which made national forms of regulation less and less effective. Moreover, the deep contradictions between the imperialist states make it virtually impossible for them to co-ordinate effectively their international economic activities. This is in no way surprising, for S.M.C. is an exceptionally contradictory phenomenon. The monopoly bourgeoisie has to draw on the state's assistance in certain cases, while, at the same time, opposing both attempts to nationalise new sectors and certain forms of state-monopoly economic regulation.

Lenin noted that, as S.M.C. develops, favourable conditions emerge for overthrowing the bourgeoisie and transferring the economy to public management in the interests of the working people; after assuming power, the working-class party would have important levers for managing the entire economy at its disposal. "State-monopoly capitalism is a complete *material* preparation for socialism, the *threshold* of socialism, a rung on the ladder of history between which and a rung called socialism *there are no intermediate rungs*" (V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 25, p. 363).

**State of the Whole People** is a socialist type of state that expresses the interests and will of the entire people and serves as a tool for building communism. The state came into existence with the division

of society into classes, with the need for the ruling class to keep the mass of the people suppressed. It was a product and manifestation of irreconcilable class contradictions. In capitalist countries the basic function of the state has been suppression. The socialist revolution breaks down the exploiting state's machinery and creates a state of a proletarian dictatorship. The S.W.P. emerges at the stage of developed socialism (see Developed Socialist Society) and acts as a successor of proletarian dictatorship, once the latter has completed its historic mission and society has entered the stage of building communism (q. v.)

The Soviet state of the whole people has nothing in common with the so-called *frei Volksstaat*, an idea put forward in the 1870's by German Social-Democrats. The creation of such a state in a bourgeois society, on the basis of bourgeois democracy, without a socialist revolution, was an opportunist and illusory idea. The S.W.P. in the USSR is no illusion or dream, but a fact made real by the activities of millions of working people, led by the Communist Party of the Soviet Union.

The S.W.P. is a stage in the development of the political organisation of society following the overthrow of the power of exploiters. It is not a tool for suppression by some class, it represents the fundamental interests of all the working people, since exploiting classes no longer exist. Certain limiting functions preserved in S.W.P. are not of a class suppressing nature. Coercion is applied to individuals who violate the standards of socialist life, rather than to classes, and will continue until public opinion is sufficient to restrain the individuals.

Unlike the bourgeois state, the social base of which is continually narrowing, the law of evolution of the socialist state is ever increasing expansion of that base. The socio-political and ideological unity (q. v.) formed in the USSR is expressed in the concept "the Soviet people"; so the state is a tool of the popular will. This does not imply, however, that the S.W.P. at the present stage can be viewed as super-class or non-class. The Soviet state is the state of the whole people precisely because the peasantry and the intelligentsia (qq. v.)

have become socialist, having moved to the positions of the working class (q. v.); the goal of the revolutionary proletariat — the building of communism — has become that of the entire people. Both inside the country and in the international arena, the socialist state pursues a class policy in the interests of the working class and all the working people, defends the rights of all peoples to national independence, freedom, democracy, and social progress. The class nature of the S.W.P. is seen in the maintenance of the leading role of the working class.

The proletarian dictatorship is state leadership of society by the working class in the context of antagonistic classes and a class struggle. These conditions call for specific forms of leadership and a political regime that provides certain privileges for the ruling class to pursue its policy. With the tremendous changes in the USSR resulting from the complete and final victory of socialism when the stage of mature socialism is achieved, state leadership in the form of a dictatorship is no longer necessary. "The aims of the dictatorship of the proletariat having been fulfilled," runs the 1977 Constitution of the USSR, "the Soviet state has become the state of the whole people" (*Constitution of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics*, p. 10). This is a new stage in pursuance of the ultimate goals of the proletariat (see Historic Mission of the Proletariat) which will culminate in a full communist society being built.

A major feature of the S.W.P. is the sophistication of the forms of popular representation for ensuring participation by all citizens in the management of society. This process includes further democratisation of the electoral system, the development of the democratic principles of election, replacement and accountability in the operation of the organs of power and administration, the strengthening of the voluntary principles in administration, the development of governing bodies that will be run by state officials and the public simultaneously. This implies that an increasing stratum of people will be involved in running society's affairs, so that this activity will cease to be a profession.

The S.W.P. is a step towards the withering away of the state and a transition to communist social self-government (q. v.). The state will, however, remain in existence until the final victory of communism, which is the ultimate goal of the socialist state of the whole people. "The main aims of the people's socialist state are: to lay the material and technical foundation of communism, to perfect socialist social relations and transform them into communist relations, to mould the citizen of communist society, to raise the people's living and cultural standards, to safeguard the country's security, and to further the consolidation of peace and development of international co-operation" (*Constitution of the USSR*, 1977, p. 11).

**Struggle Between the Two Social Systems**, a class struggle between the two opposing world systems—socialist and capitalist—which expresses the main contradiction of the modern epoch (q. v.). Basically, it ensues from the opposition of social and private ownership of the means of production and the resulting fundamental differences in the ways of life under socialism and capitalism, which excludes a reconciliation, or "convergence" of the two systems (see Convergence Theory), although the interaction and interinfluence of the two systems in the course of a single historical process is evident.

The dialectic of S.B.T.S.S. exerts a significant influence both on the entire world socialist system and on the entire world capitalist system. Struggle has now spread to all regions of the world and involves international economic, political, ideological, and cultural relations. It influences the consciousness and spiritual world of modern man, his life attitudes and scale of values.

S.B.T.S.S. proceeds in the following main spheres: political, economic and ideological. In the political sphere, socialism sets its task as actively promoting the solution of international problems by peaceful means (see Peaceful Coexistence of States with Different Social Systems). Socialism opposes the policy of force, war and national oppression, engendered by the very nature of capitalism, with a policy of peace and friendship among peoples, of equality and

sovereignty of nations and states. This is why Soviet foreign policy is always class-oriented and profoundly internationalist in respect to other detachments of the world revolutionary movement. Ensuring lasting peace and safeguarding the right of peoples for independence and social progress are constant objectives of the foreign policy of the Soviet Union.

The socialist countries are coming out actively and insistently for the dispute between socialism and capitalism to be solved not on the battlefield or by weapons, but in peaceful labour. With the growth of socialism's might, its voice in world politics is becoming stronger, while the positions of imperialism, of the forces of reaction and war are getting weaker. The successful fulfilment of the foreign-policy programmes of the 24th (1971), 25th (1976) and 26th (1981) CPSU congresses, and the shifts in detente have created real conditions for channelling S.B.T.S.S. into a peaceful arena. Yet the forces of war and reaction put every obstacle in the way of detente. In the early 1980s, these forces have succeeded in seriously wrecking the cause of detente and talks in the spirit of detente, thereby producing growing instability, uncertainty, and confrontation in S.B.T.S.S. All this has noticeably worsened the international climate and stirred up the threat of an armed conflict of global proportions between the two systems. The socialist community together with all the other peace-loving forces must once again mobilise their resources to consolidate international peace and security and to continue the process of detente.

In the historical controversy between the two social systems, a major role is played by the economic form of struggle (see Economic Competition Between the Two Systems). By their social and economic experience, by setting an example, the socialist countries exert an influence on the working people of other countries. The strengthening and further development of the material and technical basis of socialism, and the enhancement of the performance of social production aim at achieving maximum results in the economy of each socialist country, so as to show to the broad popular masses in practice what

socialism has accomplished. Economic aid to developing countries (q. v.) is becoming an important area of struggle between the two systems. Here, too, force of example decides the issue of struggle between socialism and capitalism, somewhat influencing the orientation and future development course of the nations receiving aid (see *Non-capitalist Path of Development*). In this, socialism has certain advantages: the experience of effectively solving the problems encountered by the young states, non-involvement in colonial exploitation, in non-equivalent exchange, etc.

In step with the shrinking of capitalism, the sphere of the struggle between the two systems in intellectual life, in ideology is growing in scope and complexity (see *Ideological Struggle*). The imperialists have been elaborating and attempting to implement a whole set of measures to destabilise the situation in the socialist countries, to weaken them, employing special services and anti-communist and anti-Soviet centres to this end. While doing this, they ignore the fundamental norms of international law, draw on a carefully elaborated scheme of lies and slander directed against socialism, and manipulate public opinion. The bourgeoisie stakes in earnest on the dissolution of socialism from within, on the "erosion" of communist ideals. It regards ideology as a kind of superweapon that derives its force from the development of the mass media and from the growing contacts between the two social systems. In this respect, bourgeois propagandists reveal the pseudo-objectivity of thoroughly selective information about topical events in the world, speculate on the problems involved in building socialism, on certain of the people's needs that are still unsatisfied and the political inexperience of young people.

In the early 1980s, a psychological war of unprecedented proportions and brazenness has been launched against the Soviet Union and other socialist countries. There is no doubt that the confrontation between the two world systems, between the two political courses — socialism and imperialism — has exacerbated to a degree unknown of throughout the entire postwar period. A struggle is being waged for the hearts and minds of billions of people, for

their world outlook and socio-class orientations. The future of mankind largely hinges on the outcome of this ideological struggle.

Reactionary imperialist circles resort to diverse devices of a "psychological warfare"—misinformation, fabrications and slander, and, while putting forward the slogan of "free exchange of information and ideas", seek ways to interfere in the internal affairs of socialist countries. The latter have never identified the ideological struggle with arbitrary manipulation of ideas, much less with the cold war. They wage a militant offensive against bourgeois ideology, defending the objective truth and teachings on the laws of social development.

Capitalist society has no future. It is plagued by chronic economic fever, skyrocketing prices, inflation and unemployment. The crisis of bourgeois democracy, criminal machinations by the powers-that-be, and a record rise in crime and terrorism complete the picture of the deterioration in the general conditions of man's existence in bourgeois society. The framework of capitalism is becoming increasingly narrow for the scientific and technological revolution (q. v.) under way at present. All of this cannot but strengthen anti-monopolistic and anti-imperialist sentiments among the working masses.

Socialism scores one victory after another in the historic struggle between the two systems, so the balance of power in the world is changing in favour of socialism. Its share in world industrial production has risen several-fold since before the Second World War and is still rising. The member-countries of the Council for Mutual Economic Assistance (CMEA) are the most dynamically developing ones (see *World Socialist Community*). The economic growth rate of the CMEA countries from 1970 to 1980 was double that of the developed capitalist countries. The socialist countries demonstrate stable production and the evergrowing effectiveness of production management and all other social processes. The countries of the world socialist community register a steady rise in living standards and in the cultural level of the working people. These conditions contribute to the all-round develop-



ment of the personality, to the consolidation and improvement of the new way of life (see Socialist Way of Life). Socialism has a great capacity for educating people, gradually freeing them from individualism, egotism, possessiveness and racism — these incurable vices of antagonistic societies. The achievements of socialism are the result of people's hard work and heroism. To put all the advantages of socialism into practice, a number of non-antagonistic contradictions need to be overcome both within each socialist country and in the world socialist system as a whole (see World Socialist System). There is still a lot to do in this respect. Yet real socialism has already done away with economic anarchy, unemployment, exploitation and poverty. It provides for ever greater social and moral progress of society; it has to its credit a new man and newly formed collectivist relations between people of different nationalities. These successes leave no doubt concerning the superiority of socialism as a social system and give confidence in its full triumph.

**Struggle for Peace**, the broadest democratic movement at the present time, uniting all people who oppose the arms race and the danger of a nuclear war that threatens the existence of civilisation. The present peace movement started after the Second World War to counter the threat of another war, when the aggressive NATO bloc was formed in 1949.

Since the First World Peace Congress (20-25 April, 1949, Paris and Prague), the organised peace movement has followed a glorious path and become a real force and a stabilising factor in world politics. S.P. unites people with the most diverse views and convictions, members of national organisations on all continents, who co-ordinate their activities through representatives on the World Peace Council. The WPC Presidential Committee includes public figures, leading members of various political parties — Socialists, Labourites, Social-Democrats, Communists, Liberals, Christian Democrats, National Democrats. It also includes clergymen, scientists and cultural workers. By its composition, character and methods, the world peace movement is not and cannot be the "instru-

ment" of any state or political party. In fact, it is a unique association of people of good will on earth. This was borne out by the experience of S.P. after the Second World War, and particularly in the 1970s, when the threat of a nuclear conflict was substantially lessened. By the early 1980s, the reactionary forces and the military-industrial complexes, primarily of the US, NATO countries, and Israel, regrouped their ranks and once again created a tense international situation. The adherents of peace met this new outbreak of war psychosis in a more organised way and with a deep feeling of their righteousness and the soundness of their cause. This is witnessed by the fact that in the spring and summer of 1982 alone more than 20 million people participated in peace demonstrations in capitalist countries (as against 5 million during the whole of 1981).

Today the age-old problem of war and peace has taken on a completely different shape and form. With the emergence and development of socialist society, which did away with private property, competition, and inter-class and inter-national antagonisms, the conditions have been created for eliminating war from the life of society and for dismissing war as a form of social conflict. The USSR Constitution states that the USSR pursues a policy of peace aimed at "preventing wars of aggression, achieving universal and complete disarmament". As convincing proof of the adherence to this policy is the USSR's voluntary pledge not to be the first to use nuclear weapons.

The movement's goals: to prevent a third world war; rebuff aggression; consolidate detente, bring about general and complete disarmament; uphold, in international relations, the principles of peaceful coexistence (q. v.) fixed in the Helsinki Final Act (1975) (see Detente). Today S.P. is inseparably bound with the struggle for democracy, national independence and socialism. It implies a struggle against fascism and racism (qq. v.), a right for social justice and the progress of all peoples. The world needs a democratic peace that ensures the national dignity and security of all states, the right of their people to choose the social order they want. That is why the

issues of war and peace, involving the fates of whole peoples and states, constitute major divide between the forces of progress and those of reaction. It is the scene of interaction between the most varied socio-class forces, groupings and state coalitions, and this attaches a special and ever growing importance to the peace movement.

With the appearance of modern means of annihilation (atomic and thermonuclear weapons), people have become aware of the danger of war. Such an awareness cannot by itself, however, eliminate war as a social phenomenon. Nor is the "balance of terror" that bourgeois ideologists write about a guarantee against war. In a class-divided world, the suggestions by some liberally-minded scientists regarding the creation of a world government to ensure international order are also utopian. The experience of history instructs: peace does not come by itself — it must be fought for.

With the appearance and development of socialist society which eliminates private property, capitalist competition and social antagonisms, the conditions emerge for banishing war from the life of society, for abolishing it as a means for solving social conflicts. The Soviet Constitution, for example, proclaims that the USSR shall conduct a policy of peace aimed at "preventing wars of aggression, achieving universal and complete disarmament" (Art. 28).

A concrete programme of peace and international co-operation, acclaimed by all progressive forces, was worked out by the 24th and supplemented by the 25th and 26th CPSU Congresses. It envisages the following: political settlement of military conflicts; the immediate and firm rebuff of any acts of aggression and international arbitrariness; renunciation of the use of force or threat of force; the creation of a system of collective security on the basis of historically established borders; the conclusion of treaties banning nuclear, radiological, chemical, and bacteriological weapons and the development of new weapons of mass destruction; a step up in the struggle for an end to the arms race; a reduction of military budgets; the elaboration of measures to reduce the possibility of a war

starting by accident; elimination of the vestiges of colonialism; a boycott on manifestations of racism and apartheid; a broadening of international co-operation.

Solutions to these problems are unthinkable without stepped-up activity on the part of all peace-loving forces.

At the beginning of the 1980s the international situation became more complicated. The aggressive circles in the USA and several other NATO countries set out on a course towards confrontation, step-up of the arms race and preparing for a "limited" nuclear war. In the face of a mounting threat of war, the peace movement launched vigorous and mass-scale actions against the stockpiling of weapons, the raising of tension and the stirring-up of conflicts. In September 1980, envoys from 137 countries participated in the World Parliament of the Peoples for Peace, which met in Sofia. Though the participants adhered to different political and ideological positions, they formulated general goals and tasks facing all active peace fighters, which showed that the movement had become more consolidated and mature. The Appeal adopted at the forum said: "The people have the power to preserve peace — their basic right! Act now! ... Let us put aside all that divides us and join together to defeat the menace of nuclear war."

People holding the most diverse views are becoming more and more aware of their basic natural right — to live and live decently, with an opportunity to develop their talents. Now this right is seriously threatened by imperialism and its accomplices. The arms race does not guarantee security for the peoples, for it calls into question the approximate balance of military strength that has taken shape in the world between the principal opposing class forces — socialism and capitalism. Disarmament, social development, the upholding of human rights and establishment of a new world economic order are, therefore, closely linked with the prospects for reducing international tension and securing a lasting democratic peace throughout the world. With the existing balance of power, a world war is no longer our inevitable fate, but until imperialism and the reactionary forces have been eliminated,

the threat of war will remain and will sometimes even increase, as events in the 1970s and early 1980s have shown.

The early 1980s saw not only a deterioration in the international situation, but also a sharp rise in the peace movement. The action taken by the peace forces against the arms build-up and for the right to live, for peace and social progress has now spread to all countries and continents. The forces of world socialism, the working-class movement in the capitalist countries, and the national liberation movement, the three main streams in the contemporary revolutionary process, are being fused together.

The 26th CPSU Congress, which took place in February-March 1981, proved once again that peace is the principal foreign-policy goal pursued by the Soviet Union. The Congress put forward a set of peace initiatives, a genuine programme for eliminating crises and seats of military conflicts created by imperialists and for terminating wars, declared or undeclared. These initiatives have become known as the Peace Programme for the 1980s. "All of them", said the CC CPSU Report to the Congress, "pursue a single aim, our one common aspiration — to do everything possible to relieve the peoples of the danger of a nuclear war, to preserve world peace." (*Documents and Resolutions. The 26th Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union*, 1981, p. 40.)

In July 1981, the Supreme Soviet of the USSR adopted an appeal entitled "To the Parliaments and Peoples of the World", calling on the Parliaments and peoples of all countries to take vigorous action to defend peace, maintain international security and develop worldwide co-operation.

The Soviet Union's efforts to prevent a nuclear catastrophe were demonstrated at the 36th session of the UN General Assembly, as the Soviet representative came out with an important and constructive new initiative — to create guarantees that nobody will ever be the first to use nuclear weapons; if nobody uses them first, they will never be used at all. That would be a realistic way of solving the most pressing and vital problem facing mankind — to prevent a nuclear holocaust and ensure

sound prospects for a lasting peace.

Of great importance for tackling the key tasks of the struggle for peace and world development is co-operation between the ruling parties in the socialist countries, the Communist Parties in other countries, the vanguard parties in the socialist-oriented countries, the non-aligned movement, and all international progressive, religious and pacifist organisations and alliances. They should pool their efforts in order to succeed in their struggle for a just and democratic peace, which can only be ensured relying on the principles of mutual equality, trust and mutually advantageous, equitable co-operation among all countries, a gradual curbing of the arms race, and reduction of armed forces and armaments.

No one country and no one people, no matter how great, can eliminate the threat of war single-handed. Only through joint efforts can the peace-loving nations and states, and the organised peace movement do away with that threat, which is fraught with the extermination of the human race. Peace is of general benefit to and the greatest treasure of mankind; today it has also become the primary condition for its further existence. Responsibility for its preservation lies largely with parliaments in different countries and their members, with political parties, inter-parliamentary and public organisations, and with all active champions of peace throughout the world.

The peace movement has diverse organisation and methods of activity. These include the World Peace Council and its numerous national committees, the Peace Fund, contributed to by individuals and organisations, regional peace assemblies, militant political manifestations for peace and picketing the embassies of aggressor-countries, and foreign military bases, sending petitions and demands to parliaments and governments, youth festivals, the Pugwash movement of scientists, etc. Here, also, belong such civic initiatives as the announcement of cities and provinces as nuclear-free zones, and the blocking of military communications and projects. The social base of the movement is expanding as new strata of the population join it.

The forces of reason and realism are

also gaining strength among some businessmen, statesmen, clergymen and military in the capitalist countries. Scientists have a major say in the formulation of a realistic peace policy. Their active involvement in the peace struggle has become vital. Their best representatives, American scientists among them, are now stepping up their activities against the fatal policies of an arms race and confrontation with the Soviet Union and other socialist countries.

The form in which scientists contribute to the struggle for peace can vary. Institutes engaged in peace studies, as well as individual scholars, work out recommendations to assist politicians in formulating measures to curb the arms race and go over to disarmament and averting the threat of a new world war. In the Soviet Union, for example, the Scientific Council on Peace and Disarmament Research has been active since 1979. Apart from its other functions, it invigorates and co-ordinates research into problems of peace, disarmament and international co-operation, sponsors relevant conferences and symposia, enhances contacts with scientific centres and scientists abroad, with political figures, cultural workers and the clergy who support the creation of a healthy world climate and oppose the arms race and the threat of a nuclear holocaust. Scientists also set up working groups to investigate the problem of how to shift scientific potential to peaceful uses of nuclear power or advise on peaceful uses for the nuclear armaments that have already been stockpiled. In all civic actions staged by the peace forces to preserve peace and oppose the thesis that war is inevitable and that the world has to fully indulge in the arms race, scientists' words are becoming more and more weighty.

The mass media, literature and the arts are of exceptional importance in the struggle for peace. Depending on their class and ideological orientation and responsible approach to the prospects for civilisation and culture, they can improve the relations between the nations, or make them worse, represent the policies and intentions of certain states in a true or a false light, and foster either progressive and democratic, or reactionary, nationalistic and racist views. The principles and aims of the mass

media and of the exchange in the cultural sphere were formulated at the Inter-governmental Conference on Cultural Policies in Europe sponsored by UNESCO and convened in Helsinki in June 1972; they were also reflected in the Final Act of the Conference on Security and Co-operation in Europe which took place in Helsinki in 1975. The Final Act stipulates that co-operation in all spheres of culture should promote peace and mutual understanding among peoples and enrich all individuals intellectually, irrespective of distinctions in race, sex, language and religion. The mass media of the socialist countries abide stringently by these principles. The media in the capitalist countries, on the contrary, are harming the cause of peace and co-operation among nations as they take a biased, subjective approach to explaining the causes of the social changes that are taking place throughout the world, distort the nature and class essence of wars and military conflicts, identify international terrorism with communism, and resort to anti-Sovietism to fan war hysteria and justify the growth in military expenditures and the arms race.

Peace is the common patrimony and the greatest value of humanity, and in our time also the prime condition for its survival. A great responsibility for safeguarding it devolves on the parliaments and their members in various countries, on political parties, interparliamentary co-operation, on mass organisations, on all active champions of world peace.

In the 1980s, S.P. has fused with the struggle of the people for social progress and for solving the increasingly complicated global problems. Therefore, the anti-war, anti-imperialist, and revolutionary forces and movements are drawing closer together in their ideals and political objectives. They are naturally attracted by the achievements and policy of the Soviet Union and other socialist countries, which are a bulwark for preserving peace and civilisation on earth. The masses are beginning to realise for themselves that peace and socialism are indivisible, to better understand and be more greatly attracted by the optimistic philosophy of peace the new society is ruled by.

**Survivals of the Past in the People's Minds and Behaviour** are ideas, notions, traditions, actions, and habits of people that are seen under socialism as the outgrowth and reflection of obsolete or obsolescent social relations.

These phenomena vary in nature. They include violation of humanitarian principles in inter-personal relations (indifference, rudeness, haughtiness, cruelty, dishonesty, cynicism, slander, etc.); violations of principles of communist morality (q. v.) expressed as satisfaction of egoistical personal needs at the expense of society or the collective (parasitism, truancy, grabbing, drinking, etc.). These are adjoined by phenomena that do much harm to the formation of a communist consciousness (philistinism, red tape, formalism, careerism, demagoguery, etc.); rejection of communist ideals (displays of bourgeois ideology, ideological indifference, etc.); remnants of great-power chauvinism and local nationalism (q. v.); religious prejudices and superstitions; a feudal attitude to women, etc. All these phenomena cause great detriment to socialist society. The most extreme, especially dangerous expression of survivals of the past are legal offences.

The socialist revolution has abolished the social causes (exploitation of man by man and class inequality) that continuously give rise to such phenomena. This does not signify, however, that phenomena inherent in the past will disappear automatically, by themselves. The socialist society that replaces capitalism is "in every respect, economically, morally and intellectually, still stamped with the birth marks of the old society from whose womb it emerges" (K. Marx, F. Engels, *Selected Works* in three volumes, Vol. 3, p. 17). The material and technical base of socialism is not yet enough to allow all the material and spiritual needs of the people to be met completely. A significant factor in the persistence of the survivals of the past is the relative independence of social consciousness, its lagging behind the social being. Ideas and sentiments remain in human minds long after the relations that engendered them have disappeared; they take root as habits, traditions, etc. and

are passed from generation to generation. These habits and traditions often change their shape and adapt to new conditions; they may draw strength from various contradictions of social development and difficulties in building a new society; their enhancement is the aim of bourgeois propaganda conducted against the socialist countries.

A significant factor in the maintenance or spread of survivals of the past is subjective causes such as violations of socialist legality, deviations from the principles of socialist democracy, excessive administration by injunction, etc. and weakness in educational activities (an undifferentiated approach, generality, and loss of touch with reality). This is also true of various individual causes, such as an unfavourable family atmosphere, frustrations in private life, etc. Ways that survivals of the past find into a person's mind are as complex as the individual's relations with the environment and the facts of private life. Age, cultural level, education, social status, the nature of work, etc. also play a role.

Lenin emphasised that the working people do not get rid of the survivals of the past "at one stroke, by a miracle, at the behest of the Virgin Mary, at the behest of a slogan, resolution or decree, but only in the course of a long and difficult mass struggle against mass petty-bourgeois influences" (V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 31, p. 115).

The basic way to overcome survivals of the past is to remove the causes responsible for their continuation and to create conditions that promote the formation of a communist consciousness. State, administrative, Party, and people's control over strict observance by all members of society of the laws and rules of socialist community plays a significant role there. Survivals of the past cannot be overcome without a purposeful ideological education of the working people, without the formation of a communist outlook or improvement of their cultural standards, or their involvement into active productive, and socio-political activity. The work collective, social environment, a sound system of education in the family, school, and

everyday life are also important. Socialist society cannot advance to communism unless an effective struggle is waged against survivals of the past. This struggle is a continual and integral part of work on the moulding of a member of communist society. This struggle requires constant attention on the part of the Communist Party and all conscientious forces of socialist society. Eradication of the survivals of the past signifies creation of the conditions for the predominance of the communist ideals in human minds and behaviour, for the enhancement of all human abilities (see *Harmonious Development of the Individual*).

## T

**Technocratic Theories of Society** are the conceptions within the bourgeois world outlook describing the development of capitalist society along the road of scientific and technological progress. Modern vulgar technology-oriented conceptions of social development stem from the bourgeois trend of so-called Progressism. During the transition from feudalism to capitalism, known in historical and philosophical literature as the age of Enlightenment, which replaced the "dark" Middle Ages, there appeared bourgeois ideas of progress allegedly possible only on the basis of flourishing science and technology in conjunction with a strengthening of capitalist social relations. The enthusiasm, born of reason and knowledge and leading to progress found its fullest and clearest expression in the ideology of that age. "Rationality", always identical to itself, taken out of time and history, and opposed to "fallacy", "passion" and "mystery", was regarded by the Enlightenmenters as a universal means for improving society. They understood progress as dissemination of true and rational ideas that steadily remove the riddles and marvels of a world flooding it with the light of reason. Subsequently, as the bourgeoisie lost its historically progressive role, this approach to appraisal of social development began to be relegated to an apologetic "progressivist" thesis that science (with

technology) is the only and all-powerful means for solving any human problems and achieving social harmony in a rationally designed world order. A later stereotyped notion of "technical rationality" (worked out by M. Weber), allegedly inherent in bourgeois civilisation, was instrumental in the formation of scientific illusions. Various trends in 20th-century bourgeois sociology, exploring the "metaphysics of technology", also contributed to the ideology of industrialism.

The scientific and technological revolution (q. v.) that began in the mid-20th century, produced the illusion in the West that the progress of technology could save capitalism from its historical doom, subject to the objective laws of social development, and rid capitalism of its endemic social vices and contradictions. The growth of a temporarily stabilised economy in the developed capitalist countries strengthened this notion among certain strata of bourgeois society. Thus, in the 1950s and 1960s, technocratic utopias gradually came into being.

Epistemologically, technocratism is rooted in the philosophy of positivism, which draws conclusions solely on the basis of empirical data obtained by the natural and technical disciplines. Positivism rejects a single general theory of social development, insisting on a plurality of "truths". Today technocratic ideas express the interests of the ruling bourgeoisie, as well as of the broad stratum of "captains of industry", i. e. managers, specialists, etc. It is these social groups that laid the foundations for a new ideological course.

The most detailed elaboration of technocratic conceptions is to be found in the works of R. Aron, Z. Brzezinski, D. Bell, H. Kahn, W. Rostow and J. Fourastié. With all the individual differences between the various technology-oriented theories, all of them attempt to trace direct links between scientific progress and social development, thereby transferring economic causation linearly into ideological, political and socio-psychological processes. At first, bourgeois sociologists sought to describe the social consequences of industrialism, and that gave rise to a number of specific conceptions, such as the "industrial society"

(J. Galbraith), "deideologisation" (q. v.) (R. Aron, D. Bell, E. Shils and others), which became basic to the technocratic ideology. Then bourgeois researchers undertook to substantiate a more comprehensive philosophy of history directed against scientific communism.

Bourgeois apologists turn technological progress into an absolute, reduce the productive forces to technology, and the relations of production to technico-organisational structures. They build their argumentation on the model of a so-called "technological society", which they see in the highly developed countries of the West and in Japan. It is assumed that other countries will inevitably follow the historical course currently being pursued by these countries. According to bourgeois sociologists, the basic characteristic of a "technological society" is that its nature and development are directly determined by the state of its productive forces, irrespective of relations of property, i. e. production relations. In their opinion, technology and material production determine all social factors, which means that the productive forces engender new social relations of their own accord. It is alleged that this is provided for by penetration of science and technology into all spheres of social organisation.

Proceeding from such an understanding of social development, bourgeois authors divide the history of human society into three stages: (1) "traditional", or "agricultural" society (which is their term for feudalism); (2) "industrial society" (with this term they embrace capitalism and socialism); and (3) "post-industrial society" (q. v.) (actually meaning some kind of "renovated" capitalism). The last stage is regarded as a direct continuation of the preceding one, as its new phase, which, in the opinion of Western authors, has no substitute because it embodies the main achievements of social progress.

Bourgeois apologists are prone to label the social consequences of the scientific and technological revolution with the term "modernisation". To this notion they attach a rather broad and even abstract meaning. They often make the point that economically backward countries have to be "civ-

ilised", i. e. to assume the way of life of industrially developed capitalist countries, and all these changes are supposed to proceed on the basis of technological progress. A social revolution is accepted within this thinking either as an exception or as a particular case of the general process of "modernisation". Proponents of this conception (R. Tucker, M. Halpern and others) are especially eager to use this methodology when analysing the social prospects for the liberated countries. This imperialist tendency is revealed in a more barefaced manner in the conception of "westernization" (D. Lerner, S. Lipset), which comes down essentially to the thesis that non-European nations must embark on a capitalist road of development.

According to technocracy-oriented sociologists, the contemporary world is in the phase of a transformation from "industrial society" into the society of the future. The latter, in all its "varieties", represents a modernised and reformed capitalism, which is alleged to be second to none in the development of management, automation, social planning (qq. v.), the entertainment industry, etc. In recent years, these forecast studies have been supplemented by analysis of the intellectual processes pertaining to ideology (A. Wiener), culture (D. Bell) and the mass media (M. McLuhan). The transition to a "post-industrial society" is contemplated differently by bourgeois scholars. D. Bell describes it as a smooth evolution of "industrial capitalism". Conversely, A. Toffler holds that a new society will emerge as a result of the economic and political storms and upheavals afflicting imperialism. A variant of the "post-industrial society" is offered by the conception of a "technetronic society" elaborated by Z. Brzezinski in the book *Between Two Ages. America's Role in the Technetronic Era* (N. Y., 1970).

Rejecting the Marxist teaching of socio-economic formations, bourgeois sociologists call on the popular masses to unite with the ruling bourgeoisie which, as they put it, carries out important measures by undertaking modernisation, introducing computers, etc. They also advocate a denial of "ideological fanaticism", by which they imply the growing class consciousness

of the masses. Already in the early 1970s, T. T. S., including "post-industrialism", began to lose their influence as a result of the mounting crisis of capitalism in economics, politics and culture.

**Theories of "National Socialism",** ideological conceptions that emerged among society's middle sections (q. v.) and the non-proletarian sections of the working people in the newly liberated countries. As a rule, they are an eclectic concoction of socialist ideals and national traditions, all kinds of Populist, Utopian, reformist, religious, petty-bourgeois and other ideas. Socialist doctrines of a national type have emerged at the current stage of national liberation revolutions, when their further growth is restricted by the all too narrow boundaries of bourgeois nationalism (q. v.), while the forces capable of consistently implementing scientific socialism in these countries are not yet mature enough to lead the struggle for national and social liberation.

The role played by the socialist doctrines of a national type depends on the nature of the countries and the given historical conditions under which they are formulated, on which class interests they express, and what kind of socio-economic programme they promote. Correspondingly, a number of relatively independent ideological trends take shape: socialist concepts of a national-bourgeois type; petty-bourgeois reformist doctrines of national socialism; and finally, non-Marxist socialist theories created by the contemporary revolutionary democracy of the developing countries.

The adherents of scientific socialism while supporting everything progressive in T. N. S. also remark their weak and negative points. The positive aspect of these concepts, especially those belonging to the revolutionary-democratic trend, is first and foremost their criticism of the capitalist system. The advanced part of revolutionary democracy supports radical socio-democratic transformations, which are conducive to socialist development. They strive to eradicate the aftermath of the colonial past, clear society of the vestiges of feudal and partiarchal relations, build a developed, diversified economy, improve the conditions of those who till the land, and raise the living standards and cultural level

of the people as a whole. The socialist-oriented countries attach primary importance to solving these problems. T. N. S. are being increasingly influenced by the ideas of Marxism-Leninism (q. v.). It is emphasised in the policy documents of many revolutionary-democratic parties that the evolution of mankind rests on a mutual interconnection between the productive forces and the relations of production; that social revolution is an explosion prepared for by a gradual, progressive development and the intensification of antagonistic contradictions; and that socialist society, free from class antagonisms and exploitation of man by man, is bound to replace capitalism.

At the same time, in a number of countries, T.N.S. display the marked impact of religious concepts. This is because, for many decades running, the most popular religious systems dominant in Asia and Africa, e. g. Islam and Buddhism, served as an ideological banner in the struggle of the oppressed peoples. After achieving independence, some religious figures openly sided with reactionaries; many others, however, remained with the working people, supporting them in their striving to embark on a socialist-oriented path (see Non-Capitalist Path of Development).

By guiding the thrust of the struggle against imperialism and domestic reaction, T.N.S. for the most part objectively facilitate advance along the path of non-capitalist development, the achievement of economic independence and consolidation of state sovereignty. At the same time, since this ideological platform is not an integral scientific world outlook, its supporters sometimes give their slogans a petty-bourgeois hue, displaying an inclination to "skip" certain indispensable stages of development, exaggerate the role of military-political methods in administration, understate that of organisational and ideological work among the masses, and show an un-called-for distrust of the adherents of the Marxist-Leninist world outlook.

Many concepts of national socialism current in the developing countries are characterised by an exaggeration of specific national features and historical traditions and excessive stress laid on moral



and ethical factors. Some representatives of national socialism attempt, on the pretext of modifying it to suit local conditions, to dissect scientific socialism and emasculate it of its revolutionary content by making all kinds of "corrections" and "amendments". Sometimes they extol national, racial and territorial integrity, while playing down the importance of the internationalist class solidarity of the champions of socialism.

To facilitate the liberation from nationalist, reformist and bourgeois illusions, it is necessary to study Marxist-Leninist theory more profoundly, to analyse the experience gained by the socialist countries and the national-democratic movement itself, in which the working class, the peasant masses, the non-proletarian strata, and progressive intellectuals play an ever greater role. Among the realistic trends typical at present time is that the advanced section of revolutionary democrats is drawing nearer to the Marxist-Leninist world outlook.

**Third (Communist) International (1919-43)**, an international association of the Communist Parties of various countries. It was formed as a result of the objective need to cleanse the proletariat's revolutionary movement of revisionism (q. v.) and opportunism (q. v.) and to set up an international working-class political organisation consonant with the conditions obtaining in the revolutionary age which, as it consistently adhered to Marxist positions, would become the historical successor of the First International and the best traditions of the Second International (q. v.).

"The First International," Lenin wrote, "laid the foundation of the proletarian, international struggle for socialism.

"The Second International marked a period in which the soil was prepared for the broad, mass spread of the movement in a number of countries.

"The Third International has gathered the fruits of the work of the Second International, discarded its opportunist, social-chauvinist, bourgeois and petty-bourgeois dross, and has begun to implement the distatorship of the proletariat" (V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 29, p. 307).

The Third International was established

as a result of the Great October Socialist Revolution and the ensuing upsurge of the revolutionary movement. On 2 March 1919, the International Communist Conference opened in Moscow, with 35 organisations from 21 countries participating. It adopted a decision to "assume the status of an International and take the name of Communist International". This was an event of world-wide importance marking the formation of a centre, an ideological and political headquarters of the revolutionary proletarian movement. A major role in the consolidation of the nascent Communist Parties, the elaboration of their strategy and tactics, and their fight against centrist and ultra-left attitudes in C.I. was played by Lenin; he timed the writing of his book, *"Left-Wing" Communism — an Infantile Disorder*, to coincide with the Second Congress of C. I., held in Moscow in July and August 1920. The book criticised the ultra-left, sectarian trends in the communist movement, the narrow-minded dogmatism (q. v.), ignoring the work among the masses and attempts at isolation from the trade unions and progressive non-communist organisations. The Congress dealt at length with the colonial and national questions. The resolution Lenin prepared pointed out that backward countries could go straight to socialism, bypassing the capitalist stage of development, if helped by the proletariat of the advanced countries. In this way, the ideological foundations were laid for forming an alliance between the working-class and the national liberation movement. The C.I. Third Congress, which was convened in Moscow in June and July 1921, considered a few specific questions of the Communists' organisational activities in trade unions, among women and young people. It pointed out that the struggle for the workers' immediate economic demands would have to be stepped up and raised the question of the unity of action of the working class (q. v.). Its attempt to establish a broad workers' front was frustrated, however, by the Social-Democrats (see Social-Democracy). The issue of the united workers' front was made central at the C.I. Fourth Congress, the last congress in which Lenin took part (November-De-

cember 1922). The Congress renounced the right and "left" errors made by the Communist Parties on that issue and discussed possibility of establishing a leadership of the united front. The problem of setting up the united front was also considered at the C.I. Fifth Congress, which met in Moscow in June-July 1924, when capitalism had managed to stabilise the situation and had entered a democratic and pacifist stage in its development. The Congress put forward the demand to "Bolshevisize" the parties participating in C.I. and purge them of both right-wing and "left" elements. The Sixth Congress (Moscow, July-September 1928) adopted a Programme which summed up the experience accumulated by the international working-class movement, provided essentially correct evaluations of the world situation, and outlined the prospects for the proletarian struggle. The Congress confirmed the strictly centralised principle underlying C.I. A certain deviation to sectarianism and political doctrinairism, which narrowed down the sphere of the Communist Parties' activities, was seen in the work of the Congress. Its main slogan, "Class Against Class!", aimed at invigorating the struggle against reformism (q. v.), sometimes amounted, in fact, to an underestimation of the importance of working-class unity of action. Its resolution on the situation in the colonies underrated the role of the national bourgeoisie (q. v.) in bourgeois-democratic revolutions. After fascism (q. v.) took over in Germany, the struggle against it and against the threat of war became the main task facing all progressive forces. The C. I. Seventh Congress, which was convened in July and August 1935 in Moscow (510 delegates from 57 Communist Parties and international organisations were present) supported the Soviet Union's efforts aimed at establishing a broad anti-fascist front; it also focused considerable attention on organising a popular front (q. v.) in the capitalist countries, calling on the Communist Parties to overcome sectarian, doctrinaire narrow-mindedness and stereotyped schemas, co-operate with non-communist workers' organisations, and draw the peasants and the urban petty bourgeoisie into the struggle. This strategical

orientation is relevant at the present time, too.

That was the last C.I. congress. The pre-war and first war years showed that the old organisational forms of leadership of the communist movement were not suited to the new conditions. In May 1943 the Presidium of the C.I. Executive Committee adopted a resolution on dissolving C.I. This resolution was approved by all its sections, on the grounds that "the organisational form of uniting the workers that was chosen at the First Congress of the Communist International and that satisfied the needs of the initial period in the revival of the working-class movement, gradually outlived itself as the movement expanded and its tasks in individual countries became more complicated, and sometimes even presented an obstacle to further consolidation of national workers' parties". The dissolution of C.I. made the rallying of anti-fascist forces easier.

C.I. concentrated the best forces of the working-class movement in its leading bodies and played a major role in forming the working-class political army and in consolidating the Communist Parties. It orientated its sections on conducting flexible policies, winning the support of the masses and acting jointly with the workers' organisations influenced by Social-Democrats. This programme was aimed at turning the Communist Parties into mass political organisations, capable of leading broad sections of the working people.

C.I. revived and strengthened the international solidarity of revolutionary workers, facilitated the establishment of genuinely militant parties of the working class, and educated the Marxist-Leninist cadres dedicated to the revolutionary cause. The entire experience it gained is an organic part of the revolutionary heritage, on which the international communist movement (q. v.) relies today.

**Town and Countryside** — see *Overcoming Differences Between Town and Country*.

**Trade Unions and the Trade Union Movement** are mass organisations and the movement of the working class and other strata of the working population for protection of their political and economic interests.

Trade unions were organised in the capitalist countries of Europe and America when the industrial proletariat formed and its class struggle against the bourgeoisie began in the late 18th and early 19th centuries. At that time, T.U. acted as mutual help societies; gradually their functions expanded, they became more stable and stronger; the first national unions of industrial sectors and trades and then the first national centres were set up. In the colonial and dependent countries of America, Africa, and Asia T.U. were organised later. Thus, in Africa the trade union movement did not acquire mass support until after World War II.

Marx wrote of the historical legitimacy of T.U., their contribution to the class struggle of the proletariat, and of the conditions for their success: "The ultimate object of the political movement of the working class is, of course, the conquest of political power for this class, and this naturally requires that the organisation of the working class, an organisation which arises from its economic struggles, should previously reach a certain level of development" (K. Marx and F. Engels, *Selected Correspondence*, p. 254). The collective struggle of the workers against the employers for favourable conditions for selling their labour, for improving living standards is of necessity professional, because the working conditions are quite different for different trades. On the other hand, as Lenin emphasised, T.U. should not confine themselves to protecting the economic interests of the workers. They can mould the class consciousness of the proletariat and become a very important channel of political agitation and revolutionary organisation. For this, however, T.U. should be directed by a revolutionary party.

In Russia, T.U. were first set up during the 1905-07 revolution, when a political party of the proletariat, a party of a new type, had been established. This is why T.U. adopted a militant proletarian position in the class struggle. In Western Europe and the USA, T.U. had existed before the revolutionary parties of the working class were created and had confined their activities, as a rule, to the economic struggle. In many countries, the theory and

practice of trade unionism were widespread whereby the working-class movement was kept within the framework of the struggle for better sales conditions for labour. The late 19th century saw the formation of a wide stratum of paid trade union bureaucracy (q. v.) whose members were recruited by the bourgeoisie to participate in political organisations, such as parliaments, local self-government bodies, etc.

Today, the T.U. in the capitalist countries become increasingly left-oriented. The struggle between the progressive and reformist tendencies is intensifying. Communists play a significant part in strengthening the progressive trend in the world trade union movement.

In socialist countries, T.U., ideologically guided by Communist and Workers' Parties, become a school of communism, an organisation where the working people acquire management and economic skills. T.U. organise the people for increasing the productivity of labour, participating in drawing up and implementing socio-economic plans, run socialist emulation (q. v.), help all working people in the development of know-how in management of state and social affairs. T.U. work to improve living standards, cultural and communal services, and protect the rights and interests of the working people. In the context of building developed socialism (see Developed Socialist Society) the role of the T.U., their rights and functions expand.

In the USSR, the membership of T.U. is over 128 million people, who actively contribute to building the material and technical base of communism, to further developing and improving social relations, and to organising communist education (q. v.).

The T.U. in the countries of the world socialist community (q. v.) take part in the world trade union movement as the vanguard in the struggle for peace, democracy, and social progress.

In advanced capitalist countries, T.U. have scored certain successes in improving the economic position of the working people. In many countries the working week has been reduced, the duration of paid holidays extended, etc. The T.U. have become more active in the political sphere and increasingly resolute in defence of

democracy and peace and in the struggle to abolish race segregation, etc.

In the countries that have been liberated from colonial dependence, the working class (q. v.) and its organisations are expanding. T.U. have a growing say in the choice of the country's development course, which, in turn, largely determines the conditions of the activities and functions of the T.U. The basic purpose of T.U. is to protect the vital interests of the working people. At the same time, the struggle against the remnants of colonialism, imperialism, neocolonialism, racism, and apartheid is very important. These general tasks create an objective basis for the unity of T.U. of regions and continents.

The largest and most authoritative international trade union organisation is the World Federation of Trade Unions (WFTU) established in 1945. This is the only centre where the T.U. of countries with different social systems and levels of development, socialist, advanced capitalist, and developing, are represented. The main goal of the WFTU is to struggle against exploitation, for satisfaction of socio-economic demands of the working people, for unity of the international trade union movement, for world peace, for democracy and liberation of peoples. In 1949, the splitting activities of British and US trade union leaders resulted in reformist-oriented T.U. in Britain, the USA, and some other capitalist countries breaking away from WFTU to form the International Confederation of Free Trade Unions (ICFTU). It now includes T.U. of developed capitalist and developing countries (the AFL/CIO of the USA has left it), is ideologically convergent with international Social-Democracy (q. v.), takes a more realistic position than it used to have on the struggle for peace (q. v.), and expands the scope of socio-economic democratic demands. Simultaneously, it wages propaganda of a gradual transformation of capitalism and the role of the state as an extra-class force. The elements of anti-communism (q. v.) are preserved in its policies. In 1920, the International Confederation of Christian Trade Unions (ICCTU) was set up, then renamed the World Confederation of Labour (WCL) in 1968. While paying

lip service to condemnation of capitalism, its leaders try to pose as "a third force" between capitalism and socialism. Their activities often conflict with their statements, which gives rise to discontent among the rank and file and to internal contradictions. In 1973, the European Trade Union Confederation was formed to unite the trade union centres of the ICFTU and WCL.

The Organisation of African Trade Union Unity (ATUU) joined by almost all trade union centres of Africa, was founded in 1973; the International Confederation of Arab Trade Unions (ICATU), a regional trade union association of Arab countries in North Africa and the Middle East, appeared in 1956; and the Permanent Congress of Trade Union Unity of Latin American Workers was organised in 1964.

The opportunities for contacts between the various trade union centres' organisations are increasing as a result of the growth of the international working-class movement. To unite the trade union movement in countries where it is split and on an international scale is of paramount importance for successfully defending the political and economic interests of the working people (see also Unity of Action of the Working Class).

Trotskyism is a petty-bourgeois opportunist current in ideology and politics which is hostile to Marxism-Leninism and shrouds its opportunism with radical leftist phraseology. It emerged at the beginning of the 20th century as a variant of Menshevism in the Russian Social-Democratic Labour Party and was named after its ideologist and leader, L. D. Trotsky. T. was a reaction to the Leninist phase in the development of Marxism, to the formation of a new type of revolutionary party in Russia, and it reflected the moods of a certain part of the petty-bourgeois urban intelligentsia, prone to revolutionary phrase-mongering in spite of standing outside class battles and advocating defeatist views on all the main issues of the revolutionary struggle. In methodology and epistemology, T.'s characteristics are extreme subjectivism, voluntarism, oversimplification and sophistry.

T.'s ideological foundation was the "theory of a permanent revolution" which,

while plagiarising the idea of an interrupted revolution (q. v.) put forward by Marx and Engels, was directed against Lenin's thesis of the transition of a bourgeois-democratic revolution into a socialist one. The main traits of that "theory" are as follows: distrust of the ability of the working class to rally its allies; denial of the revolutionary role of peasants; adventurous attempts to "boost" revolution and skip its incomplete phases; rejection of broad democratic movements; special emphasis on waging "revolutionary wars"; denial of the possibility of building socialism in one country. In the 1920s and 1930s, the "theory" was supplemented by one more essential element — overt anti-Sovietism, which provided a platform for rallying diverse anti-socialist forces. T. referred slightly to the revolutionary potential of the Russian working class (which was declared to be "insufficiently prepared" for accomplishing a revolution), to the peasantry (assessed as a reactionary force bound to strike the proletariat "from the rear"), to the democratic phase of the revolution (struggle for democracy was considered by T. as a "past stage of the proletarian movement"). Trotsky's voluntaristic ideas about tossing revolution from country to country denied the possibility of any prolonged coexistence between states with different social systems. In the last years of Lenin's life and especially after his death, Trotsky made a frontal attack on Leninism, attempting to replace it with T. He distorted the history of the October Revolution, belittled the role of the Party and of Lenin. At the same time, T. attempted to undermine the unity of the Communist Party, advocating freedom of factions and setting the younger against the older generation. Having failed to find support within the Party, the Trotskyites began to set up underground groups and use illegal methods of struggle. The 15th Party Congress, in 1927, declared T. to be the "tool of a third force against the regime of proletarian dictatorship" and stated that adherence to T. was incompatible with Party membership. In February 1928, the 9th Plenum of the Comintern Executive Committee (and later the 6th Congress of the Comintern) approved the decisions

of the Party congress and declared adherence to T. incompatible with membership of the Communist International.

The subsequent history of T. is merely one of anti-communist and anti-Soviet struggle by small groups standing outside the organised working-class movement. The Trotskyite "4th International" (set up in 1938) called for the political system in the Soviet Union to be overthrown, spread defeatist moods, alleging the struggle for peace and democracy to be useless, denied the liberation character of the struggle against fascism, and opposed the creation of an anti-Hitlerite coalition and a united anti-fascist front. This discredited T. even more and many of its groups dissolved. Some revival of T. was registered in the 1960s-70s, this being explained by its plagiarism of the pseudo-revolutionism and leftist phrase-mongering by non-proletarian strata drawn into the anti-imperialist movement, as well as by its usefulness to the ideologists of anti-communism (q. v.). As for its organisation, modern T. is represented by seven rival international groupings, each claiming the right to be called the "4th International".

Contemporary T. is an anti-socialist trend. It has reinforced the reactionary content of Trotsky's thesis concerning the impossibility of socialism triumphing in one country. According to the Trotskyites, the proletariat of one country or a group of countries, having won power, cannot and must not build socialism, but must pursue a course towards world revolution, without which any proletarian state is doomed to degeneration. Victorious socialism is declared by Trotskyites to be a "society of a transitional period" and the socialist states are alleged to be "workers' states", some of which have already degenerated, while others are in the process of doing so. All Trotskyite groupings attack the policy of peaceful coexistence conducted by the socialist countries, as well as any actions contributing to detente and international co-operation. Though T. juggles verbiage on world revolution, it still pursues a course of disuniting revolutionary forces, both in the world as a whole and in separate countries, alleging that to link up revolutionary currents only detracts from

the goal of overthrowing capitalism. Trotskyites slander the working class of the capitalist countries, talking of its "passivity" and "demoralisation". Some Trotskyite groups, contradicting pre-war T., seek a revolutionary vanguard among the peasantry of the developing countries; others — among radical left-wing youth. As before, T. spreads doubt concerning the need for mass action by working people in making general democratic demands, it is hostile to the traditional forms of class struggle, advocating either "revolutionary idleness" by promising an impending revolutionary "Day X", or pointless putschism and adventurism. In the second half of the 1970s, a reformist trend began to gain strength within T. T. is cosmopolitan, since it frowns upon making revolution in accordance with the national and historical conditions of a particular country. Instead of fighting imperialism, T. actually fights the revolutionary vanguard of our time, the Communist Parties, striving to ideologically and organisationally disarm the proletariat. It seeks new devices for subversive anti-revolutionary activity, resorting to the tactic of so-called entryism, i.e., camouflaged penetration into mass democratic organisations, in order to undermine them from within. The Communist Parties regard struggle against T. as an important ideological task.

## U

**Unity of Action of the Working Class**, a tactic of proletarian organisations aimed at eliminating the split in the ranks of the working-class movement; it assumes different forms depending on the specific historical situation. The U.A.W.C., as opposed to the bourgeoisie's striving to split up the working class and incite conflicts and rivalry among its various contingents, parties and trade unions, is strengthening the proletariat's political role and rallying the broad working masses around it.

This unity has various aspects: there is international, national, ideological and

organisational unity; and it manifests itself in the form of temporary political blocs, various trends in the working-class movement, etc. The importance of a particular aspect depends on the historical stage and the concrete tasks.

Marx and Engels tried to offset the international strength of capital with the working-class unity based on the principles of proletarian internationalism (q. v.). The issue of U.A.W.C. became especially important under imperialism, when the struggle between the revolutionary and the reformist trends in the working-class movement led to an ideological and organisational split among the parties of the Second International (q. v.). During World War I and particularly after the Great October Socialist Revolution, in the setting of the revolutionary upsurge, a split occurred among the Social-Democrats both within national parties and on a world scale. Revolutionary elements formed Communist Marxist-Leninist parties, which united into the Third (Communist) International (q. v.). The Social-Democratic parties that remained after the split found themselves on the platform of reformist socialism (see Social-Democracy). The ideological and organisational split within the working class weakened its positions in the struggle against imperialist reaction, and the issue of unity again became central. In these circumstances, Lenin elaborated the tactics of the workers' united front, which was proclaimed from the rostrum of the Third (1921) and Fourth (1922) Comintern Congresses; the conclusion of an agreement among Communists, Socialists and other working-class organisations on joint action to uphold the working people's economic and political demands was required, in spite of the theoretical and tactical differences existing among various contingents of the working class. Decisive significance attaches to the masses' revolutionary movement, to actions "from below", to joint strikes, meetings and manifestations, and to the establishment of Committees of the United Front. Such kinds of mass movement were to serve as the groundwork for reaching an agreement among the leaders. Afterwards, the struggle for unity of action became a major task for

the world communist movement, despite the fact that the leaders of Social-Democracy and reformist trade unions had for many years opposed it and that it was weakened due to certain errors of a sectarian type committed by young Communist Parties. During the 1930s, when the struggle against the threat of a world war and impending fascism became the most important task facing all progressive forces, the movement for unity of action won ever new supporters to its side (see International Communist Movement).

The Seventh Congress of the Comintern (1935) elaborated Lenin's principles of unity of action, thus dealing a serious blow to "left" sectarianism and making the formation of a united workers' front the nucleus for rallying together all anti-fascist forces. In several countries, owing to the pressure from the working masses, it became possible to introduce unity "from above", so that a foundation was provided for uniting all democratic forces and organising the people's anti-fascist front (see Popular Front).

During World War II, the political line of the Seventh Congress of the Comintern was logically continued in the establishment of national and patriotic fronts, in which the anti-fascist patriotic forces of whole nations were rallied. In many respects this line anticipated the strategy and tactics of the Communist Parties in the national-democratic revolutions in Europe and Asia, which brought about a unification of Communist and Social-Democratic parties on the principles of Marxism-Leninism, i. e. brought ideological and organisational unity of the working class.

Today U.A.W.C. in the capitalist countries is necessary both for securing the social and political achievements of the working people in the context of stronger anti-democratic trends among the bourgeoisie, and for the working class to win new positions in the economic, political and social spheres. By achieving unity of action and rallying all democratic forces of the nation around itself, the working class becomes the nucleus of the anti-monopoly coalition uniting broad sections of workers, peasants, urban petty bourgeoisie, intellectuals and students in the

struggle for peace and democracy, and for the elimination of the sway of the monopolies. The International Meeting of the Communist and Workers' Parties (1969) emphasised that the working class was the pivot of the anti-monopoly coalition aimed at rallying various social and political forces, and that this was an earnest of success in the struggle not only to satisfy the working people's immediate needs and interests, but also to ensure society's transformation along socialist lines in the future. The contemporary forms of U.A.W.C. are diverse: joint actions by party, trade union, youth, women's and other organisations for short or prolonged periods of time, on a local, national or global scale (see also Proletarian Internationalism).

The Communist Parties, while fighting for U.A.W.C. focus mainly on co-operation between Communists and Socialists as the two major forces in the world working-class movement. In spite of the resistance put up by the right-wing Social-Democratic leadership and trade union officials, left elements, who come out in defence of U.A.W.C., are becoming more active in the Social-Democratic parties, trade unions and religious circles in many countries. Finland, France, Italy and some other countries have already gained experience in joint action by Communists and Socialists.

Considerable shifts have also occurred \*towards unification in the trade union movement. Agreements among parties and other organisations on unity of action result from the broad movement of the popular masses, such as peace rallies and rallies for a democratisation of the administration, economic strikes, in which working people from different political parties and trade unions take part, etc. The Communist Parties are playing the most important role in this struggle, the decisive factors of U.A.W.C. being cohesion within the international communist movement, and the struggle against leftist-sectarian dissenting elements. Objective circumstances are constantly proving to the working masses that unity is necessary, and the communist movement is steadfastly working to abolish the split within the working class, overcoming all obstacles and difficulties it encounters on the way.

**Uninterrupted Revolution**, an ascending development of the revolutionary process from bourgeois-democratic actions against feudal institutions to an anti-capitalist struggle and to the assumption of power by the proletariat.

The idea of U.R. emerged as a summing up of the experience gained by the working people in their class struggle during bourgeois and bourgeois-democratic revolutions, in particular during the French Revolution of 1848, when the proletariat ventured to come out with its own demands aimed against the capitalists. This attempt could not, of course, succeed at that time, but it revealed the intrinsic tendency in the development of the class struggle and demonstrated the link between the struggle for democracy and that for socialism. In their "Address of the Central Committee to the Communist League" (1850) Marx and Engels wrote: "Our interest and our task [are] to make the revolution permanent, until all more or less possessing classes have been forced out of their position of dominance, until the proletariat has conquered state power" (K. Marx, F. Engels, *Selected Works* in three volumes, Vol. 1, p. 179).

Marx and Engels saw U.R. as a sharp political class struggle that can sometimes assume the form of civil war (q.v.), a struggle in the course of which the proletariat at first comes out against feudal reaction (in alliance with all classes and strata opposed to it), then against the big bourgeoisie and the political forces representing it, and finally against the petty-bourgeois democrats who use pseudo-socialist phraseology to cover their "wish of abolishing the pressure of big capital on small capital, of the big bourgeois on the small bourgeois" (K. Marx, F. Engels, *Selected Works* in three volumes, Vol. 1, p. 177). The experience of the class struggle gained under imperialism (q.v.) showed that the concept of U.R. should be elaborated creatively, taking into account the new circumstances. A formal approach to this concept made a caricature of it, e.g. in Trotsky's "theory of permanent revolution" (see Trotskyism), which reflected the petty-bourgeois revolutionarism

against which the Marxist doctrine of U.R. is spearheaded. The concept of U.R. in Marxist theory is not a call for a "permanent" struggle against all and sundry, but for the development of the revolutionary process, for the establishment of a link between the struggle to fulfil democratic tasks with that to transform society along the socialist lines, effecting a change in the aims of the movement as it proceeds, and re-grouping class and political forces. Contrary to the "theory of permanent revolution", which ignores the peasantry and other allies of the working class, the Marxist theory of U.R. organically includes the issue of acting jointly with non-proletarian strata and political forces at particular stages of the movement, of compromises and possible concessions to allies. The skipping over of the bourgeois-democratic stage of the revolution and rejection of the revolutionary potential of the peasantry and an alliance with it revealed its leftist, sectarian essence and turned the "theory of permanent revolution" into an adventuristic scheme while the fact that it ignored the possibility of socialism triumphing in one country reduced the idea of uninterrupted revolutionary movements (see World Revolutionary Process) to calls for the export of revolution.

Lenin's theory of the bourgeois-democratic revolution developing into a socialist one was a real step forward in the Marxist concept of U.R. "From the democratic revolution," he wrote, "we shall at once, and precisely in accordance with the measure of our strength, the strength of the class-conscious and organised proletariat, begin to pass to the socialist revolution. We stand for uninterrupted revolution" (V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 9, pp. 236-237). Lenin proceeded from strictly distinguishing between the two stages of the revolution — the struggle for democratic reforms, and the struggle for socialism, with a special strategic line elaborated for each stage. He also developed Marx's idea of an alliance between the workers and the peasants (see Alliance of the Working Class and the Peasantry), speaking not only of the need for a peasant war to support the pro-



letariat's actions, but also of the deployment of class forces during both the struggle against tsarism and the preparation for socialist revolution. Lenin's theory of the bourgeois-democratic revolution developing into a socialist revolution regarded a determined struggle against the bourgeoisie for leadership in the revolutionary-democratic movement as a condition for establishing a firm alliance between the proletariat and the peasantry, because the bourgeoisie had exhausted its revolutionary potential. Such tactics were also determined by the fact that the main issue in Russian bourgeois-democratic revolution was the agrarian question, and the interests of the bourgeoisie and the peasant masses with respect to large-scale land ownership differed radically. At the first stage of the democratic struggle, when national liberation is the central issue, the circumstances call for the proletariat to co-operate with the patriotically-minded part of the bourgeoisie. Even in this situation, the issues of an ideological struggle, the dissemination of the ideas of scientific socialism within the liberation movement, are vital.

The intensification of the general crisis of capitalism (q. v.) makes the interests of the petty bourgeoisie, the middle strata (q. v.), increasingly opposed to those of the monopoly bourgeoisie, especially when big monopoly capital develops foreign, neocolonialist features. Under these conditions, the petty bourgeoisie's struggle against big capital objectively serves to clear the road for socialist transformations. Hence the question of co-operation and the establishment of a revolutionary government in which the proletariat could take part on a par with the peasantry, the small urban bourgeoisie, and the national bourgeoisie. Marxist-Leninist theory has solved this question in its conclusion concerning the possibility of establishing such a revolutionary government which would be a dictatorship of the proletariat and the peasantry, a revolutionary-democratic dictatorship of the people (see also Revolutionary Democracy). Thus the proletariat can and must promote revolutionary processes not only from below, through mass actions, but also

from above, by participating in the revolutionary-democratic government.

The Marxist-Leninist idea of the bourgeois-democratic revolution developing into a socialist one is being elaborated and specified in the practice of various countries and diverse revolutionary-democratic and national liberation movements.

**Utopian Socialism** is an assemblage of social teachings emanating from the desire, though yet primitive in form, to establish a new type of society free from exploitation (q. v.) of man by man and from all other forms of social inequality. U.S. emerged as a reflection of the contradictions of capitalism. "When feudalism was overthrown and 'free' capitalist society appeared in the world, it at once became apparent that this freedom meant a new system of oppression and exploitation of the working people. Various socialist doctrines immediately emerged as a reflection of and protest against this oppression" (V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 19, p. 27). As the first form negating the capitalist order in the name of the supreme, communist, social system, U.S. (and herein lies its essential difference from scientific communism, q. v.) failed to substantiate, theoretically or economically, the laws governing mankind's progress towards this new society, failed to interpret the active political and revolutionary movement of the proletariat as the force, whose direct vital need was to eliminate the capitalist order. U.S. "could not explain the real nature of wage-slavery under capitalism, ... could not reveal the laws of capitalist development, or show what *social force* is capable of becoming the creator of a new society" (*ibid.*).

The prehistory of U.S. goes far back into the past. The ideologies of many popular movements in precapitalist formations leaned towards equality of property, social justice, dreams of a society without forced labour, without poverty. Elements of such utopian dreams are to be found, for example, in early Christianity, in popular socio-religious teachings, heresies, and folklore. In feudal Western Europe, this popular utopian ideology of equality was crowned by the teachings

of Thomas Münzer, the leader of the 16th century Peasant War in Germany, who dreamed of establishing "God's reign on earth", meaning a society without class distinctions or private property, without an alienated state power. The gist of the ideology of this kind lay in its revolutionary negation of contemporary realities, while its positive demands were mostly of a very confused and primitive nature, looking retrospectively to the patriarchal equality system.

The humanitarian writings of the Renaissance and Enlightenment (16-18th cent.) also contributed to denouncing a system based on private ownership and to preaching social equality. Thomas More created the first literary utopia, that is a tale of a society that never existed anywhere, but which was greatly desired. Considering private property as the main source of social evil, he drew a detailed picture of a communist social system resting on collective ownership of the means of production. Similar utopias were created by other thinkers and writers of the period (T. Campanella, Morelly and others).

Yet those utopias were not socialist teachings as such (although they frequently come under the notion of socialism in the broader sense of the term along with the popular dream of equality in the spirit of egalitarian communism, q.v.). Despite their sharp criticism of the system of private ownership, the authors of utopias never ventured beyond naive contrasts between the system of exploitation and the new society created by the imagination and existing beyond the realm of rational knowledge or realistic understanding of social relations. In many respects, the utopias were retrospective. They either praised "the golden age" willed into existence in the far-gone past, or they idealised the primeval patriarchal relations (clusters of self-sufficient communities, by J. Meslier). Utopias were usually marked by utter primitivism and an egalitarian spirit. The creators of utopias mostly had little faith in the speedy realisation of their visions.

As a theory, U.S. appeared in the epoch of bourgeois revolutions, when an

orderly transition from political and civil equality (q.v.) to social equality, above all with regard to property, had become a popular demand. U.S. appeared as a logical outgrowth of the bourgeois-democratic revolutionary movement destined to supercede the latter. U.S. was able to see not only the positive outcome of bourgeois revolutions, but their limitations as well. For the first time in the history of world thought, socialism became referred to as a practicable result of reshaping the contemporary society by J. Winstanley, in the epoch of the English Revolution of the 17th century and by F. Babeuf in the epoch of the French Revolution of the 18th century. The ideal society by Winstanley is not just a beautiful dream never to be realised, but a system that can, in the opinion of the author, materialise in real life, right here, on this sinful earth of ours. Winstanley was a reformist suggesting a constitution of "a society of equals", now that the revolution failed to bring it to life. He sought to present this society as a natural product of current economic, social and political developments, as the ultimate goal and possible result of this revolution. Babeuf gave an even more eloquent expression to the aspirations of the plebeian masses that participated in the revolutionary process, but were disappointed by its results. Babouvism was not an apology for violence (q.v.) as much as an attempt to deepen the revolution and turn it into a "blessing for everybody". It was in this deepening of the revolution, as exemplified by the system of practical measures Babeuf offered, that he saw the way to build a new society of genuine justice. The founders of U.S., undoubtedly had weaknesses of their own. Thus, Winstanley made land cultivation the basis of production, with the family as the basic production and consumption unit. Babouvism was distinguished by its levelling trend, strict regulation, and utilitarian treatment of art. Yet none of this cancels out the main thing: a new society was conceived as being built on the basis of the existing one drawing on the achievements of the preceding historical process.

Constructive criticism of the bourgeois revolution and capitalism, i.e. a positive anti-bourgeois trend, is a common feature of every representative of U.S., regardless of the school. In this respect, the great socialists of the early 19th century — C. H. Saint-Simon, J. Fourier, and R. Owen, though vastly different from F. Babeuf in their treatment of the ways leading to socialism, posed as his direct followers and heirs. Saint-Simon and Fourier became acknowledged patriarchs of socialism owing to their acceptance of the natural, though limited, character of the accomplished bourgeois revolution and their sharp and yet constructive criticism of capitalism from the standpoint of an ideal society that does away with the division between workers and exploiters, from the standpoint of an association, united by common interests. Though the three great socialists of the early 19th century sought bloodless, non-violent methods for averting a revolution and transforming society, though they stood widely apart from one another on many counts, they still produced a number of most important ideas that served as the point of departure for the scientific communism of Marx and Engels. Among these are propositions concerning the law-governed and contradictory nature of social process, the notion of historical progress, treatment of labour as man's primary need, labour education, collectivism and economic planning, machine industry as a technological basis of the new social system, overcoming the antithesis between mental and physical labour, between town and country, and other ideas.

Succeeding generations of utopian socialists have evinced a desire not only to convince the ruling classes of the need for social reforms, but also to show the new way through their own activities (later Owen, *Icaria* of E. Cabet) or to discover the foundations of a future system in existing reality. This fact gave birth to both varied forms of social reformism (Proudhonism, Louis-Blancism, etc.) and to an absolutist approach to certain forms of revolutionary movement (Blanquism, Bakuninism). Since U.S. emerges as a

logical development and critical reappraisal of bourgeois-democratic thought, its ideas gain new vitality in the process and after the culmination of each bourgeois revolution.

On the issues of how a new society should be created, in their evaluation of revolutionary violence, etc., utopian socialists are divided into adherents of peaceful and of violent methods. On the issues of administration and government, utopian socialists are divided into proponents of rigid centralisation of state power and anarchists. In the realm of philosophy, utopian socialists are known to belong to a great variety of schools (materialists and atheists, idealists and religiously biased ones). Earlier schools of U.S. are mostly known for their general reliance on religion, while succeeding generations of socialists lean on rational knowledge: philosophy (philosophical socialism) and economic teachings (Sismondism, Proudhonism).

Depending on the socio-economic conditions, the U.S. followed its own specific pattern in each country. In the less developed countries of Eastern Europe and Asia, as well as Latin America and Africa in the 20th century, utopian-socialist teachings converge with petty-bourgeois, mostly peasant, revolutionary thinking. Thus, in 19th-century Russia, U.S. mostly followed the pattern of peasant socialism — Populist socialism (q.v.) (A. I. Herzen, P. L. Lavrov), though there was a tendency towards a non-Narodnik U.S. (D. I. Pisarev).

Under contemporary conditions, U.S. as a form of revolutionary democracy is typical and representative of the ideology of many anti-imperialist movements.

## V

**Violence (Coercion)**, the use of various forms of coercion, including armed ones, by any single class (or socio-political group) with respect to other classes (or socio-political groups) in order to achieve or retain economic and political domination, and certain rights and priv-

ileges. Violent means may be applied in relations between classes, within the dominant class (the struggle for power among different factions and parties), and in inter-state relations. The main organ of coercion is the state.

The history of antagonistic socio-economic formations shows a certain evolution of the forms of violence used by the exploiting classes in the sphere of production, ranging from various forms of non-economic coercion of labourers under the slave-owning and feudal systems, to the economic coercion typical of capitalism. In all antagonistic formations, V. has been systematically used in politics. In capitalist society, the relations of exploitation (q. v.) are masked by the workers' formal "freedom". Under imperialism (q. v.), however, the dominant classes tend to cast away formally democratic methods in an attempt to establish patently coercive, militarist, fascist dictatorships, and to apply diktat and war in foreign relations. Social demagoguery in ideology is accompanied by open apologetics of V. (the cult of force, the theory of elitism, racist theories, etc.), with fascism (q. v.) as its concentrated expression.

The progressive classes, in turn, apply V. to crush the system of moribund social relations and overthrow their related classes which do not wish to forego their interests and privileges of their own free will. In this case, V. is a revolutionary factor, for it promotes the transition from one mode of production to another.

Marxists posit the problem of V. taking account of the objective laws of and conditions under which the class struggle proceeds in an antagonistic society. History has proved that the dominant classes never renounce their privileges voluntarily, but resort to all possible means, not even stopping at mass terror, in their struggle against the oppressed classes. The revolutionary classes are, therefore, impelled to use V., including armed struggle, against them, too. The scale and forms of revolutionary proletarian V. are determined first and foremost by the resistance put up by the classes being overthrown, as well as by the scale and rate of current

revolutionary processes (see Class Struggle in the Transition Period from Capitalism to Socialism). In concrete-historical terms, Marxism rules that armed V. should be reduced to a minimum at each stage of the struggle and that milder forms of coercion should be used whenever possible. This rule stems from Marxism's humane essence and is dictated by revolutionary expediency, for armed struggle and civil war (q. v.) spell a great loss of life, suffering and privation for the masses, dislocation of the productive forces, and restriction of democratic institutions.

Marxism has always suggested a peaceful way of revolutionary development, which is realistic under certain conditions, as an alternative to the non-peaceful way (see Peaceful and Non-Peaceful Forms of Transition to Socialism). The possibility of it increases as the forces of socialism and progress grow, yet recognition of that possibility in no way implies that the exploiting classes may be willing to give up their power, property and privileges. No radical social revolution is possible other than through mass political action, coercion applied against the exploiters, and a dictatorship of the revolutionary classes, i. e. through certain forms of social V.

The building of socialism also requires that coercion be applied to the resisting elements of the exploiting classes (the big bourgeoisie and kulaks). The social extinction of the exploiting classes, which is inevitable in socialist society, does not, however, amount to reprisals against all their representatives, let alone their physical extermination: while systematically crushing the resistance on the part of the forces hostile to socialism, the proletarian state offers a real opportunity to all those loyal to it to apply their knowledge and abilities in building a new society.

New forms of social life emerge under socialism owing to the millions of people working consciously to bring that about. But if education, persuasion, and organisation are replaced by bureaucratic administration and coercion, by V., while democratic principles are violated (see Personality Cult), the cause of socialism is seriously damaged.

The communist movement elaborates the correct approach to the problem of V. as it struggles against opportunist, revisionist concepts (see Opportunism; Revisionism). On the one hand, these concepts exaggerate the opportunities offered by bourgeois democracy and ignore the reality of the tremendous growth of militarism, strengthening of the military-bureaucratic machine, and the striving of the ruling classes to establish openly coercive dictatorships and use diktat in international relations. On the other hand, holders of all kinds of leftist concepts exaggerate the importance of armed coercive actions in the revolutionary struggle waged by the oppressed classes, or attempt to introduce forcible measures into the practice of socialist construction.

The Marxist interpretation of V. is attacked and falsified in modern anti-communist writings (see Anti-communism). Bourgeois propagandists ignore the fact that bourgeois society is a system based on V. with respect to the working masses and oppressed nations. They attempt to paint Communists as adherents of terror and the popular liberation movement as a manifestation of "terrorism", but never utter a word about the fact that V., applied by the proletariat, has been forced upon it, and that it is of a transient, limited nature. In their activities, Communists stick to the behests of Marx, Engels and Lenin, who repeatedly emphasised that "violence is, of course, alien to our [communist] ideals" (V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 23, p. 69).

## W

**Women's Question**, in capitalist society an issue involving the position of women and the ways and means to emancipate working women in social terms; under socialism, reference is to actual equality of women and their participation in building socialism and communism.

For centuries, women have been deprived of equal rights with men in society. The forms of women's inequality and oppression changed with time, but the

fact of inequality, formalised by the state and sanctified by the church, remained intact. The exploiting classes' ideologists tried to justify this by referring to women's "inferiority", their special biological features, the function of motherhood, etc. Marx, Engels and Lenin proved, however, that women's inequality was rooted in socio-economic conditions, that it was the appearance of private property that caused woman's dependence on her husband or father and, in the exploiting classes, her class enslavement, too. Women were deprived of economic and political rights; they were spiritually enslaved and isolated from society; their activities were reduced to household duties. Capitalism gradually destroyed these narrow boundaries as it drew women into production that was social in nature; it did not, however, provide them with equal rights with men, but used women involved in production as an additional source of profit. Capitalism does not create the conditions for women to take part in social labour along with home-making and motherhood. Hence the struggle to emancipate women becomes part of the general struggle of the working people against exploitation; it requires women's direct participation in the revolutionary movement and in the building of the new society, too.

After the Great October Socialist Revolution, women's emancipation and involvement in social, production and cultural work on a par with men was seen as a major task of the Soviet state, which made women really equal with men.

The Constitution of the USSR (1977) not only proclaims women's equal rights with men, but also ensure the exercise of these rights by according women equal access to education and vocational and professional training, equal opportunities in employment, remuneration and promotion, and in social, political, and cultural activities, by introducing special labour and health protection measures for women and by providing conditions that enable women with children to hold a job.

In 1978, women accounted for 51 per cent of the gainfully employed population in the Soviet economy; they comprised

84 per cent of workers in trade and public catering, 83 per cent in health protection, physical training and social insurance, 74 per cent in public education, and 71 per cent in cultural establishments. More and more women hold management posts in the economy, and in local and higher government bodies. They account for 32.5 per cent of the Deputies elected to the USSR Supreme Soviet in 1979. The sphere of women's labour in various branches of the economy is steadily expanding as a result of scientific and technological progress and the changes it causes in the character of labour. The fact that women in socialist countries have to spend a considerable part of their time on domestic chores has a detrimental effect on their participation in socio-productive labour and on the development of their inborn gifts. Great efforts are therefore being made in the USSR to restructure the domestic economy, shifting more of its functions to social production.

Under socialism, motherhood is woman's honorary duty. The Communist Party and the Government create all the conditions women with children need to fulfil their duty to society in bringing up their children.

The experience gained by the USSR and other socialist countries on tackling the women's question is of great international significance. It has a revolutionising impact on the struggle waged by the working women for their rights in the capitalist countries. Though the principle of equal pay for equal work has been proclaimed in the Constitutions of the capitalist countries, employers constantly violate it by discriminating against women. In the industrialised capitalist countries, women receive from 20 to 50 per cent less than men for the same work. Women's right to work is not guaranteed and largely depends on the current economic situation. Women are the first to be fired if unemployment rises, for they are usually less qualified than men. In fact, they continue to be discriminated against in the sphere of general and professional education. In the bourgeois states there is no effective system of assistance to women who have to combine work in production with the du-

ties of a housewife and mother. The majority of child-care institutions are privately-owned and are often beyond the means of the broad population. In many capitalist countries marriage and motherhood are serious obstacles for a woman seeking a job. Recently, women have achieved certain success in their struggle for political rights, in particular for suffrage. Yet only a small number of women are Members of Parliament or occupy posts in local government.

The problems involved in granting women equal rights with men loom large in the developing countries. Though, in several of them, certain success has been achieved in the emancipation of women in the course of the national liberation movement, economic backwardness, illiteracy, ignorance, religious prejudice and obsolete ideas about women's place at home and in society still tell on their position.

The international women's movement has a major part to play in the struggle to improve their position and to win rights. It is motley in character, being made up of a democratic, bourgeois-feminist, clerical, Social-Democratic, and other trends. Communists see the women's liberation movement as a component part of the struggle for peace, democracy and socialism; they try to draw women into the active struggle for social transformations. Bourgeois parties try to make use of feminist organisations to distract women from the revolutionary movement. Feminism often causes enmity between the sexes, without affecting the foundations of the capitalist system. At the same time, bourgeois-feminist, pacifist and religious women's organisations, taking into account the demands put forward by the broad masses of women, are today including in their programmes social problems, such as female employment, equal opportunities in education and vocational training, equal pay for equal work, as well as the issues involved in maintaining peace (see also *Struggle for Peace*); some of them co-operate with the democratic women's movement. The leading role in the latter is now played by the Women's International Democratic Federation

(WIDF), which was established in 1945; it is the most numerous international women's organisation and it inspires the women's movement not only to work to achieve equal rights with men, but also to maintain peace, strengthen national independence and provide freedom and democratic rights for all peoples.

**Working Class**, the is one of the major classes in both capitalist and socialist societies, the main force that produces material wealth and changes social relations. Under capitalism, the W.C. (proletariat) is the most exploited class and is opposed to the bourgeoisie. Under socialism, the W.C. holds the leading positions in society.

The first wage workers appeared in the 16th century with the emergence of capitalism. In subsequent centuries, however, the workers did not form a complete homogeneous class. The emergence and evolution of an industrial proletariat and its transformation into an independent class were a result of the industrial revolution. Concerning the industrial revolution in England, which had began in the middle of the 18th century, Engels noted that "...the mightiest result of this industrial transformation is the English proletariat" (K. Marx, F. Engels, *Collected Works*, Vol. 4, p. 320).

The W.C. is society's most progressive and revolutionary class. Since it is the most oppressed class under capitalism, it can only free itself through a class struggle against the bourgeoisie, by abolishing private ownership of the means of production and by establishing social ownership (see *Historic Mission of the Proletariat*). Thus, the W.C. abolishes all exploitation of man by man and frees both itself and the other strata of the working people. The W.C. is called upon to exercise the hegemony in the struggle for emancipation (see *Hegemony of the Proletariat*) and realises its vital interests under the guidance of the Communist Party, which is armed with a revolutionary Marxist-Leninist theory (see *Marxism-Leninism*).

The growth in the share and socio-political significance of the W.C. is a historical law stemming from its place

and role in production. The W.C. increases as large-scale industry develops. There were no more than 10 million industrial workers in the world in the mid-19th century. By the beginning of the 20th century their numbers had grown to approximately 30 million in the leading capitalist countries. There were over 600 million workers and other employees in the world by the late 1970s. The W.C. has its own professional, political and other organisations; over 250 million people are members of trade unions (see *Trade Unions and the Trade Union Movement*), and the 90-odd Communist and Workers' Parties have a total membership of close to 70 million. In addition, there are nearly 60 Socialist and Social-Democratic parties.

The W.C. of the socialist countries is the vanguard of the world W.C. The socialist revolution has radically changed its role in society and the forms of its socio-political activity. The W.C. has ceased to be a class deprived of the means of production; it has turned from the struggle against the ruling, exploiting classes under capitalism to being the driving social force in the building of socialism and communism. The overwhelming majority of workers in the socialist countries are united in trade unions; the most advanced workers are members of Communist Parties. The working class of the socialist countries displays its international solidarity by rendering a considerable aid to the revolutionary movements in other countries. Under socialism, there is no unemployment, a social evil for the working class in the capitalist countries. As the scientific and technological revolution (q.v.) proceeds in socialist society, the material position of the W.C. is improved, the educational and cultural level is raised, the professional training is sophisticated, the share of highly skilled workers in production increases, unskilled labour is gradually eliminated and manual labour acquires more and more elements of intellectual labour.

These processes, connected with scientific and technological progress, also take place in the developed capitalist countries, thereby influencing the extent to which

the W.C. is organised and the level of its class consciousness. At the same time, the nature of these processes is affected by the place the W.C. occupies in the social structure of capitalist society. The proletariat here is a class deprived of the means of production and compelled, therefore, to sell its labour and be subjected to exploitation (q.v.). The bourgeoisie spares no effort to hamper the political development and growth of the W.C.'s class consciousness. To this end, use is made of the heterogeneity of the W.C. and the existence of a "labour aristocracy" and a "labour bureaucracy" in it. Today the W.C. of the developed capitalist countries comprises a large part of the international W.C. and a large section of the working population of these countries. The industrial proletariat is its backbone. At the same time, the number of workers engaged in the non-productive sphere is increasing. There is also an increase in the number of persons occupied in mental labour whose position, way of life and type of labour are merging with those of the workers (see Office Workers). Bourgeois and petty-bourgeois ideologists and representatives of reformism and revisionism (qq.v.) put forth theses concerning the "disappearance" of the W.C., its "integration" into capitalist society, the "loss" of its revolutionary spirit, etc. The system of state-monopoly capitalism does not, however, abolish the oppression of the W.C. On the contrary, it increases it. Like other working strata, it is deprived of the right to decide the vital affairs of society. That is why its struggle against the entire system of exploitation increases rather than weakens, as do its numbers, power and influence. The W.C. is now becoming ideologically and organisationally consolidated. The ranks of the trade unions are swelling, and the influence of the Communist Parties is becoming ever greater. In recent years the strike movement of the W.C. has mounted; the W.C. takes an active part in the struggle for peace (q.v.), democracy and social progress. This struggle strengthens its unity and helps to unite it with the peasantry (q.v.), middle urban strata (see Middle Sections) and all anti-monopoly forces

(see Unity of Action of the Working Class; Political Struggle of the Working Class; Economic Struggle of the Working Class).

The number of workers in the developing countries (q.v.) is increasing rapidly in the modern epoch (q.v.). The W.C. still composes the minority of the working population of these countries. Besides, the constant influx of peasant and other petty-bourgeois elements, like the existence of feudal, clan and tribal survivals and traditions, hamper the growth of the W.C. organisation, its solidarity and ideology. Social progress is, however, bringing about the rapid growth of the industrial proletariat. Such workers' organisations as trade unions are rapidly emerging and evolving; a socialist ideology is taking hold. The working class in Asia, Africa and Latin America is actively striving for complete national and social liberation. Its role in the socio-economic and political changes in the socialist-orientated countries is increasing (see Non-capitalist Path of Development). Today the W.C.'s role in the historical process and its leading position in the struggle against imperialism, for social progress and the triumph of socialism, are enhancing. The international W.C. and its major accomplishment — the world socialist system (q.v.) — are the main revolutionary forces of our epoch.

**World Capitalist System**, the sum-total of countries with a capitalist social system, which are linked to one another by economic, political and other types of relations. Their community is based on the domination of similar capitalist production relations, though the level of their development differs from country to country. There are precapitalist structures, too, in some of the countries belonging to this system, but they are disintegrating under the impact of capitalist production relations, which generally prevail. Among the diverse relations that exist between capitalist countries, their economic relations, the aggregate of which makes up the world capitalist economy based on the world capitalist division of labour and the world capitalist market, are the definitive, system-forming ones. Political, ideological and other superstructural relations also emerge between capitalist



countries, alongside the economic relations.

W.C.S. began to take shape in the 16th century; the process went on as capitalism developed and expanded; on the one hand, there was a growing number of countries in which the capitalist system was established and, on the other, their economic and other relationships became stronger. The upsurge of the productive forces caused by the industrial revolution engendered a tendency towards economic rapprochement and expansion of trade between capitalist countries, and this, in turn, enhanced the division of labour. W.C.S. took its final form at the stage of imperialism (q. v.), at the turn of the 20th century, when the trend towards the internationalisation of economic life in the capitalist countries intensified as a result of the export of capital and the emergence of international monopolies, which divided up the capitalist countries' markets among themselves. The dialectics of the rapprochement between countries under capitalism consists in the fact that it does not proceed voluntarily, but in the midst of a fierce struggle between these countries, accompanied by wars and by some countries enslaving others. The emergence of the capitalist colonial system, which signified the establishment of the political domination, in addition to the economic one, of a small group of imperialist countries over the vast majority of the world's nations, played a major role in the formation of W.C.S. "The world capitalist system," says the Programme of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, "emerged and developed in fierce struggle between the countries composing it, through the subjection and exploitation of the weaker countries by the strong, through the enslavement of hundreds of millions of people and the reduction of entire continents to the status of colonial appendages of the imperialist metropolitan countries."

The relations between countries belonging to W.C.S. in the early 20th century were characterised, first, by a system of world domination by the imperialist powers' financial capital and of exploitation by it of the world's nations; and second, by the imperialist powers' sway over the colonial and dependent countries. "Capitalism,"

Lenin wrote, "has grown into a world system of colonial oppression and of the financial strangulation of the overwhelming majority of the population of the world by a handful of 'advanced' countries" (V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 22, p. 191).

Since the law, discovered by Lenin, of the uneven economic and political development of capitalism at the stage of imperialism operates in W.C.S., the objective and subjective conditions conducive to capitalism's revolutionary replacement by a new social system, socialism, cannot appear simultaneously in different countries. The victory of the Great October Socialist Revolution and Russia's embarkation on building socialism initiated the collapse of W.C.S. The general crisis of capitalism (q. v.) set in, with the crisis of the world capitalist economy, i. e. the destruction of the imperialist system of world economic relations, being a component part. In the course of that crisis, more and more countries leave W.C.S. and take to the socialist road of development, and its colonial system goes through consecutive stages of crisis and decay, and finally collapses altogether (see Disintegration of the Colonial System). Another world social system, the world socialist system (q. v.), has now come into existence alongside W.C.S.; the relations between countries within this system are of an entirely different type.

The contemporary W.C.S. is a complicated and controversial phenomenon. On the one hand, there is a group of highly-developed capitalist countries, such as the states of North America, Western Europe, Japan, and certain other countries; on the other, there is a large group of Asian, African and Latin American countries, which have only recently freed themselves of colonialism and launched their own independent development (see Developing Countries), and which have inherited an exceptionally low economic level from colonialism.

At present, the monopolisation of the world capitalist economy is intensifying. An ever increasing share of world capitalist production falls within the sphere of influence of the multinational corpo-

rations, i. e. the biggest monopolies of the imperialist powers, for the most part in the USA, which seize the leading positions in many countries of W.C.S. by exporting capital. The output of the biggest US multinationals is so great that their sales exceed the GNPs of such states as Denmark, Austria or Norway.

Internationalisation processes are intensifying today both in production and in capital within W.C.S. As a result of the aggravation of the general crisis of capitalism and the strengthening of the positions of socialism throughout the world, a trend is generated towards consolidation among capitalist countries. In the economic field, while trying to adapt to the requirements of the developing productive forces during the scientific and technological revolution (q. v.), they extend their mutual economic contacts, effect integration (see *Integration, Capitalist*) and elaborate some other forms of international state-monopoly regulation. In the political sphere, they form all sorts of agreements and set up military blocs of a NATO type, these invariably being spearheaded against the socialist countries and the national liberation movement. These trends cannot, however, eliminate inter-imperialist contradictions, which are growing more acute under the impact of the law of the capitalist countries' uneven economic and political development.

The chronic instability of the world capitalist economy renders inter-imperialist contradictions particularly acute. The worldwide crises of overproduction, intrinsic in capitalism, as was demonstrated once again by the grave world crisis that set in in 1974-75, are typical, and no state-monopoly regulation of the economy can eliminate them. In addition, the contemporary W.C.S. has been afflicted by energy, raw material and monetary crises born of the imperialist monopolies' activities. As the contradictions within W.C.S. grow in intensity, the economic situation in the capitalist countries becomes worse, the result being galloping inflation, unemployment and a deepening of social antagonisms.

The contradictions between the developed capitalist countries and developing states are also becoming more acute. Mo-

nopolies and imperialist states try to obstruct the economic and political liberation of the newly emerged national states and to retain them within W.C.S. by implanting neo-colonialism. Despite the certain success they have scored in their struggle against imperialism, the bulk of the developing countries remain an exploited sector of the world capitalist economy. Though many of them, it must be objectively recognised, are still developing along capitalist lines, the intrinsic interests of their struggle to achieve economic independence and halt the sway of foreign capital and exploitation by multinationals makes them combine forces to oppose the imperialist system of domination. The central goals the developing countries set themselves are reflected in their demand for the establishment of a new international economic order, which would, in particular, provide for increasing assistance to the developing countries, introducing measures to stabilise their export revenues, controlling the activities of the multinationals on their territories, etc. The newly liberated countries, that have opted for the non-capitalist road, are the ones that are waging a struggle against imperialism in the most consistent way.

Today W.C.S. has been deprived of an opportunity to determine the world development as a whole; world economics and politics are increasingly falling under the influence of the world socialist system, while the latter's economic might is constantly growing. Relationships within W.C.S. are also influenced by the socialist countries' stronger positions; e. g. economic assistance rendered by the socialist community to the developing countries impels the imperialist states to make certain concessions to their former colonies. All the contradictions inherent in W.C.S. are intensifying, and the system as a whole is losing strength as world socialism gains firmer positions, the national liberation anti-imperialist movement becomes stronger and the class struggle within the capitalist countries assumes a new dimension.

**World Revolutionary Process**, contemporary revolutionary movements, taken as a whole. It includes socialist revolutions, national liberation, anti-colonial and anti-im-

perialist revolutions, popular, anti-feudalist and democratic revolutions, the struggle for democratic change, for the overthrow of fascist and other dictatorial regimes (see also Revolution, Popular-Democratic; Revolution, National-Liberation; Revolution, Socialist). The merger of separate, and often heterogeneous mass movements into a single W.R.P., ultimately spearheaded against capitalism, is typical of the modern epoch (q. v.). Despite the unevenness of capitalist development and the formation of objective and subjective prerequisites for socialist revolution in individual countries, the world capitalist system (q. v.) as a whole is ripe for the transition to socialism. Under these conditions, anti-imperialist actions by the masses, even if backed-up by petty-bourgeois strivings in social terms, and an ideology that is a far cry from scientific socialism, are objectively, irrespective of the participants' intentions, promoting socialism and bringing its world-wide victory nearer. The evolution of W.R.P. consists in a progressive growth of genuinely socialist forces and trends.

The world socialist community comprises the leading contingent and centre of the world revolutionary movement. Fraternal socialist countries regard it as their internationalist duty to render all kinds of assistance to the peoples fighting for their political and economic independence. World socialism exerts a growing influence on W.R.P. through its achievements in all spheres of social life, through a strengthening of confidence in socialist ideals and the rendering of effective support to world revolutionary forces. The world socialist system is a component part of W.R.P., which not only operates as a factor that revolutionises the masses, but also exerts, by the very fact of its existence and the experience it has accumulated, a definite influence on the forms and ways in which certain laws of capitalism manifest themselves. To prolong its existence, capitalism in the developed capitalist countries is impelled to resort to such methods as regulation and programming of the economy, and to introduce certain improvements in the working and living conditions of the working class.

The struggle of the working class in the developed capitalist countries is an important component of W.R.P. This revolutionary contingent has accumulated tremendous experience of class struggles and has acquired noble combat traditions, established strong political organisations and gained a considerable improvement in its position in society. But it is precisely in the developed capitalist countries that the working class is confronted by a powerful and flexible opponent, the main forces of imperialism. It is here that the corrupting impact of bourgeois ideology is the strongest, and the split of the working-class movement into two wings—a revolutionary one and a reformist one—is most telling. Taking into account the lessons taught by history, the Communist Parties are actively working to achieve unity of action (see Unity of Action of the Working Class).

In the new historical conditions, the national liberation movement turns into an inherent part of W.R.P. rather than just remaining a "reserve" of proletarian revolutions, and the peasantry (q. v.), which is the chief productive class in the developing countries (q. v.), forms its social base. The semi-proletarian and non-proletarian masses of town and country, the middle sections (q. v.), the intelligentsia (q. v.) (in particular the officer corps) and the national bourgeoisie play an important part in the national liberation revolutions in most countries. One specific feature of the contemporary historical age is that the goals and objectives set by the national liberation movements are growing closer to those of other revolutionary contingents. Many developing countries resolutely object to capitalism as the general line of development. Some of them are attempting to synthesise certain elements of capitalism with those of socialism, while others proclaim socialism as the only acceptable prospect. Of course, the notions about socialism current among the leaders and ideologists of the national liberation movement are more often than not a far cry from scientific socialism (see Theories of "National Socialism"). It is quite possible, however, that as new national states emerge and socialist forces increase worldwide, these utopian and essentially petty-bour-

geous concepts will gradually grow closer to scientific socialism, while the transitional, intermediate social structures of today will become increasingly filled with a socialist content. This path is bound to be thorny, and temporary set-backs are possible now and then. But the growing role of the international working class in W.R.P., and the growing unity of the working-class and the national liberation movement create dependable prerequisites for the developing countries to advance along a non-capitalist road (see *Non-capitalist Path of Development*).

The international communist movement (q. v.) is the political force called on to ensure the unity of W.R.P. and make it embark on socialist transformations. The unity of that movement is not achieved by subordinating all parties to a single centre, but by waging a joint struggle to attain common objectives, with each party enjoying full independence as it chooses the ways and means it intends to employ in its work. The Communist and Workers' Parties resolutely oppose sectarianism, right and "left" opportunism (q. v.) and revisionism (q. v.), and vigorously promote the people's current demands; they defend the unity of action of all working-class political organisations and work to draw the broad working masses into the struggle for socialism.

It would be wrong to see W.R.P. as an uninterrupted chain of victories and gains. Certain temporary failures, setbacks and periods of reverse movement are in store for any revolutionary contingent. The greater the cohesion of the main forces of W.R.P. and the co-ordination of the Communist Parties' actions, however, the lower the price the peoples will have to pay for their national and social liberation.

**World Socialist Community**, has been formed by sovereign socialist states. It relies on a common type of economic foundation — public ownership of the means of production, a common type of state system — the power of the people led by the working class, and a common ideology — Marxism-Leninism (q. v.).

The sovereign states united in W.S.C., which is an international alliance of a

new type, follow a concerted political course, holding identical ideological views on the world social process and the building of socialism and communism, and taking an active part in socialist economic integration.

The socialist community as a new type of international alliance differs in principle from bourgeois "communities" and "alliances" that rely on state-monopoly capitalism, the bourgeois state system and the ideology of the exploiting ruling class. Participation in or siding with this kind of "alliance" is incompatible with the essence and goals of the socialist community. Marxism-Leninism sees the objective foundation of and reasons behind the appearance of inter-state capitalist associations and even recognises the possibility of maintaining business contacts with some of them (for example, with the European Economic Community) on the principles of peaceful coexistence (see *Peaceful Coexistence of States with Different Social Systems*). But it also recognises the objective existence of the class boundary running between the community of the socialist countries and the international alliances formed by imperialists.

W.S.C. is made up by the socialist states, which are allied by the community of their system and commitment to the cause of peace, socialism, democracy and national independence. Within the framework of the community, they voluntarily develop all-round co-operation with one another on the basis of the principles of Marxism-Leninism and international solidarity, respect for the equality and sovereignty of each country, non-interference in one another's internal affairs, and friendly mutual assistance. This co-operation has consolidated the ideological and political unity of the fraternal countries. The mechanism of their foreign policy interaction has been functioning smoothly (primary mention should be made of the Warsaw Treaty Organisation, the concerted activities of the community's members in the United Nations, at general European and other forums, bilateral co-operation, etc.). A long-term Comprehensive Pro-

gramme for the Further Extension and Improvement of Co-operation and the Development of Socialist Economic Integration, adopted in 1971 at the 25th session of the Council for Mutual Economic Assistance (CMEA), has been worked out and is being successfully implemented; ideological and cultural contacts are also being constantly expanded. As a result of the consolidation of the socialist countries and further promotion of fraternal friendship between their Marxist-Leninist parties and peoples, the joint strength of socialism and its impact on the development of international events has considerably increased. Today the community of the socialist countries has become the world's most dynamic economic force and the leading factor in world politics. The successes gained by the socialist countries united in the community prove convincingly that the future belongs to socialism.

Socialist economic integration has now become a major factor in the economic life of the world socialist community, called on to expand the production and improve the quality of the material goods needed by socialist society. It is characterised by unity of the productive forces and production relations. The productive forces of the socialist countries are intensively and extensively co-operated with the help of the world socialist division of labour and socialist economic integration as a whole, forming the socialist community's material base.

The economic basis of the community is made up of the national-state (internal) and international relations of production, the international superstructure being formed in conformity with that basis.

There are no supra-national bodies within the community, and the Comprehensive Programme does not provide for any. The member-countries of the Warsaw Treaty Organisation and the CMEA have concluded, at summit level, bilateral treaties of friendship, co-operation and mutual assistance, that regulate the political, economic, cultural and defence relationships between the parties. The treaties always reflect multilateral relations bet-

ween the community's countries, since each socialist country is party to similar treaties with all the other countries of the community.

Of immense importance is the operation and development within the community of the two large international organisations, the Warsaw Treaty Organisation and the CMEA. They employ a whole set of forms and methods to effect multilateral inter-state co-operation. Documents adopted by the Warsaw Treaty Organisation or CMEA bodies, for example, are recommendatory only for a short term; as soon as they are ratified or approved by the corresponding national bodies of the member-countries, they assume the force of law.

The community's success in the political sphere is enhanced by a step-up in the constructive activities of such joint bodies as the Political Consultative Committee (PCC) and the General Staff of the Joint Armed Forces of the Warsaw Treaty Organisation. There is also the Committee of Foreign Ministers and the Joint Secretariat, which operate within the framework of the PCC.

Seeing the socialist community as an international alliance of a new type has helped the fraternal parties to bring to light the historical trend and pattern in the establishment of world socialism. The 25th CPSU Congress emphasised that "the ties between socialist states are becoming ever closer with the flowering of each socialist nation and the strengthening of their sovereignty, and elements of community are increasing in their policy, economy, and social life" (*Report of the CPSU Central Committee and the Immediate Tasks of the Party in Home and Foreign Policy. 25th Congress of the CPSU*, p. 10).

Today, the socialist community leads all the revolutionary forces, which can be explained by a number of factors; first, its peoples have passed through the school of a victorious socialist revolution; second, the greatest experience has been accumulated within its framework, not only in toppling the exploiting classes, but also in socialist transformations, consolidation of the new system, development

of material and intellectual life at various stages of the transition period, the building of the foundations of socialism, and achievement of developed socialism. Collective experience has been gained in various forms and methods of waging the class struggle, winning power and building developed socialism in the USSR, and effecting socialist construction in the other CMEA countries. Finally, the world socialist community disposes of a vast material strength on which the alliance of today's major revolutionary forces reposes.

**World Socialist System**, emerged after World War II, as socialism extended beyond the borders of a single country. Its formation became the decisive factor in weakening and narrowing down the sphere of influence of imperialism (q. v.). As the military, political, economic and ideological relations between the East European socialist countries developed, the Warsaw Treaty Organisation and the Council for Mutual Economic Assistance were set up. In fact this formalised the establishment of the socialist community based on common ideological, political and economic positions and united by the common goal of building socialism and communism (see World Socialist Community). W.S.S. and world socialist community may be interpreted as similar concepts, provided the states making up the world socialist system and the Communist and Workers' Parties at their head conduct a concerted political course and share ideological views with respect to the world social process and the building of socialism and communism. The majority of the socialist countries have formalised their membership of W.S.S. in their Constitutions and programmatic documents. The Constitution of the USSR, for example, reads: "The USSR, as part of the world system of socialism and of the socialist community, promotes and strengthens friendship, co-operation, and comradely mutual assistance with other socialist countries on the basis of the principle of socialist internationalism, and takes an active part in socialist economic integration and the socialist international division of labour." (Art. 30.)

The formation of W.S.S. was initiated

by the Great October Socialist Revolution. During the period of its existence, socialism has wrought drastic changes in the world's political pattern. From 1917 to 1919, it accounted for hardly 8 per cent of the population, 16 per cent of the territory, and less than 3 per cent of the industrial output of the world; by 1980, these figures had become about 33, over 26, and over 40 per cent respectively. The growth of the socialist system is proceeding in historical terms through the comprehensive development of each of the countries that make it up, and of all of them taken together, and through it being joined by more and more countries as a result of the intensification of the general crisis of capitalism (q. v.).

Each socialist country has its own rates of economic development; owing to certain historical and economic specifics, they are higher in some and lower in others. In objective terms, however, the rate of economic growth is higher in the countries that used to lag behind the others in their development, as it is essential that the economic development levels be made uniform within W.S.S. It takes a long time to equalise social and economic levels within the system, especially because, as more and more countries embark on the socialist road, socio-economic differences will always emerge anew, since the revolutions in them do not occur simultaneously and their levels of productive forces, economies and culture vary. Further development of the productive forces and production relations, and a correct policy pursued by the Marxist-Leninist parties make it possible to eliminate the discrepancies that arise between the socialist countries and even out their economic development levels, provided they have identical social systems and their fundamental interests and goals coincide.

The socialist countries are sovereign states. Their community is based on the general promotion of their mutual co-operation (both bilateral and multilateral), on the basis of the principle of friendly mutual assistance and mutual benefit. Having grown beyond the boundaries of a single country, socialism inevitably brought

about international co-operation between the peoples of the new world; it is aimed at a rapid uplift of the economy, culture and material standards of the working people, and at the joint defence of their achievements as they confront imperialism and its attempts to split the peoples of W.S.S., it is aimed at ensuring peace and creating the international conditions for building a classless society. As a result, a special sphere of international economic, political, ideological and cultural contacts has appeared (see *Integration, Socialist*).

The socialist countries' political consolidation and economic integration is an irrevocable law of the development of each of them. To ignore the necessity of fraternal co-operation and reject the chance of utilising the advantages and opportunities offered by W.S.S. is to break with socialist internationalism and Marxism-Leninism, and side with nationalism (q.v.), which conflicts with the interests of strengthening W.S.S.

The close multilateral co-operation between the socialist countries turns W.S.S. into a new world-wide socio-economic organism, which is developing in conformity with its own laws, rather than a mere agglomerate of states with similar socio-political structures.

Economic interaction with W.S.S. helps even out not only the economic, but also the social development of its members, i.e. overcome the distinctions in their class structure, which is a major condition for bringing about an international rapprochement between the peoples of the socialist countries. "This process of a gradual drawing together of socialist countries is now operating quite definitely as an objective law" (*Report of the CPSU Central Committee and the Immediate Tasks of the Party in Home and Foreign Policy. 25th Congress of the CPSU*, p. 10).

## Y

**Youth and Youth Movement.** Youth is a socio-demographic (age) group with

specific ways of life, rules of conduct and tastes, which is relatively independent in its organisation, forms of recreation, etc. Young people under 25 comprise half the world's population. Young people reflect the views, interests and purpose orientations of the classes they represent; yet social origins do not automatically and irrevocably determine their world outlook and political stand, since they are influenced by a great variety of socio-economic, political and ideological factors and social forces that seek understanding and support among the younger generation. Forming groups according to the class principle, young people differ in the place they occupy in social production, their role in social processes and their attitude to particular ideologies. Marxism-Leninism regards the youth movement as a social force in connection with the working-class struggle and the objective of radically transforming society. The youth movement is not homogeneous as seen from this angle; it includes ideologically and politically distinctive trends: democratic and progressive, on the one hand, and leftist or right-wing, nationalist, etc., on the other.

Lenin emphasised that, since each new generation is moulded under specific conditions, youth "of necessity" has to advance "to socialism in a different way, by other paths, in other forms, in other circumstances than their fathers" (V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 23, p. 164). The economic, ideological and political crisis that set in under capitalism in the 1970s was accompanied by an aggravation of the position of young people, a growth of unemployment within their ranks and an onslaught by the bourgeois state on their rights. Objective grounds were thus created for heightening youth's protest against capitalist society and the bourgeois way of life, and for seeking genuine vital ideas and values and ways to attain them. Working youth is stepping up its activities in the anti-monopoly struggle, in proletarian strikes and the trade union movement. The influence of working-class youth on other sections and groups of young people, in particular among students, is increasing. The political views held by

students are maturing and become closer to society's real life; their various contingents are becoming further consolidated on the basis of anti-imperialism, and the organisational level of mass student actions is rising. Young engineers and technicians, office workers and senior schoolchildren and college students are taking a more active part in the anti-monopoly movement. Progressive-minded young people in the developing countries are steadfastly fighting to enhance socio-economic and political transformations, to put a stop to racism (q.v.) and apartheid, and eliminate dictatorial and reactionary regimes; they are bending every effort to achieve complete liberation from imperialist bondage and eradicate the aftermath of colonialism and neo-colonialism. Yet young people do not automatically take the side of revolutionary forces in the confrontation between progress and reaction; to ensure that, the Communist and Workers' Parties should conduct consistent and painstaking work among young people.

The democratic section of the world youth movement, which is the leading and most promising one, includes a whole system of organisations. The place of priority among them belongs to the World Federation of Democratic Youth (WFDY), which was established in 1945 and formalised the unity of democratic-minded young people in many countries that emerged in the struggle against fascism. WFDY has grown into the largest and most representative democratic organisation of young people fighting for their own rights, and for peace, democracy and social progress; it includes over 200 organisations from more than 100 countries. The International Union of Students (IUS) is another mass progressive organisation of young people; it was formed in 1946 and embraces three quarters of all national student organisations. The principal lines of its activities are the struggle to improve students' living and study conditions, assistance to students' organisations in the developing countries in preparing their national cadres, promotion of students' activities in the sphere of culture, tourism, sport, etc. The WFDY's International Com-

mittee of Children's and Adolescents' Movements (CIMEA) is an influential and authoritative co-ordinating centre of the democratic movement of children and teenagers. The revolutionary-democratic youth movement is confronted by youth organisations catering to imperialism and anti-communism (q.v.), primarily by the World Assembly of Youth (WAY).

International detente creates conditions that are more conducive to establishing broad democratic associations of young people of different political, philosophical and religious orientations in order to fight for peace, security and disarmament. More opportunities appear for youth to get acquainted with the real gains and advantages of socialism. Socialism opens up prospects for the young people of today that conform to their interests and ideals. It goes without saying that youth could not join the builders of a new society or comprehend Marxist-Leninist theory all at once, without any growing pains or overcoming the difficulties involved in moulding the new man in the contemporary world, which is constantly changing. In the socialist countries, however, problems involved in the education of young people are quite different, for there is no exploitation, lack of rights or uncertainty in the future among the young people. The socialist state is deeply concerned with the present and the future of the Soviet younger generation, and this is inscribed in the Constitution of the USSR (1977), which not only proclaims, but also guarantees young people the right to work and choose their own trade or profession, to take part in the management and administration of state and public affairs, and the right to free education; school pupils and students enjoy special privileges, such as the right to partake of cultural benefits, to go in for mass sports, have their health protected free of charge, as well as the right to housing and recreation. A major role in the communist education of the younger generation and in the massive drawing of young men and women into public life and the state, economic and cultural building is played by the YCL (Young



Communist League), or Komsomol, a mass social organisation of youth and an active assistant and reserve of the CPSU. YCL organisations enjoy the right to display broad initiative in discussing and bringing before corresponding party organisations issues involved in the work of an enterprise, collective farm, or institution. Young people are elected to the higher and mass bodies of state power. Shock Komsomol construction projects, group competitions in professional skills among young workers, student construction gangs and youth production teams, summer work and

recreation camps — these are concrete manifestations of youth's participation in the life of the Soviet country, of the YCL's educational and mass cultural work. Soviet youth cherishes and further develops the revolutionary, combat and labour traditions of the older generations and multiplies them in developed socialist society (see Social Structure of Socialist Society, the). Soviet youth maintains contacts with 1,350 national, regional, youth and student organisations from 130 countries via the USSR Committee of Youth Organisations.

#### REQUEST TO READERS

Progress Publishers would be glad to have your opinion of this book, its translation and design and any suggestions you may have for future publications.

Please send all your comments to 17, Zubovskiy Boulevard, Moscow, USSR.