G. Glezerman

SOCIALIST SOCIETY: SCIENTIFIC PRINCIPLES OF DEVELOPMENT

Progress Publishers
Moscow

G. Glezerman

SOCIALIST SOCIETY: SCIENTIFIC PRINCIPLES OF DEVELOPMENT

PROGRESS PUBLISHERS
MOSCOW

Translated from the Russian by Leo Lempert
Designed by Dmitry Anikeyev

Г. ГЛЕЗЕРМАН
НАУЧНЫЕ ОСНОВЫ РАЗВИТИЯ
СОЦИАЛИСТИЧЕСКОГО ОБЩЕСТВА

На английском языке

First printing 1971

Printed in the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics

CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION

We live in the age of the greatest turning-point in history marked by the transition from antagonistic class societies to a society free from social and national oppression and ensuring the full development of the human personality.

The birth of the new, socialist society is the basic factor of the present epoch. History placed socialism on the agenda of mankind. At the beginning of the 19th century socialism was merely the dream of a few lofty minds; in the mid-19th century its feasibility was demonstrated scientifically and it became the goal of the working-class movement; the 20th century has brought the period of translating this dream into reality.

More than half a century ago socialism scored a decisive political victory when the revolution of October 1917 by the workers and peasants of Russia initiated the building of a socialist society in a vast country occupying one-sixth of the earth's land surface. A little more than a quarter of a century ago socialism emerged beyond the bounds of a single country, when the liberation of a number of European and Asian countries from German nazism and Japanese militarism unfettered their revolutionary forces and opened the way for democratic and socialist changes.

Nowadays, for the peoples of the socialist countries, the new society is no longer a dream or a mere scientific prediction, but a reality. It has been, or is being, built in countries inhabited by more than one-third of mankind, producing about 39 per cent of the world's industrial output. The birth of socialism, which its enemies sought to picture as some kind of an "accident", now manifests itself as a natural result of mankind's historical development.

Socialism has struck root in the world because it is the only society which is able

to resolve the sharpening economic, political and social contradictions of capitalism;

to put an end to the exploitation of man by man, class and national oppression, to end wars and the mutual annihilation of peoples;

to open the road to the entire population to free creative development, to make available to the people all the treasures of world culture and utilise the achievements of science and technology in their interests.

Thus, the 20th century is marked by the birth of a new, socialist society which radically differs in its structure, laws and driving forces from all earlier societies. This new social organism requires close scientific study.

The founders of Marxism elaborated a scientific theory of social development, chiefly by analysing the history of class societies, capitalism in particular. The application of this theory to a detailed study of the capitalist socio-economic formation enabled them to foresee the main features of the communist socio-economic formation which was to take the place of capitalism. Now that the forecasts of Marxism-Leninism are being realised, it is necessary to apply the Marxist theory of society to a study of the communist formation, above all its first phase, socialist society, and further to develop this theory, taking into account the new experience furnished by history.

A scientific analysis of the laws and driving forces of socialist society is not only of cognitive interest. For a socialist country it is also a problem of practical importance, the solution of which is needed for properly guiding the building and development of the new society.

This book was published in Russian in 1967 under the title *Historical Materialism and the Development of Socialist Society*. In it the general propositions of the Marxist theory of society were applied to an analysis of socialism. It should be borne in mind, however, that the book does not give a concrete characterisation of all the sides of the socialist system, for example, its economy, ways of eliminating class distinctions, stages of development, forms and functions of the socialist state, and so on.

The general aim of the author is to present socialist

society as an integral social organism whose development is governed by certain laws. It is only within the bounds of this concept that the book examines the place of classes in the structure of socialist society, the connections between class relations and the political superstructure, and other questions.

* * *

For a scientific understanding of socialist society's development one must first examine it as a natural historical process, requiring above all a study of society in a historical perspective. Socialism is the first, or lower, stage of the new, communist socio-economic formation, the transition to which is made as a result of the overthrow of capitalism. In many respects socialism differs from the more mature, communist society which emerges as a result of the prolonged development of socialism. It is this historical approach to the new, incipient communist society that is the basic feature distinguishing scientific socialism from utopian socialism.

It will be recalled that the pre-Marxian socialist theories set out to devise a plan for the most perfect organisation of society. In elaborating this plan, most utopian socialists proceeded not from the level of development actually reached by society but from abstract considerations of reason and justice. That is why in solving, for example, the question of distribution, some writers put forward the principle of distribution according to work as the ideal, while others suggested the principle of distribution according to needs and still others proclaimed the need for egalitarian distribution, and so on and so forth. Despite these distinctions most of these thinkers regarded communist society as something which, when finally achieved, would require no further development.

Marxism approached this question in a basically different way. To begin with, Marx conceived communist society not as a static state but as a social organism in constant motion and change. Furthermore, Marxism rejected the notion that the main problems of socialism can be reduced to the question of distribution of the social product. Marx demonstrated that the basis of communist society is a definite mode of production on which the form of distribution depends. It is this approach that enabled him to establish that in its devel-

opment communist society must pass through two phases: socialism, the first phase originating from the midst of capitalism, and communism, the higher phase developing on the basis created by socialism. Generalising Marx's idea about the two phases of communism Lenin wrote: "Socialism is the society that grows directly out of capitalism, it is the first form of the new society. Communism is a higher form of society, and can only develop when socialism has become firmly established."[1]

This also determines the general features which link the two phases of communism and the specific features which set them apart.

Both phases are based on the one mode of production, characterised by the domination of social ownership of the means of production, subordination of production to the fullest satisfaction of society's material and cultural needs and the planned organisation of all production.

The degree of development of this mode of production greatly differs at the first and second phases of communism. At first socialism has to proceed on the basis of the productive forces created by capitalism. But communism presupposes incomparably more developed productive forces which, as Marx put it, will make all the springs of co-operative wealth flow more abundantly. It will only be possible when it is provided with a new, higher material and technological basis.

Distinctions in the system of economic relations are determined by the level of the productive forces. Relations of comradely co-operation and mutual assistance, based on socialisation of production and social property, link together both phases of communism. But behind this uniformity in type there are profound differences in the system of production, exchange and distribution, differences which are connected with the existence of two forms of social property under socialism—state and co-operative—reflecting the unequal degree of socialisation of production in town and country, in industry and agriculture.

Uniting the entire economy into a single whole, social ownership of the means of production exists in the form of a system of state enterprises which possess certain economic

[1] V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 30, p. 284.

independence and of co-operatives which represent the property of individual collectives, making the commodity form of ties between them objectively necessary. While excluding the land, enterprises, and also labour power, from the sphere of commodity exchange, socialism utilises the commodity form to stimulate the development of production.

The level of development of the productive forces and relations of production also determines socialism's intrinsic mechanisms for regulating work and distribution.

Socialism proclaims the universality of labour, puts an end to the division of society into those who work and those who do not, and converts work into the honourable duty of all able-bodied people. At the same time socialism, representing only the first phase of communism, does not yet turn labour into life's prime requirement for all members of society, as will be the case under communism. The principle of socialism is: "From each according to his ability, to each according to his work." This principle presupposes economic incentives for the producers depending on their labour contribution to social production, strict account and control of the measure of labour and the measure of consumption of each worker. Only at the higher stage in the development of production and of people themselves, characteristic of the higher phase of communism, can this principle be replaced by the principle: "From each according to his ability, to each according to his needs."

As regards the stimulus to work and the forms of distribution, Marxism takes the historically concrete approach, which distinguishes it from the preceding, utopian socialism.

Two ideas about changing man's attitude to labour were voiced in different variants in pre-Marxian social theories. The first was to convert labour into a *duty* for all able-bodied members of society. In reply to the assertion by defenders of the exploiting system that people would not work unless they were compelled to, many utopian socialists said: "A society in which labour is free need not be afraid of idlers." They held that society, by abolishing the division into exploiters and exploited, would recognise labour as the duty of all citizens and this duty would be discharged by virtue of their lofty consciousness. The other idea expressed by some utopian socialists was that labour must be made

attractive and turned into their prime *requirement* which people would perform not simply as a duty but because of inner conviction. William Morris, one of the later utopian socialists, arguing with Edward Bellamy, author of the well-known book *Looking Backward (1887-2000)*, emphasised that Bellamy was vainly searching for a stimulus to labour to take the place of the old fear of starvation. In Morris's opinion, the real stimulus to useful labour must be the joy emanating from labour itself. In Morris's utopian novel *News from Nowhere*, the main character on finding himself in the new world asks: " 'How you get people to work when there is no reward of labour, and especially how you get them to work strenuously?'

"He is told: " 'No reward of labour? . . . The reward of labour is life. Is that not enough?'

" 'But no reward for especially good work?'. . .

" 'Plenty of reward,' said he—'the reward of creation. The wages which God gets, as people might have said times agone. If you are going to ask to be paid for the pleasure of creation, which is what excellence in work means, the next thing we shall hear of will be a bill sent in for the begetting of children.' "[1]

Having advanced many bold surmises about the future, the utopians, however, remained utopians as regards a stimulus to work. The main thing was that they lacked a sense of the historic view of things. The idea that communist society itself would undergo changes, that it must pass through different stages in its development, that it could not come into the world readymade from the womb of capitalism, was alien to them. Some of them (including William Morris) based their dreams of the future on primitive handicraft techniques and did not associate the birth of the new society with the creation of a new material and technical basis which had to alter the content of labour itself.

The approach to the development of the new society as a natural historical process enabled Marxism to solve this problem in a fundamentally different way. The two phases of communist society—socialism and communism—are pictured by Marxism-Leninism as necessary stages for the

[1] William Morris, *News from Nowhere*, London, 1928, p. 106.

maturing of communism. At the first stage, under socialism which has just emerged from capitalism, there are as yet neither social nor material, nor technical prerequisites for converting labour into life's prime requirement for all members of society.

A sober materialist approach to the development of socialist society implies recognition of the fact that although under socialism labour has been freed from exploitation and in this sense is free, there still remains the need for certain compulsion, inasmuch as the survivals of capitalism exist and people are not accustomed yet to work for society without legal compulsion. At this stage distribution must inevitably be made according to work. It is only from socialist labour paid in strict conformity with its quantity and quality that communist labour arises. The latter, as Lenin defined it, "is labour performed gratis for the benefit of society, labour performed not as a definite duty, not for the purpose of obtaining a right to certain products, not according to previously established and legally fixed quotas, but voluntary labour, irrespective of quotas; it is labour performed without expectation of reward, 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."[1]

Marxism-Leninism in this way reveals the dialectics of development of stimuli to work during the transition from capitalism to socialism and from socialism to communism.

Distinctions between socialism and communism are consequently reduced to the degree of economic and cultural maturity of the new society. This degree of maturity is expressed, first, in the extent to which the features inherited by socialism from preceding societies are eliminated and, second, in the degree to which the intrinsic features of the communist formation are developed. Neither is determined solely by the wishes, will and revolutionary determination of the builders of the new society but by the objectively attained development of society.

The first phase of communism, socialism, as Marx put it,

[1] V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 30, p. 517.

still bears the "birthmarks" of capitalism in all respects—economically, morally and intellectually. These birthmarks are not mere survivals of capitalism in the minds and behaviour of people. The features inherited by socialism are not only the remnants of the old mores, but also the remnants of the old division of labour expressed in more or less deep distinctions between the working people of town and country, of workers by hand and by brain, certain remnants of social inequality, above all in the material security of people, their working and living conditions, and so on. It is simply impossible to get rid of all these features at once because the material and cultural requisites are lacking. Lenin stressed that socialism changes the relations of people "only in part, only in proportion to the economic revolution so far attained".[1]

In other words, socialism, representing basically an entirely new society, cannot as yet fully eliminate all the features inherited from the old class society.

Economic and other social relations existing under socialism inevitably bear the imprint of society's level of maturity. Society cannot change these relations without considering the level of development of the productive forces. For example, by eliminating the foundations of social inequality—the antitheses between those who own and those who do not own the means of production—socialism puts an end to the unjust capitalist order. But socialism does not bring yet full equality and justice. A certain inequality in distribution, connected with payment according to work, is still inevitable and it cannot be simply abolished by decree under socialism. Although it is a manifestation of socialism's historical limitations, of a certain "injustice", this inequality, if kept within reasonable bounds, is needed to stimulate an advance of the productive forces. Its abolition by decree would not promote social progress; on the contrary it would slow it down. It can be eliminated only through a rise in labour productivity and skill, by levelling out the very nature of the labour of all members of society. Therefore it is clear that abstract justice is unsuitable as a criterion for solving concrete problems of building socialism and communism. Any phenomenon must be assessed with an eye to

[1] V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 25, p. 467.

the actually achieved historical stage of society's development, its conformity and non-conformity to this stage.

Experience also shows that not everything inherited from preceding societies runs counter to the requirements of socialist society. Alongside such phenomena which socialism eliminates there are also those which it transforms, utilises and places at its service, including, for example, the mechanism of commodity-money relations. The need for commodity-money relations under socialism follows from the actually achieved development of socialist property itself, which presupposes a certain economic independence of state enterprises and co-operatives linked by commodity exchange. That is why the commodity form of exchange and the attendant money relations are the major instruments for expanding the socialist economy.

Consequently, socialism, while resolutely rejecting the Establishment and its coercive machinery, cannot flatly reject the economic and social mechanisms created in the course of the preceding development of society; it transforms them, places them at its service and includes them in the new management machinery it creates. That is why in analysing socialist society, it is necessary soberly to consider the degree of its economic maturity, to ascertain to what extent socialism has transformed the old social relations and institutions and created new ones.

The founders of Marxism gave a description of socialism, based on scientific prevision and, therefore, still of a relatively abstract nature, and outlined merely the main features of the new society. They foresaw that under socialism social ownership of the means of production would prevail, but co-operative property would be a necessary link in the socialist transformation of the economy; they did not indicate directly, however, that social property would exist in two forms—state and co-operative. They foresaw that under socialism the same principle would prevail as during the exchange of commodity equivalents, namely, the exchange of a certain quantity of labour in one form for an equal quantity of labour in another form, but they did not consider commodity exchange and money necessary in socialist conditions. They also established that the absence of exploiting classes and the conversion of all able-bodied members of society into working people would be a characteristic

feature of socialism, but they did not mention that some class distinctions between workers and peasants would remain, and so on.

We now have a full-fledged socialist society in the U.S.S.R. and socialism is being successfully built in a number of other countries. Naturally, this society appears before us in a more concrete shape because the general theoretical ideas of socialism have been enriched by practical experience, in the course of which concrete forms of its economic and political organisation have been found. But it would be wrong to regard all the concrete features of this society as the features inherent in socialism in general.

The experience of building socialism in the U.S.S.R. and other countries shows that the first phase of the communist socio-economic formation has fundamental common features and laws, inherent in all socialist countries, but at the same time these laws manifest themselves specifically in each country. In the political sphere, for example, we have the power exercised by the working class not only in the form of Soviets, as is the case in the U.S.S.R., but also in the form of People's Democracy; the transition from the democratic stage of the revolution to the socialist (or from one revolution to another) takes various forms, both non-peaceful and peaceful, without an armed insurrection and civil war. Some socialist countries have utilised parliament and a multi-party system for building socialism. In the economic sphere we have diversity in the forms of industrialisation and collectivisation of agriculture; compared with the Soviet Union and the Mongolian People's Republic land reforms were carried out in other socialist countries without nationalisation of the land, and so on. All these specific factors and circumstances must be taken into account in pursuing an internationalist policy which demands, as Lenin put it, that we should not eliminate diversity, not abolish the national distinctions, but ably apply the main principles of communism, properly adapt them *in particulars* to national and state distinctions.

At the same time, in elaborating the general theory of socialist society it is important to separate the general from the particular, the recurrent from the non-recurrent. The Marxist-Leninist theory of socio-economic formations offers the criterion for such differentiation. For example, when

capitalism is considered as a formation, the features common to all capitalist countries are singled out through scientific abstraction. The concept of the socio-economic formation, Lenin explained, makes it possible to apply to social relations the general scientific criterion of recurrence, the possibility of which in sociology is denied by subjectivists. At the same time it offers a criterion for assessing the specific features inherent in separate countries, within the bounds of each formation.

Such an approach should also be applied to socialism. We must take into account that socialism won at first not in the most developed countries, that the majority of socialist countries were countries with an average and even a low level of development of capitalism. This naturally left its imprint on the features of socialist society.

Apparently a number of features inherent in this society (for example, commodity circulation) will be found in each society when it has reached the first phase of communism, including the socialist society which will arise in future in the economically most developed countries. This can be partly judged by the nature of the economic reforms now being implemented in some socialist countries. These reforms carried out in countries at different levels—at the stage of completing the construction of socialism and of building communism—and the common features of the reforms reveal essential distinctions of the economic mechanism of any socialist society.

But can the same be said with regard to such a feature of the social structure of socialist countries as the presence of class or social distinctions? Is this an intrinsic feature of socialist society in general or only of the now existing socialist countries? For an answer to this question, as we shall subsequently show, it is also extremely important to consider the degree of economic and social maturity of socialist society.

A theoretical analysis of socialist society aims to reflect the existing connections between different sides of its life—growth of production, economic relations, social structure, and the degree of social consciousness. An historic approach, consideration of the actual stage of development attained by society is necessary for the study of socialist society to an even greater extent than in the case of any other society.

* * *

To understand the development of socialist society as a natural historical process it is also necessary to ascertain how the operation of the laws of social development changes in it.

As in the history of preceding societies, the birth and development of socialist society is a natural process subject to objective laws which do not depend on the will and consciousness of people. At the same time it is no longer a spontaneous process but conscious building of the new society.

Of course, neither was the birth of the preceding formations fully spontaneous. A new political system, a new social order has always been created through conscious struggle of one or more classes seeking to establish their rule. But for all that, these formations were not built according to a single, all-embracing plan and the economic relations underlying them were shaped in the course of development of the productive forces which proceeded primarily in a spontaneous way. Communism is the first society in history which is being built consciously. "Let us build a new society!"[1]—this call of Lenin's, which resounded after the victory of the Great October Socialist Revolution set a task of social transformation without precedent in history.

It is very important both theoretically and practically to consider this distinction in the rise and development of socialist society. This, in the first place, enables us to see the untenability of the theory of the automatic transformation of capitalism into socialism, the theory of spontaneity in socialist construction, which Marxism-Leninism still has to combat. Behind this distinction also stands a practical task of tremendous significance—to mobilise the energy of millions of people for building the new society, to draw them into purposeful constructive work, to stimulate their initiative and, lastly, to organise their efforts and concentrate them on a single aim. This task was put forward by Lenin in his speeches and articles in the first months after the October Revolution. Among the subjects Lenin designated for elaboration at the end of December 1917 was: "to elevate the lowest depths for the making of history." In the

[1] V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 31, p. 124.

original version of his article "The Immediate Tasks of the Soviet Government" Lenin characterised those days as a transition from historic slumber to the making of new history. He stressed that without enrolling new sections of the people for building socialist society, without arousing the masses to action, any revolutionary transformation was out of the question. The task of the entire period of building socialism presupposes the energetic participation of ever broader sections of the people in constructive work. To stimulate the initiative, energies, discipline and responsibility of every workingman means to accelerate socialist society's advance.

In the first socialist country in the world the stages of advance to communism have been marked out by the five-year plans. In one of his articles written at the beginning of socialist construction Lenin spoke about the possibility of setting the periods necessary for radical social changes as a very rare case in history. He further stressed: "We now see clearly *what* can be done in five years, and what requires much more time."[1]

Practical experience has confirmed the possibility and necessity of planning social changes for definite periods. The point of departure for scientific planning is to establish the scale of production growth. Depending on this, the social consequences of changing the productive forces are determined, although naturally not with the same precision. The very first Soviet five-year plan contained not only assignments for the development of the productive forces but it also characterised the prospects of change in social relations and set the task of laying the foundation of the socialist economy. Unity of economic and social planning has remained a distinctive feature of all subsequent national economic plans of the Soviet Union. Moreover, each new five-year plan rests on the fulfilment of preceding plans and correspondingly the scale of its tasks is extended.

The conscious element in building the new society, embodied in the economic development plans, is based on scientific prognosis of the main direction, the main tendencies of socialist society's development. The better a plan is formulated, the more precisely it sets really feasible as-

[1] Ibid., Vol. 33, p. 483.

signments and optimal proportions of growth in different sectors of the economy. But even the most perfect plan, naturally, cannot provide for everything. In the course of plan fulfilment new potentialities are always brought to light or, on the contrary, difficulties and problems arise which could not be foreseen in advance. The point is that under socialism, too, social consciousness is unable to encompass fully, to the end, social being in all its connections, relations, and details. Discussing changes in the capitalist world economy, Lenin noted that it was impossible to encompass their sum total in all ramifications; the most important thing was that the laws governing these changes had been discovered, the objective logic of these changes and their historical development had been revealed in the main.

This proposition, formulated by Lenin in the case of the capitalist formation, remains true for socialism as well. The new element under socialism is that social consciousness, reflecting ever more correctly the objective tendencies of the development of social being, promotes its planned transformation. Guidance of society based on scientific cognition of social processes becomes possible. In this connection particular significance attaches to the development of the social sciences and the practical application of their recommendations. The latter, as the 23rd C.P.S.U. Congress stressed, is no less important than the use of the achievements of the natural sciences in material production and the development of the people's spiritual life.

Socialist society, based on social property and a high degree of socialisation of the productive forces, cannot develop spontaneously; it demands the planned administration of social affairs. That is why the role of consciousness, of the subjective factor as a whole rises under socialism. Social relations, which formerly were shaped spontaneously, are placed here under society's rational control.

This, however, does not abolish their objective determination by the level of development of the productive forces.

The conscious nature of social development under socialism at times engenders the illusion that the subjective factor is omnipotent. The proponents of such views allege that under socialism the relationship of social being and social

consciousness, the objective conditions and the subjective factor, the basis and superstructure, economics and politics, undergo such a radical transformation that these categories change places: social consciousness becomes a determinant of being, the subjective factor determines the objective conditions, and so on. But such a notion is merely an illusion.

However high the role of consciousness, the subjective factor and the superstructure as a whole under socialism, it remains within the bounds of their general determinant dependence on social being, the objective conditions and the economic basis. Under socialism, too, social consciousness reflects social being, and its possibility of exerting influence on being depends above all on how correctly it mirrors the objective tendencies of development and takes into consideration the real possibilities and the existing situation. General laws governing the historical process preserve their force in socialist society, too, although their operation has certain distinctions. Ignoring these distinctions makes it impossible to understand the specific features of socialist society's development. But their exaggeration and elevation to an absolute prevent the application of the materialist understanding of history to an analysis of socialism and ultimately lead to subjectivist misinterpretation of the laws of its development.

The scientific understanding of socialism combines an objective approach to social development as a natural historical process, subordinated to laws that are independent of man's will and consciousness, with recognition of the fact that socialist society is being built consciously, in a planned way, that it can neither arise nor be improved without the conscious, purposeful activity of people.

* * *

To appreciate how the understanding of the natural historical process of socialist society's development is combined with recognition of the conscious nature of building this society, it is necessary to consider the mechanism of social development under socialism.

The laws of social development, as distinct from the laws of nature, are laws governing the practical activity of

people. Opponents of Marxism, seeking to discredit the idea of the law-governed nature of social life, have repeatedly tried to impute to Marxists the absurd view that society's laws operate without people. But such a view is alien to Marxism. The objective nature of the social development laws consists not in that they supposedly are manifested apart from the practical activity of people, but in that they are independent of man's consciousness and will. The mechanism of social laws must include the practical activity of men, because nothing is done in society without the participation of people.

The laws of social development are laws realised through the actions of the people. Lenin pointed out that the method of reducing the individual to the social was the prerequisite for creating a scientific sociology. This means that the laws of social life could be discovered only when we discerned behind the countless diverse actions of individuals, which therefore seemed accidental, the actions of the masses naturally determined by their position in society. The position of men in society shapes their interests which are reflected in their minds and impel them to act. An account of these interests makes it possible to explain the motives of people's actions in a materialist way.

At the same time the problem of men's interests represents a junction in which not only the application of materialism, but also of dialectics to society is intertwined. Understanding of contradictions in historical development is most intimately linked with this problem. The interests and actions of men must not be considered in isolation from the dialectics of social development. Every social event, big or small, is a result of numerous individual actions which are interlocked, go partly in one direction and partly in other directions. The results of men's actions might differ greatly from their intentions and aims, the more so since they are ultimately determined by the objective economic conditions, and not simply by their desires. Engels compared this process with the addition of forces of different directions in mechanics which form a parallelogram of forces ultimately in the form of a resultant force which does not coincide fully with the direction of any one of them.

The question arises, does this proposition of Engels hold good not only for pre-socialist society where people, as he

put it, made history not guided by a common will and not according to one common plan, but also to socialism?

Under socialism, too, the laws of social development remain the laws of the mass action of people, because such is their nature. Here, too, the strivings and actions of people are intertwined and make up a common result. But the new element under socialism is that not only separate individuals, but society as a whole sets itself a definite aim and undertakes to achieve it. This is not a temporary and relative coincidence of the aims of different classes or social groups, which was also possible in previous societies, for example, in periods of struggle for national tasks, in national liberation wars, and so on. This is a new type of social development which becomes feasible after private ownership of the means of production which disunites people and engenders conflicts between their wishes was abolished, after the division of society into antagonistic classes with their opposite interests was eliminated.

Socio-political and moral unity of society is a new phenomenon characterising the qualitative state of socialist society where social ownership of the means of production prevails, uniting all people by common basic interests, where the class antithesis has been eliminated and only non-basic class distinctions remain. In these conditions the laws of social development are realised not through disunited actions of individuals, not through a struggle of antagonistic classes (there are none in socialist society), but through the organised actions of all of society, through co-operation of its social groups. Unity of action of the overwhelming majority of society's members and the scientifically based tasks set by the Party which they work to accomplish create the objective possibility for the coincidence of the aims and intentions of people with the results obtained. That is why the results of actions of men no longer turn into a force which is alienated from them and begins to dominate them. Society is freed from spontaneous forces and begins to guide the processes of its life and development in a conscious way.

This fundamentally new feature, as compared with preceding societies, however, must not be turned into an absolute. Socialist society, too, still has class distinctions between workers and peasants united in co-operatives, between town and country, between workers by hand and by brain,

between skilled and unskilled labour. All these and similar social distinctions will disappear only in the course of socialism's development into communism, which will be a society of complete social homogeneity. From the correct proposition about the coincidence of the basic interests of people in socialist society it does not at all follow that specific interests are absent and consequently there are no contradictions between them.

The nature of socialist society creates the objective basis for rationally combining the diverse interests, but this is not achieved automatically. This demands correct consideration for interests in formulating a policy, in devising the most rational forms of organising production, planning and guiding the economy and culture. The intricacy of this task can be seen from the new system of economic management introduced in the Soviet Union. It was elaborated in the course of a long discussion needed to find the most efficient criteria for assessing the activity of enterprises, ensuring the proper combination of the interests of the entire economy, the enterprise and the worker.

Interests as the motive to action remain the most important element in the mechanism of laws under socialism too. But these are interests which arose on the basis of socialist economic relations, socialist commodity exchange and socialist principles of distribution according to work. Conscious use of socialism's economic laws presupposes such an organisation of social relations in which interests could act in the direction society needs. People cannot be made to act contrary to their interests, social or personal; this would be utopian and would run counter to the nature of socialist society which is being built for the good of the people. But actions motivated by diverse interests can be directed into a channel conforming to the main direction of socialist society's development, promoting its advance to communism. This is done by devising the most expedient forms of organising production, exchange and distribution and also of managing the economy.

Thus, we arrive at another prime prerequisite for the scientific understanding of socialist society's development: the need to examine it from the aspect of the objective mechanism of its intrinsic laws and above all the role of interests as the motive force of this mechanism.

These theoretical premises dictate the composition of the present book.

The methodological principles are formulated in the first chapters: "Relationship Between the Objective Conditions and the Subjective Factor in Building Communism" and "Economic Relations and Interests of People in Socialist Society". The general propositions outlined here are further developed in the next chapters (for example, in examining the role of the objective conditions and the subjective factor in transforming social consciousness, the role of interests in relations between classes and between nations, in the moulding of the new man, and so on).

The examination of all these questions is summed up in a chapter on historical progress and the change in its nature under socialism. The reader will notice that this problem, too (specifically the understanding of the criterion of historical progress) is linked with the problem of interests.

The author is fully aware that he has merely raised a considerable number of problems, each of which could be the subject of a special study. He only wants to remark in justification that the concept of the book requires a discussion of these problems in their interconnection, because otherwise it is impossible to picture socialist society as an integral social organism.

Chapter I

RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN THE OBJECTIVE CONDITIONS AND THE SUBJECTIVE FACTOR IN BUILDING COMMUNISM

The starting point in the materialist understanding of society is the solution of the question of the correlation between the objective conditions and the subjective factor in social development. The development of socialist society, to no smaller extent than that of any other, is a natural historical process whose laws are not determined by the will and consciousness of man. On the contrary, it is these laws that determine man's will and consciousness. At the same time this is a process of conscious, systematic building of the new society, carried on, moreover, on such a huge scale, as, for example, is seen in the Soviet Union.

To establish the relationship between the objective conditions and the subjective factor in building communism, it is necessary first to examine the general propositions of historical materialism which hold good for all social formations and then to show the specific features of their application to the development of socialist and communist society.

1. The Categories of the Objective Conditions and the Subjective Factor and Their Place in Historical Materialism

The concepts of the objective conditions and the subjective factor belong to the most general categories of historical materialism and may in a certain sense be considered in the same order as such categories as social being and social consciousness, material and ideological relations and basis and superstructure. All these categories reflect, in one way or another, the relationship between these two inter-

connected sides of social life, of which the first is the primary, determining side and the second is the derivative, the determined side.

But the content and functions of these categories do not fully coincide; otherwise there would be no need to employ all of them in explaining social phenomena. Taken together, these categories can, even if merely in general outline, encompass the wealth of social phenomena and relations.

By differentiating between social being and social consciousness, we solve the fundamental question of philosophy as applied to society, namely, what is primary and what is secondary. Just as materialism in general recognises being as primary and consciousness as secondary, so does historical materialism regard as primary the material life of society and as secondary its spiritual life which reflects material life, i.e., social being.

The categories of society's basis and superstructure characterise more concretely the structure of society, the relationship between its economic system or, to put it differently, the sum total of production and economic relations, which form the basis, and the entire huge superstructure which grows up on this basis. The concept of superstructure covers not only social consciousness, not only the views and ideas of people, but also the numerous institutions and organisations created in conformity with these ideas; the superstructure is made up of the ideological, political and legal forms of the economic system of society.

The categories of objective conditions and of subjective factor also have their specific content; they do not fully coincide with any of the categories mentioned earlier. Their very designations, their functions differ. As distinct from such categories as basis and superstructure, the categories of objective conditions and subjective factor explain not so much the structure of society as the process of its *change* by man. They reveal the relationship between the conscious activity of man and the conditions in which he acts. That is why they are especially important in studying the processes of the revolutionary remaking of social life, building of the new society, and so on.

What are the objective conditions and the subjective factor?

Objective conditions are the conditions in which men

make history, but which do not depend on their will and consciousness. The subjective factor in society's development is the conscious activity of people, classes and parties which make history, it is their organisation, will and energy necessary for coping with definite historical tasks.

At times the subjective factor is defined too broadly so that the specific nature of this category is lost. It is claimed, for example, that people are always a subjective factor, that all people should be considered the subject of history, although they are not always aware of this. Of course, all social life is a product of the activity of people and in this sense it may be said that people are the subject of history.

Generally, the subject is the carrier of an action in which a definite aim is achieved. What distinguishes human history from the history of animals, by the way, is that animals are a passive object of their history, while man is the active maker of history. Labour and production constitute the starting point and basis of mankind's history. That is why people are the subject, whose practical activity determines historical development. In this sense the population "is the basis and subject of the entire social process of production".[1] But Marx noting that in history taken as a whole "the subject, mankind, and the object, nature, are one and the same thing", warns that this unity should not make one forget "the essential difference between epochs".[2] In all epochs man is the subject of history. People, the masses, have always in one way or another, consciously or unconsciously, made history. Nothing in history is done without people, all of it is the result of their practical activity. Not only the spiritual life of society, but also its material life is a product of people's activity (naturally, under definite natural and historical conditions which each generation inherits). But no matter how important the recognition of this fact is for ascertaining the specific features of human history in general (as distinct from the history of nature) it is not yet sufficient for establishing who is the subject of concrete historical transformations in various epochs. Here it is also necessary to establish what social forces, owing to their

[1] K. Marx, *Grundrisse der Kritik der politischen Ökonomie (Rohentwurf), 1857-1858*, Berlin, 1953, S. 21.
[2] Ibid., S. 7.

objective position in society, organisation, consciousness and other properties, can practically effect, and do effect, the given historical transformations. The question of who makes history in general cannot be identified with the question of what social forces consciously accomplish definite historical changes.

The role of the people and the subjective factor in history also must not be regarded as identical. Let us note first of all that in a class society the subjective factor should include the conscious activity not only of the masses, the classes and social forces which work for social progress. Pitted here against each other are diametrically opposed social forces whose will, energy and organisation affect the course of the struggle and the general outcome of historical development.

On the other hand, it would be wrong to put all the activity of the people who act as the main force of social progress into the sphere of the subjective factor. The daily activity of people, designed to satisfy their needs, is itself part of the objective conditions of society's development. It appears as the objective making of history by people; moreover, people, as usually has been the case in history, may not even be aware that they are its makers. But as the subjective factor people act only to the extent that they consciously accomplish definite social tasks. Otherwise there would be no point in speaking of enlarging the size of the masses that make history, because even without it historical materialism considers them the makers of history. But when Marx and Engels say that, together with the thoroughness of the historical action, there will grow the size of the masses whose cause it is, they refer not simply to the objective process of making history, but to the process of drawing them into active conscious struggle for effecting timely changes. Only in this case does the question arise of waking the masses, gripped by long historical slumber, and extending the range of people taking part in the struggle to change social relations. This is especially true of the socialist revolution, which is the deepest-going of all and, therefore, involves the greatest social changes, a revolution which rouses to a new life the lower depths of society oppressed by capitalism. They become the makers of the socialist revolution in the real sense of the word.

Lenin said about the people in the colonies and semi-

colonies that in the past they were regarded "merely as the objects and not as the subjects of history".[1] The present epoch has awakened them to an independent life, to struggle for their national and social emancipation, which has greatly broadened the size of the masses who are consciously making history and has accelerated its development.

In the course of society's progress the unconscious activity of people making history is thus converted into conscious activity. This, of course, must not be understood in an oversimple way, as if the objective ceases to exist and is replaced by the subjective. This is not the case at all. The life of mankind always proceeds in definite objective conditions and under corresponding laws which do not depend on the will and consciousness of people and ultimately determine the nature and trend of their activity. The laws of social development are realised only through the practical activity of people. But the nature of their activity differs, depending on the historical conditions. People, for example, can act without considering the social results of their activity and the laws are displayed spontaneously, behind their back, so to say. Under other historical conditions people can act consciously, seeking to achieve definite aims which follow from the interests of society's development, the interests of a class, and so on. In such cases they act as the makers of history not only objectively but also subjectively. When ever larger masses who work for progress become the subject of history this accelerates mankind's development.

We must further qualify what we understand as conscious activity. In a certain sense all activity of people who pursue a definite aim may be regarded as conscious. Men differ from animals by acting consciously, setting themselves a definite aim in advance. The labour process is a purposeful activity in which a result is attained that originated in the mind of the worker as his conscious aim, i.e., as an idea. But whereas the production process for each labourer is a conscious action, for society as a whole production carried on by thousands and millions of producers operating on the lines of private property, is an uncontrollable process.

Consequently, the indisputable fact that people in social life act as conscious beings, endowed with will and mind,

[1] V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 32, p. 478.

does not at all mean that their entire activity in history is conscious. Material goods are always produced by people who, pursuing their aims, act as conscious beings. But for society productive activity becomes conscious only when society as a whole and not only a separate individual consciously subordinates production to a definite aim. It is clear, therefore, that in social development consciousness must be regarded from the angle of *social* and not individual consciousness. Conscious activity in history is one which meets not only the individual aims of the people participating in it, but also the common aims of the members of the given class or society.

It goes without saying that the *degree* of consciousness of people who make history may be quite diverse. Not only the movement of various classes, but also the actions of a single class at different stages of its history differ considerably in terms of consciousness.

Conscious activity does not necessarily imply scientific understanding of the laws and processes of social development. Otherwise it would be necessary to hold that before the birth of Marxism and Marxist parties there was no conscious activity in history in general. Yet, although the laws of social development had not been cognised, radical changes in the relations of production, prepared by the spontaneous development of the productive forces, were consciously effected in the past, too. The new state system introduced by revolution exerted great influence on the development of the economy.

Nikolai Mikhailovsky, an ideologist of Narodism in Russia, stated that European life was shaped as spontaneously as the flow of a river which "washes away everything it can, be it a diamond field, skirts everything it cannot wash away, even a dunghill. Locks, dams, by-pass and derivative channels are arranged by the human mind and emotions. This reason and this sentiment, it may be said, were not present when the contemporary economic system arose in Europe. They were in the embryonic stage and their influence on the natural, spontaneous course of events was negligible."[1]

Lenin criticised Mikhailovsky's allegation that the conscious influence of people on the "course of events" was negligible. "People in sound mind and judgement," Lenin wrote, "then erected extremely well-made sluices and dams, which forced the refractory peasant into the mainstream of capitalist exploitation; they created extremely artful by-pass channels of political and financial measures through which swept capitalist accumulation and capitalist expropriation that were not content with the action of economic laws alone."[1] This conscious activity of people did not, however, eliminate the spontaneity of capitalism's economic laws. Political, financial and other measures merely facilitated, extended the scope of these laws which inexorably ruined the mass of small peasants and artisans and deepened the abyss between the poverty of the majority and the wealth of the minority.

The trend, nature and forms of conscious activity can be quite diverse: they depend above all on *who* carries it on and in *whose* interests. But it always includes action by men who pursue definite social aims. This does not necessarily presuppose the knowledge of laws of social development. People can confine themselves to empirical understanding of the connection between social processes. Scientific understanding of the conditions and ways of transforming society implies a higher level of consciousness and is a prerequisite for the higher development of the subjective factor, which ultimately becomes an instrument for the systematic remaking of all social life in the interest of human progress.

Moreover, the subjective factor is not reduced to an understanding of definite historical tasks; this is not only consciousness. It also includes the *organisation* of people, needed for achieving these tasks. That is why the subjective factor includes, for example, all class organisations created to fight for the interests of the given class, first of all political parties, and all the weapons utilised by them in this struggle.

The boundaries between the objective conditions and the subjective factor are fluid. What in one context or in some historical circumstances may be put among the objective conditions, in another context or in different circumstances may come within the sphere of operation of the subjective factor.

[1] N. Mikhailovsky, *Works*, Russ. ed., Vol. II, p. 90.

[1] V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 1, p. 399

The objective conditions are at times identified with social being, with society's material life. But such identification cannot be regarded as correct if one examines the development of society not as a whole, but its specific processes, for example, the maturing of a social revolution. The objective conditions of revolution are not only definite material prerequisites, i.e., an appropriate development of the productive forces which come into conflict with obsolete relations of production. For revolution to mature a whole set of objective conditions is needed, which Lenin called a revolutionary situation, namely, the ruling classes are unable to preserve their domination in an unchanged form, there is a crisis "at the top"; the oppressed classes refuse to live in the old way, and so on.

By far not all the elements of a revolutionary situation relate to social being, to society's economic life. An important place among the elements of a revolutionary situation is held by changes in society's political life—a crisis of power and even changes in the consciousness of the masses expressed in that "the lower depths" do not want to live in the old way. Why should all these elements be put among the objective conditions of revolution? Because, as Lenin put it, their advent is "independent of the will, not only of individual groups and parties, but even of individual classes".[1]

Consequently, the concept of objective conditions in the given case is broader than the concept of social being. It would be even broader if we were to study, for example, the process of moulding the personality. It is clear that the mind of man is moulded under the influence not only of economic relations but also of all other social relations he finds in life. The socio-political system, political and legal relations, for example, make up a very important part of the social environment in which man is moulded. This also includes a definite state of social consciousness and also the organisations which spread social ideas and views. In capitalist society, for example, the state machine, the ruling political parties, the press, radio, cinema, TV and the church exert great influence on the minds of people. And this influence (coupled with some other factors which retard the development of class consciousness, such as bribing by the bourgeoisie of the upper crust of the working class in a number of countries, and an increase in the labour bureaucracy) is so strong that to this day considerable sections of the working class in some capitalist countries are held captive by bourgeois ideology and lack of class consciousness.

And so, as regards an individual or even social sections the entire social environment in which they live and work acts as the objective conditions moulding their consciousness.

These examples show that the concepts of objective conditions and the subjective factor are correlated, that they must be examined in each case specifically and that their content is not something immutable. But regardless of how the content of these concepts changes, the objective conditions are always those which do not depend on the will and consciousness of the acting subject, whether that subject is all mankind or a separate nation, a certain class, party or, lastly, an individual.

Both the objective conditions and the subjective factor are shaped historically, in the course of society's development.

Moreover, the maturing of the objective conditions and the subjective factor needed for achieving definite historical tasks may proceed unevenly. Here there is no pre-set harmony. For example, the maturing of a revolutionary situation does not lead automatically to the shaping of the subjective factor and, therefore, not every revolutionary situation leads to a revolution and even less to its victory. "It would be a mistake to think," Lenin said, "that the revolutionary classes are invariably strong enough to effect a revolution whenever such a revolution has fully matured by virtue of the conditions of social and economic development. No, human society is not constituted so rationally or so 'conveniently' for progressive elements. A revolution may be ripe, and yet the forces of its revolutionary creators may prove insufficient to carry it out. . . ."[1]

What role in realising social changes is played by the objective conditions and the subjective factor? Generally speaking, the objective conditions play the determining role, inasmuch as they determine, first, the very necessity of accomplishing some historical tasks, and consequently, also

[1] V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 21, p. 214.

[1] Ibid., Vol. 9, p. 368.

the trend of men's activity and, second, the real possibility for accomplishing these tasks.

Marx formulated the profound idea that mankind always sets itself only such tasks which it is able to accomplish because, on closer scrutiny, it always turns out that the task itself arises only when the material conditions for coping with it already exist or at least are in the making. It goes without saying that we refer here not to problems which may be suggested to a man by his imagination, but to the tasks objectively set before mankind by the course of historical development. People become aware of such tasks only when the objective conditions for realising them have appeared or are emerging in life itself; without this they simply could not arise.

Consequently, in the final count the objective conditions also determine the development of the subjective factor needed for achieving historical tasks because the latter is shaped as a reflection of the ripe requirements of society's development. But the subjective factor possesses relative independence and hence a non-conformity between the development of the objective conditions and the subjective side is possible.

If the objective conditions for a revolution are lacking, no efforts by revolutionaries can bring it about and no revolutionary energy can remake society. But if the objective conditions are available, the fate of a revolution depends on the subjective factor, i.e., on the energy of the fighting classes, the exertion of their energies and their ability to wage the struggle. Thus, the subjective factor can play the decisive part, not in general and not under any historical conditions, but only when the objective conditions for the transformation of society have already matured. In such a case victory or defeat may decisively depend on how united and organised the masses are, how ably and with what determination the revolutionary party acts, how capable it is of leading the masses and uniting them in a political army.

The opponents of Marxism-Leninism often perceive a contradiction between recognition of the determining significance of the objective conditions in society's development and the assertion that the subjective factor can be decisive. But, recognising the decisive role of the subjective factor

when the necessary objective conditions are available, Marxism-Leninism does not deny its own materialist principles; on the contrary, it fully relies on them.

The subjective factor is important in history because realisation of the possibilities created by the objective conditions depends upon it. These possibilities are not realised automatically, but only through the struggle of people for their aims. That is why the conscious activity of people exerts tremendous influence on the acceleration or slowing down of progress, and influences the periods required for solving historical problems. In a class society, the carrying out of mature social changes depends on the struggle of classes in which a big part is played by correct understanding by the advanced classes and parties of their tasks, the degree of their organisation and their revolutionary energy.

It is also necessary to bear in mind that the results of the activity of people—whether it is conscious or not—always become one of the objective conditions of society's further development. On reading Hegel's *Science of Logic,* Lenin noted that "the thought of the ideal passing into the real is *profound*: very important for history".[1]

The building of socialism furnishes an example of the ideal passing into the real: socialism which formerly was an idea, the aim of the proletariat's struggle, is achieved and in consequence becomes an objective condition for the further development of society, for its advance to communism.

The thought of the ideal passing into the real, as Lenin pointed out, is directed against vulgar materialism which belittles the significance of the subjective factor and its effective role in society's progress. Vulgar materialism underlies various theories of "spontaneity" which picture the development of society as an automatic, predetermined process. Lenin vigorously attacked such theories. The great importance he attached to a precise definition of the role of the subjective factor is indicated by his correction to an article written by V. Vorovsky in 1905. This article stated: "... This 'organisation in a class' is not something arbitrary, divorced from life; no, Social Democracy here, as in its entire activity can merely [adapt itself to the spontaneous historical process] ... thus illumining and shortening the

[1] V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 38, p. 114.

road the proletariat has to traverse."[1] Instead of the words in brackets "adapt itself to the spontaneous historical process" Lenin wrote: "*guide the spontaneous historical process*", which defines much more precisely the role of the subjective factor.

The "spontaneity" theory was preached in different variants by ideologists of the Second International, Russian Economists and Mensheviks, Right opportunists, and others. At present it is also advocated by people who picture the transition from capitalism to socialism as a spontaneous process of "transforming" society. The spontaneous maturing of material prerequisites for socialism within the bounds of capitalism is identified by them with the transformation of capitalist into socialist society. In contrast to the former it cannot occur spontaneously, but demands the conscious revolutionary struggle of society's progressive forces, headed by the working class.

While vulgar materialist views which belittle the role of the conscious activity and organisation of classes form the methodological basis of *Right* opportunism, subjectivism, which ignores the determining role of the objective conditions in society's development represents the methodological basis of "*Left*" opportunism. Subjectivism ascribes a decisive role in history to the revolutionary will and to the subjective factor regardless of the objective conditions. Such is the position of petty-bourgeois revolutionaries—anarchists, Blanquists, Bakuninists, and also ultra-"Left" elements in the communist movement. This position leads to adventurism in politics, to attempts, for example, to rouse the masses for revolution in the absence of a revolutionary situation, attempts which doom the revolutionaries to defeat. "Left" opportunism pushes a Communist Party onto the road of sectarianism, divorces it from the masses and time and again substitutes actions by a group of conspirators for struggle by the masses.

A policy is scientifically based only when it relies on a proper understanding of the relationship between the objective conditions and the subjective factor, recognises the determining significance of the objective conditions, and at the same time takes into consideration the tremendous role

[1] *Lenin Miscellany XXVI*, Russ. ed., p. 342.

of the subjective factor which is capable, given the objective conditions, to play the decisive part in effecting historically ripe changes. A divorce of the objective conditions from the subjective factor, a gap between these two sides of the historical process, inevitably leads either to Right or to "Left" opportunism.

2. Relationship Between the Objective Conditions and the Subjective Factor in Socialist Society

The general propositions about the relationship of the objective conditions and the subjective factor also fully apply to socialist society. But under socialism this relationship is marked by a number of distinctions, above all, the enhanced role of the subjective factor.

In socialist conditions, the subjective factor is formed from the conscious and constructive endeavour of the masses, the leadership of Party, governmental and other organisations called upon to head the masses and organise their efforts in building communism. Under socialism, the enhanced role of the subjective factor is expressed in the fact that the activity of the masses rises tremendously, the number of active participants in the building of the new society grows considerably and at the same time conscious leadership of the masses by the Party and the state acquires still greater significance.

The role of the subjective factor under socialism is raised above all by the change in the nature of economic development and in the relationship between spontaneity and conscious activity.

The development of the economy was spontaneous in pre-socialist societies. Naturally, in those socio-economic formations, too, each individual producer pursued definite aims in his daily productive activity and in this sense he acted consciously. But the progress of the economy as a whole, resulting from the activity of many producers, proceeded spontaneously and was not subordinated to the conscious control of society. This is above all explained by the fact that in all modes of production before socialism, the development of the productive forces was subordinated to imme-

diate aims and interests. Because of the objective conditions of their life people could not ponder over the more remote social consequences of their actions and take them into consideration; their calculations and aims were confined to their immediate interests. Moreover, in societies founded on private property, the interests and actions of people clashed, ran counter to each other and the result of their actions was frequently unexpected for the people themselves. Although in critical periods of history the break-up of old production relations and the introduction of new ones came as a result of conscious struggle of advanced classes, the economic development of society as a whole remained subordinate to spontaneous forces uncontrolled by people. "If ... we apply this measure to human history, to that of even the most developed peoples of the present day," Engels wrote, "we find that there still exists here a colossal disproportion between the proposed aims and the results arrived at, that unforeseen effects predominate and that the uncontrolled forces are far more powerful than those set into motion according to plan."[1] This cannot be otherwise, Engels stressed, as long as social production is subordinate to the blind play of spontaneous forces, as long as capitalist relations of production are preserved, which make the anarchy of production, crises, and the domination of the product over the producer inevitable.

Life naturally also impels capitalism forward, forces it to adapt itself to the tremendous growth of the productive forces. In present-day conditions state-monopoly capitalism introduces some elements of conscious regulation into the economy. Even Engels, in the last years of his life, noted, in connection with the appearance of trusts, that capitalism must not be regarded in the old way, that one could not continue to define capitalism as a system of production lacking planning. "This is now out of date; once there are trusts, there can no longer be lack of planning." Expressing in these words Engels's idea, Lenin stressed that in the 20th century the development of capitalism went even farther, that a transition was under way from monopoly in general to state monopoly.[2] In conditions of state-monopoly

[1] F. Engels, *Dialectics of Nature*, Moscow, 1966, pp. 34-35.
[2] V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 24, p. 240. See also Marx/Engels, *Werke*, Berlin, 1963, S. 231-32.

capitalism, the tremendous growth of the productive forces dictates a certain regulation of production. Not only particular measures for regulating economic growth, but entire economic programmes designed for more or less long periods are being applied in certain West European capitalist countries and in Japan. It cannot be denied that with the help of "economic programming" the bourgeois state succeeds in influencing the economy and its trends. Although the state redistributes through the budget a considerable part of the national income (about one-third in most imperialist countries) and makes substantial investments, no "economic programming" can eliminate the spontaneous nature of the capitalist economy as a whole, abolish crises and uneven economic growth. State programming is effected on the basis of agreements by the government and the biggest monopolies but is not binding on the latter: it is of an indicative (i.e., recommendatory) nature. The monopolies accept the recommendations, in so far as they meet their interests. The situation cannot be different as long as production remains capitalist and its aim is to extract profit. Capitalist programming, effected in the interest of the monopolies, ultimately further aggravates the antagonism between the social nature of production and the private capitalist form of appropriation; it cannot save doomed capitalism.

The founders of Marxism foresaw the need for abolishing capitalist relations and replacing them by socialist relations requiring the planned, balanced organisation of all social production. They scientifically outlined the main features of future society: abolition of private property and the establishment of social property in the means of production, abolition of the exploitation of man by man and subordination of social production to satisfying the needs of the whole society. In these new social conditions, people for the first time gain the opportunity to subjugate the spontaneous forces which up to now have predominated. Subordination of production to society's interests enables people to consider not only the immediate but also the more remote social consequences of their productive activity. Social ownership of the means of production unites people and prevents antagonistic clashes of their interests. All this turns economic development into a purposeful process in which the results needed by people are increasingly attained.

The new element, consequently, is that social ownership of the means of production enables socialist society to act as a single entity. It has neither private owners whose interests clash, nor opposing classes. The conflicting aspirations of people resulting in a fundamental divergence between the aims and consequences of their actions, which is characteristic of preceding societies, under socialism are replaced by a new type of relationship between class and personal interests, between the actions of people and their consequences. The aspirations and actions of men coincide in the main and the entire people are united around a common goal in a society where there is socio-political and ideological unity.

This naturally rules out neither contradictions between the particular, non-basic interests of various groups of people nor aspirations which run counter to the general advance of society towards communism. They cannot be avoided, because some social distinctions inherited from class society are preserved in the first phase of communism: because the carriers of survivals of capitalism exist and, lastly, because there are conservative people who, owing to their allegiance to the old or interest in preserving it, hamper society's development. We must also bear in mind that not all members of society are at once drawn into the conscious endeavour of tackling the common tasks of building communism.

But the main characteristic of socialism is that social progress is achieved not as a result of the clash of contending classes, but as a result of the co-operation of all social groups and the pooling of their efforts. This means that the entire people become the subject of history, inasmuch as they consciously accomplish historical tasks facing society. It is this stage of society's development that is "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".[1]

Consequently, the sphere of the subjective factor is extended in socialist society. It encompasses not only the leading forces of society, first of all the Party and the socialist state, but also the entire mass of the people who act as the conscious builders of the new society.

[1] V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 25, p. 472.

Under socialism, the role of the subjective factor also rises because of the distinctions of its political system. Before the victory of the socialist revolution state power was held by the classes hostile to the proletariat and state activity that affected the proletariat was a factor that did not depend on its will. But with the winning of political power by the proletariat, the activity of the state and the employment of instruments of power becomes an important subjective factor in coping with the tasks of the socialist revolution. The majority of the working people headed by the working class are the subject of socialist transformations. They acquire in the socialist state an instrument of unprecedented force for influencing the course of historical development.

Thanks to all this, the subjective factor gains a new function, without parallel in history, namely, to direct society's development consciously, in conformity with the available objective conditions and objective laws operating under socialism.

Political relations, culture and the very foundation of society's life, the economy, become the object of conscious endeavour. Under socialism, too, the productive activity of people remains a sphere of the objective making of history, inasmuch as the production of material goods is, as before, an economic necessity. But in this sphere, too, the subjective factor acquires a special role, because the results of economic construction largely depend on the consciousness of the masses, on guidance of the economy.

The building of socialism is from the very beginning of the socialist revolution a process of conscious and organised work by the masses to develop the productive forces and to remake economic relations through the socialisation of the means of production (nationalisation of industry, transport and the banks, organisation of co-operatives in agriculture and the crafts, and so on).

The building of socialism is at the same time a process of subordinating the spontaneous elements and tendencies of economic growth to single state guidance. This task was accomplished in the Soviet Union in bitter struggle between the forces of the organised working class and the classes

opposing it, between the socialist sector of the economy which developed according to plan and the capitalist sector of the economy which tried to foil socialist construction, utilising for this purpose petty-bourgeois elements.

Economic development, which under the domination of private property was spontaneous, becomes a consciously directed, planned process when social property gains dominance.

Does this mean that under socialism the relationship of the objective conditions and the subjective factor radically changes so that the determining role is played by the subjective factor and not by the objective conditions? No, such a view would be wrong. What changes radically is not the relationship between the objective and the subjective, but the relationship between the spontaneous and the conscious elements. Society is becoming a consciously directed whole which subjugates the spontaneous forces that dominated people in preceding societies.

The objective is not tantamount to the spontaneous. Under socialism, the concept of the objective preserves the same meaning as before: it denotes that which exists outside, and is independent of, the consciousness of men and is not determined by their will and mind. The spontaneous denotes that which is not controlled by people, is not subordinate to their will, but on the contrary dominates them.

History shows that the confusion of these concepts leads to class mistakes in understanding the development of socialist society. Some men, recognising the objective determination of socialist society's development, regarded this as a spontaneous process and thus arrived at the "automatic flow" theory, which is profoundly inimical to socialism. Other men, regarding socialist society's development as a consciously directed process, denied on these grounds the objective nature of its laws and thus slipped into the position of subjectivism, which leads to adventurism in economic policy. Both these views have nothing in common with the scientific understanding of socialist society's progress.

The transition to socialism widely extends the bounds of men's conscious activity and changes the nature of operation of economic laws. Socialism's intrinsic economic laws fundamentally differ from the laws of capitalism both in their content and nature, because these laws express new

relations of production, relations of comradely mutual cooperation and socialist mutual assistance of people free from exploitation. Socialism's economic laws, which are just as objective and independent of men's will and consciousness as the economic laws of capitalism, are no longer spontaneous laws. Whereas under capitalism the means of production and labour are distributed between sectors of the economy spontaneously, through the mechanism of the laws of competition and anarchy of production, the average rate of profit, and so on, under socialism the means of production and labour are distributed among sectors by society consciously, in accordance with the requirements of the law of planned, proportional development of the economy, the basic economic law and other economic laws of socialism.

That under socialism economic laws operate differently is explained not only by the fact that men comprehend these laws and utilise them in their economic activity. Of course, knowledge of objective laws and their practical application are a prerequisite for curbing the spontaneous forces and subjugating them to man's control. But the possibilities of the planned use of laws and the mechanism of their operation are themselves determined by the objective conditions of the life of the people. Even the most exhaustive knowledge of capitalism's economic laws cannot eliminate the spontaneity of their operation. The development of the national economy ceases to be a spontaneous process only with the abolition of private property, when the economic laws of capitalism, which express the relations of private commodity producers, are replaced by new economic laws, the laws of socialism, which express the relations of producers united by social ownership of the means of production. Consequently, the objective conditions for subjugating the spontaneous forces of economic development by society are the establishment of social property in the means of production.

The triumph of the planning principle, naturally, does not mean that under socialism the spontaneous forces and tendencies in the economy have been fully abolished. They still make themselves felt. Some sectors of the economy (especially agriculture) are to a certain extent affected by the spontaneous forces of nature which society at the attained level of the productive forces is as yet unable to

subjugate fully to its control. Spontaneous elements also exist in economic relations owing to the presence of an unorganised market in which prices fluctuate. Private-ownership tendencies, displayed in the actions of some people, the survivals of capitalism in men's minds, mores and way of life hinder the conscious, purposeful advance of socialist society towards communism.

Spontaneity, however, is engendered not only by objective but also by subjective reasons. It can also be caused by the activity of the subjective factor, if people inadequately consider the objective conditions in which they live, and do not reckon with the demands of economic laws. Their planned, conscious use by society is a form of their operation under socialism and communism. But when people disregard their demands, the operation of these laws results in spontaneous, undesirable consequences. Moreover, the results of their activity do not conform to the aims people set themselves. For example, subjectivism, displayed at one time in guiding Soviet agriculture, gave rise to numerous consequences which adversely affected its development.

By and large, spontaneity of social development is eliminated under socialism, but its objective determination naturally remains. The concept of the objective embraces here also such connections and relations which are established consciously. For example, in determining the concrete tasks of socialist and communist construction it is necessary to proceed from the objectively existing level of development of the productive forces. In contrast to the earlier formations, under socialism this level is not merely a result of spontaneous economic growth; it embodies not only what has been inherited from preceding societies, but also the results of the conscious effort of the people to develop the socialist economy. But all this does not alter the fact that each successive stage in the development of socialist society is objectively determined by the preceding one. This determination does not depend on man's will.

Socialist society is arranging and changing its economic relations consciously, which, however, does not deprive them of their objective nature, just as, let us say, the development by chemists of synthetic materials with pre-determined properties does not abolish the laws of chemical compounds. Socialist relations of production are established not arbitrarily, but in conformity with the existing productive forces. The connection between the level of the productive forces and the state of the production relations is an objectively necessary connection which exists outside men's minds and independently of their will. That is why under socialism, too, the difference between material relations (which above all include economic relations) and ideological relations is not eliminated.

Material social relations are established by men who act individually as conscious beings and at the same time "*independent* of *the social consciousness* of people".[1] In *Materialism and Empirio-Criticism,* from which this quotation is taken, Lenin demonstrates that the criterion of the materiality of social relations is their lack of dependence on social consciousness. Relations of production are shaped independently of social consciousness as a form of the material productive forces used for maintaining the life of people, and they exist objectively, regardless of whether people are aware of it or not.

The criterion of the materiality of social relations is also fully applicable to socialist relations of production. Under socialism, too, these relations, just as social being as a whole, exist objectively, independent of social consciousness and the will and wishes of men. Whether men want it or not, they face definite living conditions which are the result of society's preceding development. Before changing these conditions they are forced to adapt themselves to them.

In the period of building socialism, spontaneous market forces are replaced by the conscious, constructive work "of setting up an extremely intricate and delicate system of new organisational relationships extending to the planned production and distribution of the goods required for the existence of tens of millions of people".[2] But people do not establish these relations "from scratch", so to say. They find definite productive forces and relations of production which have arisen on their basis. These relations can be consciously changed in the direction suggested by the development of the productive forces, but they cannot be established arbitrarily or organised anew at will, disregarding

[1] V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 14, p. 325.
[2] Ibid., Vol. 27, p. 241.

the objective conditions. Attempts to do so inevitably bring on serious failures and miscalculations which harm society.

More than that, although society foresees the main trend of the change in relations of production and acts accordingly, it cannot foresee all social consequences of its productive activity: life will always produce something new. People do not become at once aware of the need to make some change in the relations of production. They become aware of this only when in their practical activity they encounter sufficiently ripe contradictions in life. But the latter arise, without passing through the minds of men. "Life proceeds by contradictions," Lenin pointed out, "and living contradictions are so much richer, more varied and deeper in content than they may seem at first sight to a man's mind."[1] This dialectical proposition preserves its full force in socialist society, too.

Hence, the need to study life carefully so as to discern the birth of contradictions and take measures for resolving them in good time.

Account must also be taken of the differing levels of social consciousness in socialist society. The highest level is represented by the consciousness of the Party which scientifically analyses and guides society's development. But there still remains the difference in the level of the consciousness of the Party and the entire mass of the people. In socialist society, too, not every producer, entering into relations of production, is aware of the nature of these relations and their development trends. Many people first enter these relations because they are prompted to do so by vital necessity and only then become more or less aware of their social nature. That is why work at a socialist enterprise becomes for them also a school where they learn to understand social life. The Party gradually elevates the level of the people's daily consciousness to the level of its scientific consciousness. At the same time the Party and its leaders rely on the experience of the masses who, as a rule, are the first to encounter in life the maturing contradictions, look for ways to resolve them, display their initiative and thereby accumulate valuable experience which has to be analysed and summed up by the Party leadership.

[1] V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 34, p. 403.

It is necessary, finally, to differentiate between an understanding of the prospects of social development, which is inherent in the conscious builders of communism, and a scientific analysis of the processes of social development which under socialism, too, requires the summing up of a vast amount of materials and penetration into the essence of phenomena and remains a function of science. This science is mastered by many people, but this does not yet obliterate the boundary between scientific thought and practical activity.

And so, social consciousness is not identical with social being under socialism either. There can be no such identity because, first, social being remains primary and independent of social consciousness and, second, social consciousness, being a reflection of social being, never encompasses it fully.

Socialist consciousness is capable of exerting active influence on social being, but within the bounds determined by being itself and to the extent to which it properly visualises the trends of the former's development. The more precisely the objective conditions are considered and their trends are ascertained, the greater the opportunities people have for purposefully changing the conditions of their being. This also determines the demands socialist society makes on social consciousness and the subjective factor as a whole.

The enhanced role of the subjective factor under socialism is determined by the objective conditions themselves; it follows, as pointed out earlier, above all from the nature of the economic system of socialism which, based on social property, requires the united, collective actions of people and cannot be developed by disunited producers. But to concentrate their efforts on one goal and guide the intricate work of building the new society, the Party has to rely on a scientific analysis of the laws governing social development and of the objective situation.

3. Scientific Guidance of Society's Development

The role of the subjective factor in socialist society is above all a matter of utilising the potentialities of socialist relations for developing the productive forces and advancing the economy and culture.

Under socialism, as in any other society, people have to reckon with the objective conditions. To ignore the objective conditions would mean to take an adventurist stand that would be disastrous. Conscious guidance of social development does not release men from the need to take into account the achieved level of the productive forces; on the contrary, it demands an even more precise consideration. It opens up the possibility for accelerating society's progress, but it does not in any way allow the setting of its rate at will. The possibilities for advance are determined every time by the attained level of society's development which does not depend on men's wishes.

It would be wrong, for example, to think that by pooling all its forces society is capable of carrying out any plan whatever. The plan must reflect the demands of socialism's objective laws, properly express the requirements and real possibilities of the socialist economy. In cases where Soviet plans did not take exact account of these demands life dictated their readjustment.

In drafting plans not only the internal but also the external conditions must be considered. The objective conditions for the development of a country include the productive forces and production relations taken in their entirety, the natural conditions which affect economic growth and the international economic and political conditions in which the country finds itself. For example, the objective factors which the U.S.S.R. had to consider when building socialism included such an unfavourable condition as the fact that it was the only socialist country in the world, surrounded by hostile capitalist states. Among the external conditions in which socialism is being built today in the People's Democracies is the existence of the world capitalist system, which is hostile toward socialism, and also the existence of the world socialist system, which makes it easier for them to build socialism.

The capitalist world, which creates the danger of a military attack, is a factor that does not depend on the Soviet people's will and has affected the development of their state from its very birth. Let us recall that the wars imposed on the Soviet people by the imperialists and the restoration of the war-ravaged economy retarded peaceful construction for many years. The imperialists are also

seeking to impede the development of socialism and prevent it from demonstrating its advantages over capitalism by exacerbating the international situation and creating a war danger.

It goes without saying that in this sphere, too, much depends on the policy of the socialist states, for example, their ability to utilise in their own interests the contradictions between the imperialists, to avoid military conflicts, and so on. Moreover, as the forces of the world socialist system grow, it acquires greater possibilities for influencing the international situation and changing it in the interest of the people. But it is clear that not everything depends on the will and desire of the Soviet people and that they have to consider the actions of the aggressive forces of imperialism and to strengthen the country's defence potential so that it will not be caught unawares.

While the objective conditions for the development of socialist society and its potentialities do not depend on the will of men, the subjective factor, the will and energy of people, play a paramount part in translating these possibilities into reality. The potentialities inherent in the socialist economic system are not realised automatically. Their use demands, first of all, a correct policy; it is elaborated by the Communist Party by applying Marxist-Leninist theory in a creative spirit.

The C.P.S.U. considers the gradual development of socialism into communism as an objective law and shapes its policy accordingly. Only such an approach to the tasks of building communism is truly materialistic.

The building of communism in the Soviet Union is a fully feasible task, for which all objective possibilities are available. This, however, does not mean that all material prerequisites for coping with the big and intricate tasks of the transition to communism already exist in the U.S.S.R. They have to be created in the process of laying the material and technical foundation of communism. It is on building this basis that the solution of all other tasks depends, above all the improvement of socialist social relations and the moulding of the new man. In turn, the remoulding of the minds of men in the spirit of communism will help create the material and technical basis and shape communist social relations.

It is clear that the only policy that can be considered scientific and correct is that which takes into account the objective connections between the different tasks of communist construction and relies on the objective laws that do not depend on man's will and consciousness.

People infected with subjectivism see the mounting role of the subjective factor, but do not understand its dependence on the objective conditions, do not consider the point that the subjective factor can gain decisive importance not of itself but only on the basis of the existing objective conditions. They also do not see that the influence of the subjective factor can be effective and bring the expected results only if the objective conditions and real possibilities are thoroughly taken into account. Otherwise, the results of the operation of the subjective factor might be directly opposite of those expected and inflict great harm on society.

Under capitalism, economic management of an enterprise is the private affair of its owner: if he miscalculates, he may be ruined, but this cannot and does not affect society directly and at once. Under socialism, however, economic management includes all sectors on a nationwide scale and directly affects the interests of society. If planning agencies miscalculate, this to some extent affects the entire economy. It is clear that in this case centralised guidance of economic life and the planned introduction of management methods, which make up the great advantages of socialism, react against society and result in a waste of its resources. That is why mistakes in economic policy and subjectivism in guiding the national economy are so dangerous.

The untenability of subjectivism is displayed not only theoretically but also practically. Subjectivism in practice, for example, is manifested in attempts to disregard the law of value in fixing prices of goods, in ignoring the personal and collective interest in developing production. All manifestations of subjectivism are ultimately rooted in an unwillingness or inability to consider the objective conditions, in a desire to "circumvent" in one way or another the laws of social development, to act independently of these laws and contrary to them. But in such cases the laws always take "revenge", dooming subjectivist actions to failure.

Attempts to ignore objective laws do not release people from them and do not subordinate social development to

their will; on the contrary, they make men dependent upon spontaneous forces. Thus, attempts to set excessively high growth rates of production arbitrarily, without regard for the real possibilities, can actually slow it down, because they give rise to disproportions in economic life and upset the normal course of reproduction. Similarly, ignoring economic stimuli and unwillingness to consider them in fixing prices and wages lead to a lag of some sectors and can even retard growth. In a word, subjectivist illusions of being able to "order" anything at will actually increase the dependence of people on spontaneous forces.

One of these illusions which usually accompany subjectivism is that an extension of the sphere of centralised planning by itself enhances the role of the conscious element in society's development. Actually, however, such enhancement is not at all the same as increased centralism.

Real enhancement of the role of the conscious element in socialist economic development demands not only a sober account of objective possibilities but also the proper organisation of the people's effort aimed at realising these possibilities. Such an organisation is achieved by combining centralised planning and economic management with the broad stimulation of initiative from below. This dual task stems from the very nature of socialism. Based on large-scale socialised production, socialism cannot develop without a centralised element and at the same time it is inconceivable without utilising the initiative of the people, and enlisting the masses in the management of production. Life taught the Soviet people, as Lenin noted, to combine these opposites. But they can be blended in different ways, resulting either in a disruption or harmony. This means specifically that at each stage of society's development it is necessary to find the proper measure for blending centralisation with independence and initiative from below.

Such a blending of opposites is also expressed in the very mechanism of social development under socialism: centralised setting of the main plan targets and major national economic proportions must be combined with granting enterprises a measure of definite economic independence, without which the genuine interest of the personnel in improving production and the stimulation of their initiative are impossible.

Excessive centralisation in planning, which aims to provide "from above" for everything down to the minutest detail, does not signify actual reinforcement of the planned, conscious element in the economy. It fetters initiative from below, often infringes the interests of individual enterprises and links of the economy and thereby retards production. But similarly it would be wrong to think that the socialist economy can be developed by extending the operation of "spontaneity", for example, in the form of offering enterprises unlimited freedom on the market or renouncing centralised planning. To follow this path means to lose all the advantages of large-scale centralised production and to undermine the very foundations of the planned socialist economy.

Both mistakes stem from a common methodological basis —ignoring a reasonable measure of combining centralisation with the independence of separate links in the economic machine. If this measure is neglected, any phenomenon may turn into its opposite.

The measure of combining centralism with independence and initiative from below is different at each stage of society's development and in various spheres of social life. It is clear that the degree of centralisation cannot be the same in guiding the economy or society's spiritual life, for example, art, or the sphere of society's political life as a whole and in the organisation of its armed forces. Similarly clear is the dependence of this measure in each sphere of society's life on the attained level of development, on the internal and external situation.

The advance to communism does not imply a continuous growth of centralisation. As for the economic sphere, here two tendencies operate: on the one hand, the growing socialisation of production and rise in the importance of specialisation of sectors and their co-operation on a nationwide scale; on the other hand, the rising role of independence and initiative of enterprises in the planned socialist economy.

In this connection let us examine one more important aspect of the relationship between spontaneity and consciousness. We have discussed in the previous section elements of spontaneity which hamper development. From this it does not, however, follow, that all spontaneous phenomena

retard development. There are also spontaneous phenomena which express the birth of the new, attesting to its vitality.

It would be wrong to assume that conscious leadership of socialist society's development means that everything new and progressive is introduced from above. As far back as the beginning of the October Revolution Lenin stressed that socialism is not created on orders from above, that bureaucratic automatic action is alien to its spirit. Socialism is created by the people themselves, for socialist society opens up the widest scope for initiative from below. The task of the leadership is to utilise in the interest of society all the initiatives and to set them fully into motion.

Communist society will be the most highly organised society in man's history. But this organisation can be attained not through petty regimentation of all the actions of people, not through the subordination of each step to the strictest centralisation. Such a system is unsuitable not only for communism but also, as demonstrated by experience, for socialism. Conscious guidance of social life, elaboration of scientific solutions of major problems of economic development will be combined with the daily customary activity of men who produce and distribute life's necessities and amenities.

Of interest in this respect is the statement of Marx in his notes on the Paris Commune that only the lengthy process of development of new conditions can replace the "present spontaneous operation of the natural laws of capital and landed property" by the "spontaneous operation of the laws of the social economics of free and associated labour...".[1]

What is the meaning of Marx's statement about the "spontaneous operation of the laws of the social economics of free and associated labour"? Does it mean that the economic laws of communism will operate blindly, spontaneously, like the economic laws of capitalism? Of course not. Marx evidently had in view something else. As communist relations attain definite maturity, they, just as the relations of people in other social formations, are consolidated, become customary and reproduce themselves. Moreover, in contrast to the preceding formations, under communism the "spon-

[1] *Marx-Engels Archives*, Russ. ed., Vol. 3 (VIII), Moscow, p. 335.

taneous operation of the laws of the social economics of free and associated labour" signifies the disappearance of the need for state regimentation of the actions of people, for whom the observance of the rules of communist society will become customary, something taken for granted. The need will be obviated of compelling people to observe the rules of communist society, they will become customary and will be observed without any special coercive means. This signifies that communist society will gradually and increasingly turn into a self-regulating organism in which the operation of economic laws will become customary and will not arouse resistance. The forms of guiding society's development will correspondingly change. Under communism, this guidance will not vanish but will merely lose its political nature and rise to a higher level.

Elementary, daily forms of people's activity will no longer be the object of guidance, because they will become a habit and will be performed automatically. But the solution of fundamental problems of society's development, naturally, will remain the object of conscious regulation.

Similarly, the operation of the economic laws of socialism and communism, consolidated in daily practical activity, does not mean that all processes of economic growth can take place automatically. The basic proportions of social reproduction are set by society in advance; without this, planned operation of the economy is inconceivable.

In the first phase of communism, when commodity-money relations exist and distribution according to work prevails, guidance of the economy requires both state control over the measure of labour and consumption and also attentive consideration of the interests of separate collectives of workers in order to combine their interests with the interests of the state as a whole.

If the subjective factor includes not only the guiding activity of the Party and the state but also the activity and initiative of the masses, there follows the need for combining centralisation, indispensable for a society founded on socialised production, with the wide development of local initiative and independence. To achieve this, definite operational independence must be given to enterprises and their personnel and they must effectively participate in planning production.

The economic development plans of the U.S.S.R. demand the utmost development of the democratic principles of management and the consolidation and improvement of centralised planned guidance of the national economy. The new economic management system plays a big part in accomplishing these tasks. This system creates more favourable conditions for the rational use of the gigantic productive forces, for a swift rise in living standards and fuller scope for the advantages of the socialist system.

* * *

The Soviet Union is now improving the scientific principles of guiding all economic and social affairs. Socialism for the first time in history creates conditions for the scientific guidance of society's development. These conditions are created above all by society's cognising the laws of its development and mastering the necessary instruments for their conscious use. The reciprocal connection between various sides of society's economic life appears here, as Marx put it, not as a blind law which is imposed on the people taking part in production, but as a "law which, being understood and hence controlled by their common mind, brings the productive process under their joint control".[1]

But the clarity of socialist social relations does not mean that guidance of society's development becomes a simple matter. This is a very intricate affair, calling for profound study of the objective processes of society's development, elaboration of the most effective forms of mastering economic and social laws, creation of a flexible and smoothly functioning management system and selection of competent personnel capable of solving, with wisdom and statesmanship, problems raised by life.

Profound study of objective processes is the first requisite for scientific guidance of society's development. This demands objective, unbiased information. To have a correct picture of the state of affairs is the most elementary and at the same time the most essential requisite for taking proper decisions. Social investigations organised on a wide scale also can and should play a vital part in the study of objec-

[1] K. Marx, *Capital*, Vol. III, Moscow, 1966, p. 257.

tive processes. Without reliance on data of science, it is impossible to guide society's development in a scientific way.

Reliable information is the first but certainly not the only requisite for scientific guidance. In socialist society, as in others, the essence of things does not lie on the surface; a deep analysis is needed to penetrate the substance of social processes, to reveal the interconnection of causes and effects. Otherwise it is impossible to find the answer to a single important question.

The scientific guidance of society's development requires both a proper appraisal of the present situation and the forecasting of trends in social development. This task acquires special importance thanks to the scientific and technological revolution. The increasing scale of production and the further socialisation of labour processes dictate the ever growing need for the prognostication of the social results of economic progress. The scientific and technological revolution witnesses the growing ties and interaction between changes in production and in the people's way of life, in their labour conditions and spiritual life. Science is becoming a direct productive force and penetrates all spheres of social life which is changing at an increasing speed. This being the case, the prognostication of social processes becomes the society's direct necessity. This is required by the increasing scale of applying natural resources, the greater population density, the growth of cities, urbanisation, etc. The prognostication of social processes is now in the limelight even in the capitalist countries. Under socialism, it is ever more important, for this system is built and develops on a conscious basis, on the basis of scientific plans. The choice of optimal variants of national economic development acquires special importance at the present stage of the socialist economy, when the people are tackling the tasks of intensification of social production and of maximum increase of its efficiency.

Any large practical task which confronts socialist society developing according to plan, whether it is a matter of growing cities or districts in cities, or the influence of automation on man, demands that account be taken of scientific data in order to make correct forecasts and produce the requisite recommendations for practice.

After analysing the interconnection of phenomena, the question arises, how to influence their further development. Here different variants of action are possible, from which the most effective must be chosen.

A scientific solution of problems demands an all-round account of all the circumstances, both advantageous and disadvantageous, while a subjectivist approach is confined to picking from the entire context one or another arbitrarily chosen favourable side. Hastiness and unreasonable decisions always accompany subjectivism.

The building of communism is an undertaking without precedent in history. It would be naive to think that in such a matter it would be possible to get along without exploratory moves, without testing various forms of organisation, without casting aside those that have proved unsuitable and improving the most expedient forms. Here wide scope is opened for social experimentation. Many questions cannot be decided at once, on a nationwide scale, without preliminary trial, experimenting and testing on a narrower scale. What makes social experiments important is that they offer the opportunity to weigh up and to try out different variants of action and thereby avoid unnecessary losses inevitable when decisions are taken hastily, without preliminary trial. Such experimentation, naturally, demands the participation of the working people themselves.

Study of the practical experience of the masses, proper evaluation of local initiative and dissemination of the best know-how make up an important element of scientific guidance of society. Lenin called for a thorough study of the shoots of the new, for testing how communistic they are and giving them every support. He foresaw that with the support of the Party and the socialist state the shoots of communism would not wither but develop and blossom into full communism. This is especially important now when communism is being built in the Soviet Union.

Scientific guidance of society's development also presupposes the proper organisation of administration, the efficient carrying out of adopted decisions and the involvement of the masses in this work. Such an approach is incompatible with spontaneity or with excessive centralism, and it is similarly incompatible with an ossified management system.

Application of Lenin's behests about the scientific organisation of management and the employment of the latest devices furnished by modern science and technology can play a significant part in this respect.

Proper organisation of the subjective factor must rule out the very possibility of any unjustified, voluntaristic decisions. Such decisions usually are a result not only of insufficient consideration of the objective conditions. They become possible wherever the principles of collective leadership and socialist democracy are violated and socialist legality is ignored. Scientific guidance of society's development is closely linked with the consistent application of the Leninist rules of Party life, with the further improvement and development of socialist democracy. The further improvement of the scientific principles for guiding society will contribute to the fuller use of the advantages of the socialist system.

The leadership of the Communist Party imparts to the entire work of building communism an organised, planned and scientifically-based character.

Chapter II

ECONOMIC RELATIONS AND INTERESTS OF PEOPLE IN SOCIALIST SOCIETY

The materialist understanding of the development of socialist society, just as of any other, is impossible without ascertaining the role and nature of the interests which prompt people to participate in history-making activity. A solution of this problem furnishes the key to discovering the real driving forces of the historical process.

As for idealists, they regard ideological motives as the decisive driving force of social development. Ideas and their spontaneous development are claimed to be the ultimate force of historical progress. Time and again the idealists counterpose lofty ideas to "lowly" interests. Such an antithesis is alien to the materialist understanding of history. In one of their early works Marx and Engels ironically remarked: "The *'idea'* always disgraced itself insofar as it differed from the *'interest'*."[1] Ideas which played a really important part in history and brought into action large masses never differed from interests, they always expressed real interests and needs of social life and were an ideological expression of social, class, national and similar interests. Thus, the materialist conception of history does not deny the significance of ideological motives in society's development, but it does not regard them as the prime cause of historical events; it ascertains the objective conditions which gave rise to them and also the interests created by these conditions and expressed in ideas.

The role of conscious activity of men and the importance of progressive ideas, moral stimuli to work, and so on, rise in socialist society. Communist consciousness which

[1] K. Marx and F. Engels, *The Holy Family*, Moscow, 1956, p. 109.

spreads among the people is a mighty force accelerating the building of the new society. But we shall understand neither the driving forces of socialist society nor the real conditions for the moulding of communist consciousness itself if we ignore the significance of interests—social, collective, and personal—which prompt men actively to participate in building socialism and communism.

Many mistakes in theory and in practical activity have stemmed from ignoring the interests of people. For example, attempts have been made to reduce the driving forces of socialist society primarily to those of a moral and political order or to make socialist and communist construction dependent solely on the enthusiasm of the people, to develop chiefly moral stimuli to work. This in fact has resulted in subjectivist neglect of the material interests of the working people. The building of the new society in the Soviet Union and other socialist countries indisputably demonstrates that proper guidance of this construction demands the ability soberly to consider the interests of the people, to find the correct measure of combining private interests with general interests and the degree of subordinating the personal interests to the general interests.

Many other theoretical questions arise in this connection, questions related to understanding the nature of interests, the conditions for their effective combination, and so on. Without solving these problems a scientific understanding of socialist society's development is impossible.

1. Interest as a Sociological Category

Appreciation of the role interests play in the development of society was the first step in the history of social thought toward a materialist understanding of history. We find an embryo of the materialist view of society, for example, in the thoughts of philosophers of antiquity (Democritus, Lucretius, and others) about the role of necessity in cognising and mastering the world around man and using the forces of nature in inventions and the creation of objects useful for people and in the development of the arts. A number of philosophers and historians (in particular Italian historians of the Renaissance) voiced the idea about

the primary role of interests in the clashes of various social forces which represented the mainspring of historical events. For example, Niccolo Machiavelli regarded "material interest" as the driving force of history. "Men," he wrote, "forget more quickly the death of a father than the loss of a father's estate."[1] He saw in the clash of material interests the cause of struggle between the poor and the rich and the basis of political events. Some philosophers in that and later periods expressed the view that the struggle of various ideas reflected the clash of interests of people. Let us recall the well-known aphorism of Hobbes that if geometric axioms were to affect the interests of people they most likely would be refuted.[2]

Such thoughts, however, were no more than surmises and they did not form the basis of a sustained theory of the historical process. Moreover, these views were still far from being a scientific understanding of what gives rise to interests of people and clashes between them.

Nor were these questions finally solved by 18th-century French materialists. Their concept of interest formed the basis of their theory of morality and in effect their theory of man's social behaviour. The French materialists consistently applied the idea of interest as the main and even the sole driving force of man's actions. Helvétius metaphorically said that "interest is the omnipotent sorcerer which changes the form of every object in the eyes of all beings".[3] If the physical world is subordinate to the law of motion of bodies, the spiritual world, in the opinion of Helvétius, is no less subordinate to the law of interest.

The theory of interest, expounded by the French materialists, was an attempt to provide a rational (in contrast to religious) and materialist explanation of man's behaviour in society. This theory regarded man as a "social atom"

---

[1] Machiavelli, *The Chief Works and Others*, Vol. 1, Durham, North Carolina, 1965, p. 63.

[2] Thomas Hobbes believed that mathematical kind of learning was free of disputes and disagreements, for in these things "Truth, and the Interest of Men, oppose not each other" (*The Moral and Political Works of Thomas Hobbes of Malmesbury*, London, 1750, p. xxxii).

[3] Helvétius, *De l'esprit*, Paris, 1843, p. 32. "Rivers do not flow upstream, nor do people act contrary to the rapid current of their interests," Helvétius remarked (*Ouvrage Posthume de M. Helvétius*, Tome II, Londres, 1773, p. 466).

which is set in motion by interest, just as a physical atom is set in motion by the forces of attraction and repulsion. The French materialists also used this theory to solve problems of ethics. It served as the point of departure for different variants of the theories of "enlightened self-interest", which, for all their shortcomings, were an attempt to furnish a materialistic explanation of the origin and essence of morality.

This was a considerable step forward in the history of social thought, but the limited world outlook of the French materialists foredoomed their effort to create a rational theory of man's social behaviour. This specifically told on the interpretation of two questions which only Marxism was able to solve scientifically. The first is the question of the relationship between social and personal interests; the second is the objective source of interests, their origin and essence.

It was impossible to understand correctly the relationship between social and personal interests from position of individualism, with a mechanistic approach to society as a totality of "social atoms" which may be combined but are more or less independent of one another.[1] The individual person is the starting point of the social theories of the 17th and 18th centuries. From the individual the thought of the philosopher turned to society which must obey some natural order. This order, instituted by contract among people and regulated by law, must be such that the private and the social interests coincide. Then man, acting in his own interests, will at the same time act for the common good.

In the opinion of the French materialists, man ultimately is prompted to act by personal interests. If he performs self-sacrificing deeds, this, too, ultimately is to be explained by his personal benefit. In this case he renounces a smaller benefit to gain a bigger one. But it was impossible to explain in this way all self-sacrificing actions of people.

Marx demonstrated the relative nature of the antithesis between self-sacrifice and egoism, in which metaphysicians became entangled. He discovered that everywhere in history the "general interest" is created by the individuals with their private interests and stand opposed to the latter only because

[1] "Society is only an assemblage of individuals," Helvétius remarks (*De l'esprit*, p. 27).

it acquires the form and significance of an ideal interest. That is why "Communists do not put egoism against self-sacrifice or self-sacrifice against egoism.... They do not put to people the moral demand: love one another, do not be egoists, etc.; on the contrary, they are very well aware that egoism, just as much as self-sacrifice, *is* in definite circumstances a necessary form of the self-assertion of individuals."[1]

Ultimately, the driving force of man's activity in all spheres of social life is his interests. But they are not reduced to individual interests, as claimed by proponents of utilitarianism like J. Bentham.[2] Members of any more or less developed society have a diversity of interests: personal, group, class, social, and so on. It goes without saying that society, a nation, a class and other forms of community of people do not exist apart from the individuals comprising them. But neither are they reduced to a mere sum total of individuals. The starting point of a Marxist analysis is a society, within the bounds of which individuals gain the opportunity to develop and distinguish themselves. That is why Marxists reject the atomistic notion of society as a sum total, the result of adding together isolated individuals. Similarly, social interests are not merely a sum total of individual interests. This, as we shall subsequently demonstrate in detail, are the interests of society's progress, i.e., an expression of the objective needs of its development.

The interests of a class, nation, and so on appear to the individual as his own interests, inasmuch as he is a member of these communities of people. But they differ from his individual, i.e., personal interests in the narrow sense, first, because they are common for the entire class or nation and, second, because they express the needs of their existence and development as a whole. In contrast to direct personal interests, general interests are expressed in the ideas of

[1] K. Marx and F. Engels, *The German Ideology*, Moscow, 1968, pp. 266-67.

[2] Bentham reasoned as follows: "The community is a fictitious body, composed of the individual persons who are considered as constituting, as it were, its members. The interests of the community then is, what?—the sum of the interests of the several members who compose it.

"It is vain to talk of the interest of the community, without understanding the interest of the individual" (*The Works of Jeremy Bentham*, Vol. I, London, 1859, p. 2).

class solidarity, in the awareness by people of their moral duty to their class, nation or country which might demand of the individual selfless struggle, heroism and in case of need to sacrifice his life.

But ideological, moral stimuli to action must not be considered as motives unconnected with interests. They also express interests, not individual but social. That is why Marx, recognising in one of his early works that "everything man fights for is connected with his interest", resolutely objected to the opinion that "only 'petty' interests, only invariably selfish interests"[1] exist.

The Marxist theory, on the contrary, proceeds from the principle that there are great and lofty interests and that struggle for them is capable of inspiring man to great deeds and elevate him to the summits of nobility.

Egoism and altruism thus do not appear as absolute, totally incompatible opposites. This was well demonstrated by Plekhanov in some of his works ("Essays on the History of Dialectical Materialism" and "N. G. Chernyshevsky"). "The dialectics of history," Plekhanov wrote, "converts *selfish* interests of society or a class into *self-sacrifice* and heroism of the individual."[2] A society or a class evaluates the action of men by the way they meet the interests of the given community. This, if you please, could be called social egoism, whose existence even Ludwig Feuerbach already guessed. But for the individual who perceived the demands of society or a class under the impact of his living conditions and education, community interests become an inner requirement, a motive of his action devoid of any egoism. His actions which correspond to the interests of society may be a result either of conscious understanding of these interests or an instinctive need, or, lastly, an acquired habit to act in this and in no other way. Be that as it may, individual altruism develops here from social egoism and the behaviour of man is determined by his interests—either social or personal.

The relationship between social and individual interests changes, too, depending on the social conditions. There can also be conditions making it impossible or almost impossible for man to ignore social interests (such, for example, were

[1] Marx/Engels, *Werke*, Bd. I, Berlin, 1956, S. 67.
[2] G. V. Plekhanov, *Works*, Russ. ed., Vol. VIII, Moscow, 1923, p. 46.

the social conditions in a pre-class society where the tribal order still held full sway). But there can also be social conditions which, contrary to society's interests, impel man to selfish actions running counter even to the needs of his own class. It is a fact, for example, that base egoism is a "necessary form of the self-assertion of individuals" striving for personal enrichment. Where this is dictated by material interest, the magnates of capital trample upon society's interests, and even betray their country. They try to derive profit even from national calamities. Characteristic in this respect are the replies to a poll conducted by the *Business Review* magazine among American businessmen and executives. To the general question about the motives of enterprise many replied with pompous phrases about their social duties, responsibility to society, and so on and so forth. But when they had to reply to definite questions, something else was brought out. Fred J. Cook, an American publicist, commented on this poll as follows: "When four out of every seven executives believe businessmen would violate a code of ethics whenever they thought they could escape detection, when an overwhelming four out of five affirm the existence in their industries of 'practices which are generally accepted and are also unethical', there can be little question that a nation so swayed by business as ours faces a grave moral crisis."[1]

In capitalist society, genuinely human traits—self-sacrifice, devotion to civic duty and comradely solidarity—become widespread only among the proletariat and other working people fighting together with it. The objective conditions of the class struggle foster in proletarians courage, self-sacrifice, readiness to fight to the end for their common cause. The experience of the class struggle teaches that they can liberate themselves from exploitation not by caring for their personal interests, but only by jointly fighting for the common cause. That is why, to use Marx's picturesque expression, the entire beauty of mankind gazes from the toil-coarsened faces of the workmen.

Thus, the theory of Marx makes it possible scientifically to explain the social actions of people, however diverse and contradictory they are. Both the basest actions and the lof-

[1] Fred J. Cook, *The Corrupted Land. The Social Morality of Modern America*, New York, 1966, p. 76.

tiest deeds are ultimately determined by the concrete historical conditions of people's life, their position and interests.[1]

This furnished an answer to the second question which was a stumbling block for the social theory of pre-Marxian materialists, what are the sources and essence of interests. The French materialists displayed a dual attitude in interpreting this question. On the one hand, they regarded the individual as a product of the social environment and also deduced his interests from the nature and conditions of human life. This had to reveal the objective basis of interest. In this case interest was treated as something necessary or useful for the individual, nation or state, conforming to their nature, as was done, for example, by Denis Diderot in his *Encyclopaedia*.[2] Such a view was in essence a correct, materialist view, but it, like the entire theory of pre-Marxian materialism, lacked the historical approach. It was impossible to explain the changes and differences of men's interests by the immutability of human nature. Interest was explained by usefulness to man. But why in that case do interests change in different epochs? Examining the logic of arguments used by Helvétius and other 18th-century French philosophers, Marx remarked: "To know what is useful for a dog, one must study dog-nature. This nature itself is not to be deduced from the principle of utility. Applying this to man, he that would criticise all human acts, movements, relations, etc., by the principle of utility, must first deal with human nature in general, and then with human nature as modified in each historical epoch."[3] But the lack of a historical approach prevented the French materialists from understanding how human nature is modified. Why, for example, do people obey laws, believe in religious superstitions which are not really useful? Helvétius sought to reply to this question by reference to "imaginary utility", i.e., to the notions of people that depend on public opinion. He held that public opinion imparts a certain

[1] We refer here not to some actions of individuals which can be explained by their psychology, but to mass actions.

[2] Denis Diderot, *Collected Works*, Russ. ed., Vol. VII, Moscow-Leningrad, 1939, p. 214.

[3] K. Marx, *Capital*, Vol. I, Moscow, 1965, p. 609.

interest to things, makes them more or less attractive to people and thus determines their actions.

Here we have another understanding of interest which signifies a shift to idealism. Whereas originally interest was regarded as an objective category determined by human nature, now interest is made dependent on the opinion of people, i.e., is regarded as something subjective. Such an interpretation of interest stands out clearly in the works of Paul Holbach. "*Interest*", he asserted, "is an object with which man associates, depending on his temperament and his ideas, the notion of his happiness; in other words, *interest* is simply that which every one of us considers necessary for his happiness."[1] But the notions of happiness may differ greatly not only among different people, but also in different periods in the life of an individual.

The historic contribution made by the French materialists is indisputable. But notwithstanding their achievements in understanding society, they could not create a materialist theory of its development. Their mistake was that they confused the objectively determined interest with the notions of people concerning their interest. But real interest and the notion of interest are by no means identical. They may not coincide, just as consciousness in general may not coincide with being.

Interests must not be regarded as only a product of consciousness, they exist objectively: this is a direct expression of the position of people in society, in the system of social production and the needs determined by this position. Objective needs of people which follow from the conditions of their social being make up the content of interest. The object of their interest is what is objectively needed for the life and development of society, class and man, for satisfying their vital requirements and needs.

Interests, of course, are not determined by people's opinions or notions; they are determined by the conditions

[1] *Système de la Nature ou Des Lois du Monde Physique et du Monde Moral*, par M. le Baron d'Holbach, Vol. I, Londres, 1770, p. 312. He gives a similar definition in his *Elémens de la Morale Universelle, ou Catéchisme de la Nature*. To the question, "what do you understand as interests?" he replies: "I understand in general everything man considers necessary for maintaining his life and securing his happiness" (Holbach, op. cit., Paris, 1791, p. 54).

of their life. Let us take class interests as an example. These interests depend above all on the place of the given class in a historically definite system of production, on its relation to the means of production and other conditions of its existence. Lenin associated the interests of classes with all the conditions of their life.[1]

The objective nature of interests lies in that usually men do not become aware of them as soon as they appear. At the early stages of the class struggle (and even today in a number of capitalist countries) many workers did not become aware of their basic class interests. Nevertheless these interests have been, and remain, objective reality because they flow from the conditions of the proletariat's social being. "The question," Marx and Engels wrote, "is not what this or that proletarian or even the whole of the proletariat at the moment *considers* as its aim. The question is *what the proletariat is*, and what, consequent on that *being*, it will be compelled to do."[2] The interests of the proletariat are shaped objectively as a result of the development of the capitalist economy, in the process of its crystallisation as a class; it becomes aware of them in the course of class conflicts with the bourgeoisie, especially rapidly when a proletarian party is created.

There have been attempts in the working-class movement to treat the class interest of the proletariat as a subjectively psychological category. The mistake of the Economists in Russia consisted in reducing the basic class interests of the proletariat to immediate specific interests, and also in regarding as real only the interests of which the workers were aware at the given moment. A collection of materials issued in 1900 by the Emancipation of Labour group quoted a letter written by an Economist in which the tasks of Social Democracy were confined to propaganda of the methods of organisation "based on the appreciated interests of the workers". "The workers," one of the letters stated, "know only two things: 1) their own clearly understood, concrete interest and 2) their position among other classes. Hence the function of the superstructure, of the intellectual Social Democracy is to understand the interest of the given moment,

[1] See V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 1, p. 411.
[2] K. Marx and F. Engels, *The Holy Family*, p. 53.

i.e., the active psychological basis which is the driving force of the masses. . . ."[1] On this ground the author rejected the advocacy of socialism and propaganda of the need to win power and carry out a social revolution as alien to the workers defending their real interests.

Such a narrow understanding of the interests of the working class revealed the main feature of opportunism, namely, sacrificing the basic interests of the working class (regarded as something unreal) to the current interests (considered the only real ones). It also demonstrated an idealist interpretation of interests alien to Marxism, to which Plekhanov rightly directed attention in his preface to the collection. The Economists reduced interest to the "active psychological basis" of action; for this reason they considered that only interests of which the workers were aware really existed. Plekhanov remarked that the author of the letter "identified interest with a *certain state of consciousness.* He decided that interests '*are engendered*' not by the actual relations of men in social production, but by human consciousness. "In brief," Plekhanov sums up, "he interpreted this word in absolutely idealist terms. And since he wanted at all costs to stand on a '*scientific*' basis, he talked of the 'active psychological basis' as the limit which Social Democracy must not transgress if it did not want to turn into a utopian party."[2]

The basic error of the Economists, consequently, was that they made the interests of the working class dependent not on the conditions of its social being, but on the degree of development of its consciousness. That is why the subjective process—awareness of interests—was confused with an objective process—their formation in life itself.

The materialist conception of history differentiates: 1) shaping of interests as an objective phenomenon; 2) their reflection in the minds of people, which can be more or less exact and correct or distorted; 3) their realisation through practical activity, through struggle.

Formation of interests is an objective process. Interests are engendered by a definite position of people in society and the needs determined by this position. Awareness of

[1] G. V. Plekhanov, op. cit., Vol. XII, p. 490 (Appendix).
[2] Ibid., p. 17.

interests does not add anything to their content, inasmuch as this content is determined by the conditions of life. But awareness of interests is a major prerequisite for their realisation; without understanding its interests a class is unable to launch a conscious struggle for their realisation. This determines the tremendous role of consciousness in the class struggle.

In the struggle against the Economists Lenin proved that the task of the proletarian party was to introduce socialist consciousness into the spontaneous working-class movement, to impart to it a conscious nature. This helped the working class to become aware of its basic interests and accelerated this process.

According to the materialist understanding of history, social consciousness in general, including the consciousness of each class in particular, is a reflection of social being. This, however, does not imply that at every moment in history all people and classes are fully aware of their position in society and the consequent interests. Awareness by a class of its fundamental interests is a more or less prolonged historical process, which is consummated not by all classes. Real interests are often expressed in an illusory form and combined with fantastic notions.

The question arises, if real interests are not understood at once, what determines the activity and struggle of a class which has not yet become aware of its interests? Can unappreciated interests become a stimulus to action?

Engels pointed out that all the driving forces of the actions of any individual must pass through his brain in order to turn into motives of his will.[1] Stimuli, i.e., definite motives to action are a reflection of their interests in the minds of men. It stands to reason that any interest of which man is unaware, cannot produce any stimuli. But interest can be reflected in the minds of people not only in the form of notions which reveal its content and prompt them to work for its satisfaction; an interest can be manifested in an instinctive striving for some goal.

Moreover, interests themselves can be of diverse kinds: basic and partial, long-term and short-term, remote and immediate. People first of all become aware of their immediate interests which they encounter in daily life. They can become aware of these interests within the bounds of ordinary consciousness, but understanding of basic interests demands certain theoretical thinking and is impossible without generalisation.

[1] See K. Marx, F. Engels, *Selected Works*, Vol. II, Moscow, 1962, p. 395.

This process can be demonstrated in the conversion of the proletariat from a "class in itself" into a "class for itself". Crystallisation of the proletariat into a class has two sides: objective and subjective. The objective side is the rise of material conditions needed for the formation of a whole class from the sum of guilds and trades: the development of industry, transition from the craft to the manufacture and factory, increase in the number of workers, their concentration in production, and so on. In the course of this process the living conditions and immediate interests of the working class are evened out to a certain extent, inasmuch as machines, as noted by Marx and Engels in the *Communist Manifesto*, increasingly obliterate the differences between separate kinds of labour and almost everywhere reduce wages to an equally low level. The objective class interest of the proletariat—emancipation from capitalist exploitation—arises together with its formation as a class. But awareness of this interest, as pointed out earlier, does not come at once. At first workers of separate enterprises, industries and localities wage a struggle against their oppressors, prompted solely by awareness of their immediate interests which often run counter to one another among different sections of the workers. Awareness by workers of their basic class interests is promoted by the objective process of deepening the antithesis between their interests and those of the bourgeoisie. But this awareness does not come spontaneously; it presupposes organisation of the working class into a political party which introduces socialist consciousness into its struggle.

And so, a class is able to wage a mass struggle while it is still at the initial stages of its development, being a class objectively but not yet understanding fully its position in society and the antithesis between its interests and those of other classes. This struggle, in which awareness of immediate interests is the driving force, remains spontaneous. It is awareness of the basic, general class interests that turns this spontaneous struggle into a conscious struggle.

In history, oppressed classes usually became aware of their basic interests later than the oppressing classes who established their political rule. This is also true of the working class. Moreover, in a number of cases the formation of the proletariat into an organised, politically conscious class proceeded much later than the objective side, especially when slowed down by various historically concrete circumstances (for example, strong influence of bourgeois and petty-bourgeois ideology, bribery by the bourgeoisie of the upper crust of the working class, the heterogeneous national composition of the working class, etc.).

William Z. Foster, the late Chairman of the Communist Party of the United States, pointed out that although the working class in the U.S.A. wages a sharp class struggle, the workers of America in their majority "have no concrete perspective of socialism, and they are still not class-conscious". But if these workers do not yet consciously strive for socialism, if some of them share in the profits American capitalism extracts by exploiting other nations, this, of course, does not negate the fact that their fundamental interests, just as those of workers in other capitalist countries, can be satisfied only by abolishing capitalist exploitation and building socialism. It is this fact, together with the future economic upheavals which American imperialism will not escape, that opens up the prospect for the rise of the class consciousness of U.S. workers and the development of socialist strivings among them.[1]

To differentiate between the real, objective interests of a class and their subjective reflection in the minds of the masses, parties and ideologists, is a prerequisite for the scientific explanation of the intricacies of the class struggle. In analysing historical events, the founders of Marxism-Leninism always carefully considered what were the real interests of the classes taking part in the events, to what extent they could be satisfied in the given historical situation and at the same time how correctly they were understood by various parties, political leaders, and so on. "In historical struggles," Marx said, "one must distinguish still more the phrases and fancies of parties from their real

[1] William Z. Foster, *The Twilight of World Capitalism*, New York, 1949, pp. 62-64.

organism and their real interests, their conception of themselves, from their reality."[1]

A class is not always distinctly aware of its interests, or theoretically understands them, but frequently the class instinct itself impels it onto a path conforming to its interests. For example, during the first Russian revolution, the "owner's instinct" prompted the peasantry to demand the nationalisation of the land, although it had no clear-cut economic ideas associated with the transfer of the land to the people. Nevertheless when the peasants said "God's land", "no-one's land" they expressed in their own way the idea of abolishing private ownership of the land, which corresponded to their real interests.

Ideologists of a class usually express in a more or less lucid generalised form what the mass of this class vaguely feels and strives for. On the other hand, any representatives of parties and classes can make mistakes, but in the final count their mistakes are usually rectified by groups or classes which have an interest in the struggle. In this sense Lenin wrote that "classes do not err".[2] This means that on the whole they act in accordance with their interests, prompted to this, if not by a clear class consciousness, at least by their class instinct.[3]

This proposition, of course, must not be universalised. There is no denying the point that people might act contrary to their basic interests. History knows many instances when the masses, entire classes or peoples participated in actions or events which did not conform to their basic interests and subsequently brought them grievous calamities.

[1] K. Marx, F. Engels, *Selected Works*, Vol. I, Moscow, 1962, p. 272.
[2] V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 13, pp. 366-67.
[3] We naturally do not examine here the question of class consciousness as a whole, inasmuch as it goes beyond the bounds of our subject. In order to avoid misunderstanding, let us remark that the consciousness of a class stems not only from its interests but also from its position in society. At one time Karl Kautsky in his polemic against Belfort-Bax directed attention to the point that material conditions of society's life must not be identified with the material interests of separate classes and peoples (symposium *Istorichesky materializm* [Historical Materialism], 4th Ed., State Publishers of the Ukraine, 1923, p. 38). Thus, for instance, sentiments of despair and helplessness, frequently voiced in the philosophy of doomed classes, can sooner be explained by the position of these classes rather than by their direct interests.

What is the reason for such developments? They become possible because objective interests are not always correctly understood by people. But more often such actions, if we speak of masses and not of individuals, are a result not of ideological illusions, but of the fact that people are guided by their immediate interests to the detriment of their fundamental interests. At times reactionary forces succeed in luring the masses onto a false path, utilising for this purpose their temporary, partial interests. "Marxism," Lenin noted, "appraises 'interests' according to the class antagonisms and the class struggle which find expression in millions of facts of daily life."[1] Lenin, for example, regarded the division of the world by the great imperialist powers as an objective indicator that all the propertied strata are *interested* in the possession of colonies, in the oppression of other nations, in privileges associated with being part of the oppressing nations. He further showed how the bourgeoisie had succeeded in utilising the interests of the labour aristocracy (and bureaucracy) in getting crumbs of the colonial superprofits to fan chauvinism among the masses, to vitiate its "own" working class with the poison of nationalism.

A materialist understanding of the sources and essence of interest enabled Marxism to determine the relationship between interests of a different order. Here first of all the question arises, what is the relationship between interests which differ according to their *subject*, their source, i.e., between social, national, class, group, personal and other interests? On the other hand, the question also arises about the relationship between general and particular, long-term and short-term, basic and immediate interests of *one and the same* subject. Are all these diverse interests interdependent in some way? Is it possible and necessary to place some interests above others?

Before replying to these questions let us note that Marxism-Leninism, emphasising the decisive importance of class interests in a society divided into classes, by no means denies the existence of social interests. At times the view is encountered that a society divided into antagonistic classes has no

[1] V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 21, p. 228.

social interests, because the opposite classes have no common interests.

Such an opinion is a vulgarisation of Marxism. To begin with, one must not identify social and common interests in all circumstances. In a classless society they, of course, coincide, but in a society divided into antagonistic classes the situation is more complex. Social interests are the interests of progress of society as a whole; they go to create conditions for the development of the productive forces which represent the material basis of social progress. Society is interested in developing the productive forces, inasmuch as its life and further advance depend upon it.

It goes without saying that every class is guided in its daily activity by its class interests and not by abstract social interests. But this does not eliminate the question of the relationship of its class interests to the interests of society. To maintain that the latter do not exist means to discard the objective criterion for assessing class interests, for determining whether they are progressive or reactionary.

The role of every class in history can be properly evaluated only by its actions—whether they correspond or run counter to the interests of social progress.

At different stages in the development of the same mode of production the attitude of a class toward social interests can be of a diametrically opposite nature. The activity of ascending classes meets the interests of social progress, their class interests more or less coincide with the social interests. In these periods of development their interests to a certain extent appear as common interests, i.e., the interests of society's members, if not of all, then at least of the overwhelming majority. Marx and Engels explained that "each new class which puts itself in the place of one ruling before it, is compelled, merely in order to carry through its aim, to represent its interest as the common interest of all the members of society, that is, expressed in ideal form: it has to give its ideas the form of universality, and represent them as the only rational, universally valid ones".[1] Of course, such a concept is illusory, but originally this illusion had a real basis, because the interest of the given class was actually connected more or less with the common interests of all

[1] K. Marx and F. Engels, *The German Ideology*, pp. 61-62.

other, non-ruling classes. Thus a class carrying out a revolution appears "from the very start . . . not as a class but as a representative of the whole of society".[1] But when this class, in its turn, wins power and even more so, when it becomes a reactionary class, its interests run counter to the interests of other classes and the interests common for all classes become completely illusory. Of course, the interests of social progress, i.e., the social interests, do not disappear, but the interests of the given class fully clash with them. This means that the formerly progressive class has turned into a reactionary one.

Certain interests of some classes which are faced by a common enemy may temporarily coincide at definite stages of historical development. Such coincidence occurs when definite national tasks arise (for example, in the struggle for national liberation). In such cases we speak of the *common* interests of the overwhelming majority of society's members. But in solving common national problems each class acts in its own way, guided by its class interests. That is why Lenin demanded a precise analysis "of those varied interests of *different* classes that coincide in certain definite, limited common aims".[2]

Such common tasks and consequently common interests coincide at the given stage of historical development with those of social progress. But the latter remain the criterion for assessing the degree to which a class is progressive or reactionary after the common tasks have been accomplished and the contradictions between the interests of different classes come to the fore. The application of this criterion shows that the working class acts as the most revolutionary and progressive class in history, because its class interests fully coincide with the interests of social progress. At the same time the working class most fully expresses the common interests of all the working classes seeking liberation from exploitation. Liberating itself, it liberates all of society from class and national oppression, from all types of material and spiritual enslavement.

From these positions it is possible to understand the great methodological importance of Lenin's proposition about the

[1] K. Marx and F. Engels, *The German Ideology*, p. 62.
[2] V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 12, p. 404.

relationship of interests of different orders: "From the standpoint of the basic ideas of Marxism, the interests of social development are higher than the interests of the proletariat—the interests of the working-class movement as a whole are higher than the interests of a separate section of the workers or of separate phases of the movement."[1] The question might be asked, why did Lenin place the interests of social development higher than the interests of the proletariat itself? This is explained by the fact that from the standpoint of the basic ideas of Marxism, of which Lenin spoke, the progressive nature of the proletariat itself is judged by its ability to ensure society's advance, to raise society to a higher historical level, to achieve the transition from the pre-history of mankind to its genuinely human history. In this sense the interests of social development are the supreme criterion of the historical role of a class.

Let us examine, further, Lenin's thought that the interests of the working-class movement as a whole are higher than the interests of separate sections or separate phases of the movement. The interests of each class are common for all its members. But there are undoubtedly some differences between the interests of separate sections or groups within a class. They, however, affect not the basic, but secondary interests determined by the differences in the position of the given group. These are differences between the particular and the general, and also between the temporary, current and constant, stable interests. Marxism-Leninism proceeds from the principle that the particular interests must be subordinated to the basic and the immediate to the long-term interests. Of course, immediate interests always are the direct motive of men's actions. That is why Marx and Engels wrote in the *Communist Manifesto* that the Communists fight for the attainment of the immediate aims of the working class, but at the same time in the movement of the present, they take care of the future of that movement. Marxism rules out a divorce of the immediate and long-term interests, and does not permit disregard of particular, current interests. At the same time, in contrast to opportunism, it never loses sight of the basic, common interests, upon which the fate of the entire class and the

[1] Ibid., Vol. 4, p. 236.

entire working-class movement ultimately depends. Within the working-class movement, a Marxist party invariably upholds the general interests of the proletariat, of the revolutionary movement as a whole.

Both before the October Revolution and after the working class won power, Lenin resolutely objected to introducing the psychology of petty-bourgeois egoism and disunity into the ranks of the working class. Recognition of the priority of general class interests is a prerequisite for collective, united action of the working class. Without this there can be no organised struggle of the working class as a whole, no single proletarian discipline. That is why Lenin stressed that the workers who take state power into their hands, make all sacrifices and create a discipline which makes them feel that "class interests are higher than craft interests".[1] A narrow craft and trade approach, national selfishness, and so on split up the working-class movement. But unity of struggle by the working class both on a national and international scale makes it necessary not merely to combine various interests, but also to subordinate the lower to the higher interests.

Interests are also divided by the spheres of their scope—economic, political and cultural—standing in definite degrees of subordination one to the other. General class interests are expressed in the most concentrated form in politics, although ultimately politics is nothing but the means of realising the economic interests of a class. Economic interests are the most important thing for every class and this is natural, if we refer to basic interests. But to satisfy them it is necessary to win (or, if the class stands at the helm, to retain) political power. To accomplish this fundamental task a class can and should make temporary economic sacrifices, as demonstrated by the experience of the Soviet working class in the first years after winning power. Such sacrifices are amply rewarded.

Social life, examined in its entire complexity, presents a picture of the greatest diversity of interests which are intertwined and often clash. The materialist understanding of history explains how history emerges from this intertwining of interests and aspirations; moreover, it shows so-

[1] V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 30, p. 513.

ciety's progressive forces how to influence its forward movement and on what interests they can rely. This requires the ability properly to take account of interests and subordinate some of them to others, to the more general and basic ones.

The interpretation of interest as a sociological category differs essentially from its interpretation in psychology. In psychological literature interest is usually regarded as a certain trend in man's attention or action which depends on his position, occupation, cultural development, views, tastes, and so on. We cannot deny the legitimacy of this use of the word "interest" and we ordinarily employ it when referring to the diversity and wealth of the interests of man, whose attention is attracted by various occupations, spheres of culture, etc. But it would be a gross error to confuse the different notions designated by the same word "interest".[1] Such a confusion introduces into sociology and political economy the psychological interpretation of interest, which makes it dependent on conscious aspirations and wishes of men. The upshot is that the materialist interpretation of interest as an objective category is replaced by a subjectively psychological meaning.

We consider it necessary to differentiate between *interest* as an objective cause which arouses in man definite aspirations and *stimuli* as a reflection of their interests in the minds of men. Interest is an objective phenomenon. Interests, as understood to one extent or another, give rise to definite motives for action which might be called stimuli.

The objectivity of interest is not determined by its existence outside of the subject which is its carrier. It is self-evident that there are no social interests outside society, no class interests outside a class. In this case objectivity means that the nature and position of the given subject (society, class, man, and so on) evoke in it definite requirements and necessarily demand of it definite action to satisfy them. Moreover, this need is engendered not by its consciousness, but

[1] That such a confusion is wrong has been rightly noted by G. M. Gak in his article "Social and Personal Interests and Their Combination under Socialism" (*Voprosy filosofii*, No. 4, 1955) and in his book *Ucheniye ob obshchestvennom soznanii v svete teorii poznaniya* (The Doctrine of Social Consciousness in the Light of the Theory of Knowledge), Moscow, 1960.

by the conditions of its social being. Thus, interests express conditions of existence and development of a society, class, and so on, the position of men in society, and above all their place in the system of economic relations. These relations determine the interests of people in solving definite problems, and, depending on this, definite stimuli, impulses, strivings and passions are evoked in them. The intensity of these stimuli evidently can greatly differ depending on how essential the interests they reflect are, how strongly the man, class or society need their satisfaction.

The realisation of interests, in turn, depends on many objective and subjective conditions, first of all on the course of the struggle of people for definite aims. It is not the interest itself that represents a unity of the objective and subjective, as is wrongly claimed by many authors, but the process of realising it.

We said earlier that awareness of interests may be separated by a more or less considerable period from the time they arose. Even a longer period may separate the realisation of interests from their understanding by the advanced part of the class or society and then by the entire class or the whole of society. When the masses become aware of an interest this means that stimuli arise prompting them to work for its realisation. This is one of the essential elements of the subjective factor needed for the success of the struggle. But success also demands, on the other hand, corresponding objective conditions. Objective conditions and subjective elements should merge to ensure the full success of the struggle to realise interests.

2. Sources and Nature of Interests in Socialist Society

At all stages of social development history is made by people who are prompted to act by their interests, among which *economic, material interests* are of decisive importance. They arise on the basis of the relations of production, exchange and distribution existing in the given society, and for this reason change together with a change in these relations. The economic interests of people, the relationship

between their personal and social interests, fully depend on the nature of the production relations.

Domination of private property in the means of production imparts a selfish nature to the interests of the men who own this property. This gives rise to deep contradictions between the interests of people and classes, between the individual and society.

Such contradictions arise already with the appearance of the social division of labour. "...The division of labour," Marx and Engels wrote, "implies the contradiction between the interest of the separate individual or the individual family and the communal interest of all individuals who have intercourse with one another. And indeed, this communal interest does not exist merely in the imagination, as the 'general interest', but first of all in reality, as the mutual interdependence of the individuals among whom the labour is divided."[1]

Marx and Engels examine here interest as an objective category, existing not only in the minds of people but also in reality. General interest does not vanish even when the social division of labour separates the producers, assigning a special kind of activity to each one of them. Its source is the mutual interdependence of individuals connected by economic relations through the division of labour. Interest at the same time appears as a natural necessity that holds the "members of civil society together".[2]

Separation and mutual dependence—such is the inherent contradiction of the social connections between people which develops in conditions of the social division of labour and private ownership of the means of production. It is expressed in the division of interest into private and general. The contradiction between them is developed to the full in capitalist society.

The contradiction between the interests of the individual capitalist and the interests of society is inherent in capitalism. Private property in the means of production is the foundation of the capitalist system. This property and the attendant competition and anarchy of production disunite and separate people. The private property system fos-

[1] K. Marx and F. Engels, *The German Ideology*, p. 44.
[2] K. Marx and F. Engels, *The Holy Family*, p. 163.

ters in people greed and indifference to civic duty. In developed capitalist society competition suppresses the initiative and constructive energies of the overwhelming majority of the people and leads to the devouring of the weak by the strong. C. Wright Mills, an American sociologist and author of the honest and outspoken book *The Power Elite*, showed how the impersonal power of the capitalist corporations oppresses the people. "Americans like to think of themselves as the most individualistic people in the world," Mills wrote, "but among them the impersonal corporation has proceeded the farthest and now reaches into every area and detail of daily life."[1]

Under capitalism, the contradiction between the individual and society, between personal and social interests, is expressed primarily in that private ownership of the means of production pits the interests of the individual entrepreneur against the interests of other entrepreneurs and prompts him to act contrary to the interests of the entire society. This contradiction also affects the activity of people who are deprived of the means of production. Although conditions of large-scale production tend to unite the proletarians and develop their class solidarity, capitalism introduces competition into their ranks as well.

The contradiction between the individual and society also implies that the free development of the individual is incompatible with the mainstays of capitalist society, which by its very nature is hostile to man. Economic progress in this society has its obverse side; it takes place through the suppression of the personality of the workingman.

> "A man-eating monster
> society's my name..."[2]

These words of Eugène Pottier, poet of the Paris Commune, characterise the conflict between society and the individual under capitalism. The conditions of monopoly capitalism further exacerbate this conflict. The entire system of life under contemporary capitalism is inhuman because man is regarded by the tycoons as a means for the extraction of profit, as material for exploitation. Growing regimentation

[1] C. Wright Mills, *The Power Elite*, New York, 1956, p. 120.
[2] Eugène Pottier, *Oeuvres complètes*, Paris, 1966, p. 477.

of the people's life is a characteristic feature of state-monopoly capitalism.

The possibility of an office employee keeping his job or a small businessman surviving in the competitive struggle depends on the monopolies, the actual rulers of the capitalist world. The monopolies are the makers of "big politics" which decide the destinies of millions of people who exert no influence at all on political affairs. Even one's way of life and thinking are increasingly regimented by the monopolies. To push the sale of the goods they produce the corporations resort to all-pervading advertising which employs the latest psychological methods to dictate the choice of everything people should consume. The mass media—radio, TV, cinema, and the press—which are also controlled by the monopolies, din into the minds of people standardised thoughts and emotions and fabricate illusions on a mass scale. This is how a social type of man is created which some sociologists and psychologists call "man directed by others" devoid of a personality of his own, who is incapable and even unwilling to think for himself.

The apologists of capitalism seek to conceal these contradictions. Typical in this respect are the articles written by Robert Lekachman, Professor of Columbia University, and published in the magazine *America*.[1] In the picture painted by the author you will find neither monopolies dictating their will on the market nor capitalist sharks who swallow up the small business fry. Instead we behold peaceful coexistence of gigantic and small companies equally interested in satisfying the needs of the consumers. However much the interests of the businessmen clash, the professor claims, the consumer is the winner. The "free market" mechanism is fully subordinated to his changing tastes and wishes.

And so, in the second half of the 20th century, after a market free of monopolies vanished into the limbo long ago, an American author could think of no better way to defend capitalism than to drag out from the mothballs the "wisdom" of Jeremy Bentham who claimed that the clash of private interests gives rise to the common good. All this would have been good and sufficient if it were not for the crises

[1] *America*, No. 85, p. 49; No. 78, p. 2.

racking the capitalist world, chronic unemployment and the enrichment of the few by robbing the majority.

The system of economic relations under capitalism subordinates production to the extraction of profit, and not to the satisfaction of the interests of the working people. Private property and the common good are by no means good neighbours as Professor Lekachman pictures them to be. Their relationship has been described much more truthfully by Fred E. Martin, an American banker who has spent his life amassing profit. In a moment of frankness he admitted that America belonged to the rich who cared nothing for the common good.

The abolition of private property relegates to the past the interests it engenders. Dominance of social ownership of the means of production subordinates the economy to the interest of the working people. Here the interests of those who own the means of production and those who work are no longer diametrically opposed. They are one and the same people: the direct producers are also the owners of the means of production.

Social property is the basis for shaping a fundamentally new interest, as compared with class societies, namely, the social material interest of people in the development of production. This interest is new above all because it unites all the members of society. If we examine material interest as the force which, to use Marx's expression, holds together the members of society, under socialism this force is produced by the very domination of social ownership of the means of production. The social interest here is really *common* for all social groups in society—the working class, peasantry, intelligentsia—and also for all members of society.

The source of this material interest is above all that the well-being of every member of society depends on the general level of development of social production. Under socialism, the expansion of social production, the rise in the productivity of social labour and the general growth of the national income also signify an improvement in the living standard of all the people. The welfare of all and, consequently, of every individual, depends on the development and improvement of production.

This is the basis for the development of new ideological, moral stimuli to work. Such stimuli are quite diverse and,

just as in the case of material interest, can be divided into social and personal. For example, among the personal spiritual stimuli can be the interest of a man in his work where he can develop his abilities to the full; the interest in exploratory endeavour which is especially displayed in the mass movement for rationalisation and inventions; the desire to win the respect of fellow workers, and so on. But social stimuli are undoubtedly the main ones among moral stimuli. The desire to contribute their labour to the building of the new society, patriotic motives, awareness of civic duty—such social stimuli to work are an expression of appreciated social interests, i.e., the interests of the entire socialist society. They are engendered by social ownership of the means of production.

Social material interest which underlies moral stimuli to work, links together both phases of communism. It naturally will remain at the higher phase of communism when labour turns into man's prime vital requirement. At the higher phase of communism, just as under socialism, every member will be interested in the social results of his labour, inasmuch as the general and, consequently, his own well-being depends on them. But, as distinct from socialism, at the higher phase of communism social interest will prompt man to work directly and not through the mechanism of remuneration for his personal labour.

The disappearance, under communism, of the personal material interest of each workingman in the results of his labour, therefore, does not signify the disappearance of material interests in general. People have never developed, and never will develop, production only for moral reasons—they will always be prompted by material interests. Thus, the social material interest constantly accompanies social property in the means of production and develops together with the latter.

The existence of two forms of property under socialism —state and co-operative—creates, as will be shown subsequently, the specific interests of the working class and the collective-farm peasantry. The collective farmer's personal property in subsidiary farming also gives rise to certain specific interests. Eventually, the disappearance of differences between the two forms of socialist property and the transition to one communist property will lead to the furth-

er development of social interests and to the absorption of all specific interests by them.

The interests of people are shaped not only by the distribution of the means of production among the members of society, but also by all the other aspects of production relations. The forms of exchange of labour activity and the produced goods also greatly influence people's interests. Exchange of labour activity is based on the forms of the division of labour, which in conditions of commodity production also determine the exchange of the products of labour. The division of labour between economic sectors gives rise to specific interests of these sectors (for example, of industry and agriculture and also of separate types of production within them), which may not coincide. The vocational division of labour, in its turn, produces interests of separate trades. In this connection Marx spoke of the endless fragmentation of interests created by the division of social labour among the workers and also among the capitalists and the landowners; the latter, for example, are divided into owners of vineyards, arable land, forests, mines, and fisheries (see *Capital*, Volume III, Chapter LII). Private ownership of the means of production counterposes such interests and introduces competition, while social ownership, on the contrary, makes for co-operation and mutual assistance between people connected with different kinds of social production and sectors of labour.

Consolidating the entire economy of socialist society into a single whole, social property exists in the form of a system of state enterprises which possess certain economic independence and of co-operatives which are the property of separate collectives. That is why at the first phase of communism commodity exchange is a necessary form of the economic ties between them. Socialism excludes from commodity exchange the land, enterprises and also labour power, but does not eliminate commodity relations in general; the economic independence of enterprises makes the commodity form of ties between them an objective necessity.

The economic independence of separate production units engenders certain specific interests. This is obvious in the case of collective farms, which have a common form of property (co-operative), but each of which is operated

independently because this property is not united on a nationwide scale. Each collective farm, consequently, has also its own interests.

Specific interests also exist in enterprises which fall into the category of state property. As distinct from the collective farms, these enterprises belong to one owner, the state, which represents the entire people. They are economically united into a single whole. A socialist enterprise represents a part of the single national economic organism. Therefore, its interests cannot differ radically from those of the entire economy. But at the same time an enterprise is a relatively independent economic unit; the satisfaction of the collective needs of its personnel depends on the results of its operation and, consequently, it also has its own interests. The Regulations Governing the Socialist State Enterprise lay down that every enterprise carries on its activity "in the interests of the entire national economy and the collective of its workers".

The interests of people are also shaped by the methods of distribution. First of all they determine the group or personal interests of producers, the degree of their interest in the development of production. Capitalists employ numerous wage systems designed to make the worker interested in producing more, to weaken somewhat the paralysing influence exerted on his labour activity by the basic fact that he is separated from ownership of the means of production and is doomed to a proletarian existence, to exploitation. By applying different wage systems the capitalists, moreover, seek to divide the interests of various groups of workers, to weaken their class solidarity.

Under socialism, a prime source of labour activity is the transfer of the means of production into the hands of the entire people, the emancipation of labour from exploitation and its conversion into labour for one's own society, for oneself. The socialist principle of distribution according to work done makes the worker personally interested in developing social production, in raising the productivity of his labour and advancing his skill. An increase in output and a rise in labour productivity meet the interests of all of society and at the same time the personal interests of the individual producer, inasmuch as this brings him a higher income. In socialist society every workingman is interested

in the results of his labour both as a member of socialist society and as an individual worker. He is interested in the most rapid development of social production because this increases the consumption fund as a whole, raises the welfare of entire society and, consequently, his personal welfare; as an individual worker he is interested in raising the productivity of his labour, inasmuch as his share of the consumption fund depends on the quantity and the quality of his work. Thus, the socialist principle of distribution firmly links together the personal and social interests of the worker.

The personal material interest under socialism differs qualitatively from such interest in preceding societies. This follows from the nature of socialist relations of production and above all from socialist distribution according to work done. Remuneration according to work for all able-bodied members of society abolishes the injustices of capitalism where distribution is made not according to work done but according to capital and there is no equal pay for equal work: for example, women receive less than men, a coloured worker is paid less than a white worker, and so on. The socialist method of distribution expresses the substance of the new, socialist relations under which there is no exploitation of man by man and labour is the duty of all able-bodied people. It makes the worker materially interested in conscientious labour for society to the full of his ability, in raising the productivity of labour and advancing his skill.

Under socialism, economic interests are engendered not only by direct production relations but also by forms of economic organisation, of planning and so on, which are an expression of production relations. For example, various forms of uniting enterprises into firms which operate on a cost-accounting basis make the personnel of these firms interested in their activity. Similarly, the setting of some indicators for planning and evaluating the operation of enterprises may make them interested either in increasing total output (this happens when gross output is regarded as the main indicator) or also in raising the quality of goods, improving technology and more thrifty management. This enables society to stimulate the activity of enterprises in the required direction by elaborating the most effective indicators.

Community of the basic interests of people in socialist society by no means excludes the great diversity of their specific interests. Moreover, any man, inasmuch as he is connected by diverse social ties with other people, collectives and society as a whole, has many interests. A collective farmer, for example, has personal interests linked with his subsidiary farming; he has interests as a member of the given collective farm and at the same time of the entire class of the collective-farm peasantry; he has interests as an inhabitant of a given republic, region, district and village and as a citizen of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, and so on. These interests are interlocked and do not always coincide. This may open up the possibility for contradictions, which society must consider and solve if it is to advance.

Specific interests of various communities and associations of people can play both a stimulating or a retarding role in society's development. This depends on how these interests are combined and utilised. For example, specific interests of enterprises in general play a stimulating role in the socialist economy. They promote the better use of the resources of enterprises and raise the efficiency of their operation, which meets the interests of the entire society.

But these interests might also play an adverse part if they run counter to the interests of the entire national economy. At times an enterprise (for example, a clothing, furniture, or similar factory) might be interested in producing expensive goods which are not in great demand and, on the contrary, neglect the production of goods the consumer needs only because they are cheap and therefore "disadvantageous" for the fulfilment of the gross output plan.

Consequently, the interests of an enterprise must be combined with the interests of the entire economy which, just as the general interests of the people, are supreme as regards a separate enterprise. Such a combination is achieved by elaborating optimal planning targets and a system of bonuses to enterprises and their workers, by improving the wages system, and so on.

Personal interest, too, can play a similar dual role. Generally speaking, it can be a powerful driving force of production. Under socialism, personal material interest strengthens the ties of the worker with his enterprise. Given

the proper organisation of payment for work and appropriate educational activity, personal interests, far from running counter to social, are placed at the service of the latter. Payment according to the actual labour contribution of each worker to the common cause accustoms to social discipline persons of inadequate civic consciousness, and fosters in them the habit to work for society; in the case of highly conscious workers it acquires the significance not only of a material incentive, but also of a certain moral appraisal of their labour effort. High wages, for example, make the worker feel that society really appreciates his labour.

But if production and payment for work are improperly organised, the personal material interest may lead to the counterposing of the interest of an individual worker to society's interests, promote money-grubbing tendencies and thus act as a negative factor.

The possibility of rationally combining interests is determined by the objective conditions of socialist society's development, by its economic and political system. But this possibility is translated into reality only by removing contradictions engendered by life.

At one time the opinion was current that socialism allegedly precludes contradictions between personal, collective and social interests. Such an opinion is wrong because it gives rise to the illusion that a rational combination of interests is established automatically and there is no need to achieve it by conscious effort.

In reality, the socialist system, removing the ground for irreconcilable conflicts between the interests of people, does not eliminate the possibility of contradictions between them —contradictions between basic and non-basic, general and specific interests. These contradictions are resolved by the proper policy of the Party, by its organisational and educational work.

3. Interests of People and the Driving Forces of Socialist Production

A study of the diverse interests produced by economic relations enables us to reveal the mechanism through which relations of production affect the development of the productive forces. It demonstrates the economic relations in action and shows how and in what direction they impel people to act. That is why, as Engels put it, "the economic relations of a given society present themselves in the first place as *interests*".[1]

Proper understanding of the role of interests makes it possible to solve an important *theoretical* problem: what are the driving forces of the development of production? At the same time, it is the point of departure for settling a major *practical* question, that is, how to utilise in socialist conditions these driving forces for the most rapid expansion and improvement of production.

Let us first examine the general sociological problem of the driving forces of production. Marxist literature long ago raised the question of what the causes of the development of the productive forces are. If the development of the productive forces is the ultimate cause of changes in a social system, what determines the movement of the productive forces themselves? It will be recalled that attempts to find the causes of the development of the productive forces outside production itself, for example, in the influence of the geographical environment, growth of population, and so on proved untenable (although there is no denying the influence—often quite considerable—exerted by such factors on the development of production). The conclusion that the source of the development of production should be sought in the mode of production itself is almost generally recognised among Marxists. But this correct conclusion is still too general.

The productive forces and relations of production interact within the mode of production. What is the role of each of these sides of the mode of production? Is it sufficient to point to their interaction to establish the source of the development of production?

A number of objections to recognising the interaction between the productive forces and the relations of production as the source of development have been raised in Soviet philosophical and sociological literature. Some authors have stated that this leads to a vicious circle: we see the cause of changes of production relations in the development of the

[1] K. Marx, F. Engels, *Selected Works*, Vol. I, p. 622.

productive forces, and the cause for the development of the productive forces in the influence of production relations. They try to break out of this vicious circle by shifting the main emphasis to the inner logic of development of the productive forces themselves, for example, to the interaction between elements of the productive forces (the workers and the means of production). Otherwise, they say, it is impossible to explain why the productive forces continue to develop even after the relations of production have become obsolete and turned into a brake on this development (for example, under contemporary capitalism). Lastly, attempts have been made to link a solution of this problem with recognition of the decisive role of the people in developing production. If the people are the makers of history, it is the masses, the working people who in the final analysis are the motive power of the development of the productive forces.

These viewpoints, of course, present a number of correct arguments but, in our opinion, they are one-sided. Neither the inner logic of the development of the productive forces nor the activity of the people in production must be regarded in isolation from the interests which prompt people to act. And these interests, as pointed out earlier, are shaped by the relations of production.

No "vicious circle" whatsoever is formed here, given a proper, and not a simplified understanding of the interaction between the productive forces and the relations of production. The productive forces are the determining side of the mode of production. It is on the basis of a definite level in the development of the productive forces and depending on their nature that the given relations of production are shaped. This does not in the least run counter to the fact that, depending on the type and form of production relations, some or other interests are shaped prompting people to develop their productive forces.

In the final count it is the people who develop production—this is indisputable and self-evident. But the question is: what real possibilities do they have and what prompts them to do so? The real possibilities for the development of the productive forces are each time determined by the level of production already achieved and they are extended as production grows. Let us take an elementary example. It was

only in the 18th century that the possibility appeared to develop a steam engine as a universal motor for growing industry, while in the 20th century, and not earlier, the possibility arose of creating a nuclear power industry. Each new stage in the development of the productive forces sets before people new, broader tasks in technological progress and creates new, greater and more diverse means for achieving them. The preceding development of science and technology, however, determines only the possibility for the further development of the productive forces. The use of these possibilities, including those created by science and technology, depends on the relations of production, on society's economic system.

The influence of the production relations on the development of the productive forces is expressed in that they, first, afford bigger or smaller scope for this development, or on the contrary hamper it, set too narrow bounds for it; second, they provide definite stimuli for the development of production, which arise from the real interests of the people participating in production.

The inner logic of the development of the productive forces, in our opinion, cannot be denied. The interaction between the elements of the productive forces, above all labour power and the instruments of production, forms the inner mainspring of the development of production, because people, acting on nature and changing it, change themselves: they acquire new habits of work and develop their capabilities, including the ability to improve the instruments of production. They are prompted to do so by personal and social requirements.

But the growth of production cannot be explained solely by the inner logic of the development of the productive forces. If, for example, we consider the reasons for the continued growth of the productive forces under contemporary capitalism, reference to the inner logic of the development of the productive forces cannot explain anything. Such an abstract answer will offer nothing for explaining why, for example, despite capitalism's decay, production has developed very rapidly in certain periods and in some capitalist countries (for example, Japan and Italy).

An answer to this question can be given only if we bear in mind that the retarding role of capitalist relations of

production does not at all imply that all stimuli to the development of the productive forces engendered by capitalism have vanished. Private property long ago began to hamper the productive forces; they are cramped within these bounds especially because the socialisation of labour is steadily developing and assuming an ever wider scale. But the striving for profit and competition continue to impel the development of capitalist production even in conditions of monopoly domination. These stimuli, engendered by capitalist relations of production, do not disappear, but their action becomes increasingly contradictory. The quest for profit and competition act not only as factors which force the capitalists to expand production, but frequently also as factors retarding technological progress (for example, in cases when the monopolies, in order to protect their high profits, buy up patents for new inventions and do not use them) and even as factors which lead to the destruction of the productive forces (especially in conditions of crises, the arms race, and wars). Scientific and technological progress which leads to the creation of entire new sectors and demands the renewal of fixed capital, the intervention of the bourgeois state in the economy, the attempts partly to adapt capitalist relations to the growth of the productive forces (for example, by setting up state-monopoly associations like the Common Market)—all these and other factors also affect the development of the productive forces. This is the general background and against it stand out the specific causes which accelerate the development of the productive forces in some capitalist countries at the expense of slowing down this growth in others.

To consider the productive forces outside concrete economic relations and the interests they produce means to block the road to a scientific explanation of the driving forces of economic growth. Reference to the role of the masses as the ultimate cause of the development of production is, in our opinion, too general and abstract. It is beyond dispute that production is always carried on by working people, that society's entire wealth is created by their labour, sweat and blood. But in considering the role of the masses in production, we must not ignore two highly important questions, otherwise we run the risk of vulgarising historical materialism.

The first question is: what prompts the people to develop production, what stimuli to developing production are engendered by the given mode of production? The second question is: what interests prompt people who own the means of production, classes which hold a dominating place in the given mode of production, to develop production?

Clearly, it is impossible to consider the role played in the development of production by people and classes without considering their interests. The general proposition that people advance production can be rendered scientifically precise and concrete only if we analyse the interests impelling them to act. Moreover, it is necessary to consider both the interests of the direct producers, who make up the prime element of the productive forces, and also the owners of the means of production, the carriers of the given relations of production.

In antagonistic socio-economic formations the interests of the people participating in production are divided. The working masses who carry on production remain exploited throughout the history of antagonistic class societies and their labour is forced labour. Nevertheless, as the type of production relations changed, there was progress in this respect as well.

It will be recalled, for example, that the slave was not interested at all in raising labour productivity because it gave him nothing, it did not ease his hard lot. The serf already had a certain interest in raising labour productivity because he had his own small plot, but on the lord's land he toiled, just as the slave, under compulsion. Evolution of the forms of feudal rent—from labour rent (corvée) to rent in kind, and then money rent—enhanced the interest of the peasant in his work.

Under capitalism, the worker is personally free, but economically he depends on the capitalist, to whom he sells his labour power. The life of the proletarian is absolutely insecure; in a certain sense, he is even less secure than the slave, whom the master had to feed, or the serf who had his own plot providing some means of subsistence. But although under capitalism the worker is brutally exploited, wage labour makes him more interested in production than forced labour does. That is the reason why, according to the calculations of N. G. Chernyshevsky, renowned Russian

thinker and publicist, a hired worker produced daily more than three times as much as a serf under the corvée system.[1]

The nature of the production relations also determines the interests of the owners of the means of production, which prompt them to expand or, on the contrary, slow down the growth of the economy. Under feudalism, the economy was mainly of a subsistance character, the scale of production was frequently limited to the quantity of food which the feudal lord and his retinue could consume, that is, to their needs. In feudal society, just as in slave society, the ruling classes spent most of the surplus product not for expanding production, but for their unproductive needs. All this made inevitable the relatively slow development of the productive forces. Under capitalist production designated for the market, the aim of production is to extract profit, surplus value, a big part of which is invested in the economy. The capitalists are forced to do so by the competitive struggle. This is one of the reasons why despite the tremendous waste, under capitalism the productive forces develop much faster than in preceding societies.

Socialist society removes the clash of interests of people participating in social labour. For the first time in history the aim of production—ever fuller satisfaction of the material and cultural needs of the people—coincides with the aims of the direct producers and meets their interests.

For many years the ideologists of capitalism alleged that the abolition of private property would lead to the disappearance of stimuli for the development of the productive forces and to consequent stagnation in the economy. These arguments have now been refuted not only theoretically, but also by the practical experience of socialist and communist construction. The great efficiency of the socialist economic system has been demonstrated first of all by the tremendous acceleration of the growth rates of production. A comparison of the annual increase of industrial output over a long period shows that it is much higher in the socialist countries than in the capitalist world. Total industrial output in CMEA socialist countries increased 490 per cent from

[1] N. G. Chernyshevsky, *Complete Works*, Russ. ed., Vol. 1, Moscow, 1960, p. 80.

1950 to 1968, while in capitalist countries it rose only 160 per cent.[1]

High rates of development of the productive forces are a result of the objective advantages of the socialist economic system. It rules out economic crises and the anarchy of production and makes it possible to secure the planned, balanced development of the economy and continued advance of the productive forces. It creates conditions for the comprehensive development of all sectors of production and the rational use of natural resources.

Socialism abolishes parasitic consumption which devours a considerable part of the national income in the capitalist countries. In socialist society the national income is distributed in the interests of the people, which makes it possible to combine higher rates of accumulation than under capitalism with a constant advance in the standard of living.

One of the important economic advantages of socialism is that it creates new stimuli for the development of production. The emancipation of labour from exploitation, its conversion into labour for oneself, for the entire society, creates, as pointed out earlier, the social interest of the working people in the results of their labour; the collective and personal interests of workers in raising the productivity and efficiency of their labour are thus combined. This is the basis for the rise and extensive spread of socialist emulation.

The socialist economic system converts the worker from being an appendage of the machine to being its master. Technology is developed with an eye to easing labour and extending the opportunities for displaying the creative abilities of the worker.

Lastly, socialism opens up favourable opportunities for the application of science in production. It has no such obstacles to the introduction of technology as unemployment and cheap labour power which frequently makes comprehensive mechanisation and automation of production unprofitable for the capitalist. The close co-operation of workers by hand and by brain accelerates scientific and technological progress.

The advantages of the socialist economic system create objective prerequisites for the accelerated development of

[1] *Pravda*, January 24, 1969.

production. But the growth rates of production also depend on the utilisation of these advantages, the efficiency of economic guidance. In contrast to the spontaneously developing capitalist economy, the socialist economy cannot function without purposeful guidance on the scale of the entire society. One of the important aspects of this guidance is the ability to consider properly and combine reasonably the diverse interests of people, because on this depends the full use of the possibilities for developing production created by the socialist economy and, consequently, in the long run the scope of the stimulating role played by socialist relations of production.

A correct economic policy must rationally combine the diverse interests both on a nationwide scale (and even of the entire community of socialist countries), and also on the scale of production units. Society faces the task of properly combining diverse interests when determining the main economic proportions. Let us take, for example, the allocation of the national income to the accumulation fund and the consumption fund. The growth rates of the productive forces largely depend on the volume of the accumulation fund and the way it is used. Economic progress is possible only if society expends its labour not only for satisfying current requirements but also for further expanding and improving production. This gives rise to the need for properly combining the people's long-term, basic interests with current interests. The former are embodied in the policy of priority production of the means of production; the very possibility of extended socialist reproduction ultimately depends on the implementation of this policy. One must not neglect the long-term interests; priority growth in the production of the means of production is needed for ensuring a stable advance of the socialist economy. But at the same time, the Communist Party of the Soviet Union is against ignoring the current interests, for this may lead to neglecting the daily needs of the people.

The Soviet Communist Party has repeatedly stressed that it would be wrong to proceed from the one-sided interest of *accumulation*, or from the one-sided interest of *consumption*: "Taking into account both the relative contradictory nature of these factors and their interaction and interconnection, and, moreover, the fact that from the viewpoint

of long-term development these interests in general coincide, it is necessary to proceed from an optimal combination of both these factors."[1] Such a combination precludes both a one-sided approach from the consumer's angle, which leads to ignoring the long-term needs of economic development and thereby ultimately to slowing down the economic growth rates, and also the similarly harmful neglect of the people's current needs, which may lead to a gap between the growth of production and consumption, lessen the interest of the people in developing the economy, and ultimately also slow down economic growth.

It goes without saying that the *measure* of combination and consequently the *degree of subordination* of current to long-term interests, of personal to social interests, cannot be the same at different stages in the development of socialist society. In the first years of socialist construction the need for satisfying the basic social interests dictated restricting for a time the satisfaction of the growing personal needs of the people. To build up heavy industry rapidly the Soviet people had to make certain sacrifices, to restrict personal consumption temporarily. But the policy of the Party has always been aimed at ultimately satisfying more fully the requirements of the people.

By resolving contradictions arising in the course of socialist construction, the Soviet people succeeded in building up a powerful heavy industry which is the foundation for the prosperity of the socialist economy and the basis of the country's defence potential. Progress in the manufacture of means of production prepared the conditions for expanding the output of consumer goods. Today there is every possibility for utilising the further expansion of heavy industry to attain the accelerated development of the light and food industries and the advance of agriculture in order to substantially improve the provision of the population with foodstuffs and manufactured goods.

It is necessary to eliminate the disparity between industries manufacturing means of production and consumer goods, determined above all by the lag of agriculture be-

[1] *KPSS v resolyutsiyakh i resheniyakh syezdov, konferentsii i plenumov TsK* (The C.P.S.U. in Resolutions of Congresses, Conferences and Plenary Meetings of the Central Committee), Part II, 1953, p. 333.

hind industry. This will make it possible to satisfy current interests more fully and not to the detriment of long-term interests.

The elimination of certain disproportions arising in various sectors of the economy, in the relationship between production and consumption and in satisfying the needs of various sections of the people, is a prerequisite for optimally combining the current and long-term, particular and general, personal and social interests.

Any big national economic problem affects many specific interests and in solving it these interests must be taken into consideration. Let us take, for example, the allocation of capital investments between different sectors of the economy. More rapid development of the most progressive sectors is in the interest of the entire people. But re-allocation of investments in favour of the new sectors may temporarily affect the interests of the "old" sectors and may involve some contradictions. These contradictions may be exacerbated if planning the growth rates of different sectors is approached subjectively. They must be resolved so that no harmful disproportions should arise and the national economy as a whole should develop more rapidly.

Behind growth rates in various sectors stand people materially interested in the flourishing of the entire economy, and of their own sector. The task naturally is reasonably to utilise this interest, to steer it into the channel of a general advance and ensure proportions in the economy most beneficial for society.

Elaboration of the most efficient forms of economic management also requires proper combination of various interests.

By consistently applying the principles of democratic centralism, the Party, for example, ensures the rational combination of state and local interests. Lenin stressed that centralism, understood in a really democratic sense, presupposes the possibility, created for the first time, for the full and unhindered development not only of local distinctions, but also of local initiative and a diversity of methods and means of advancing to the common goal. To disregard local interests, not to consider local distinctions would mean to fetter initiative from below, which ultimately would adversely affect all social production. On the other hand, to

lay stress on local interests to the detriment of state interests would mean to slip into parochial positions.

The industrial management system on the territorial principle, which existed in the U.S.S.R. from 1957 to 1965, somewhat extended the possibilities for intersectoral specialisation and co-operation of industrial production within the bounds of economic areas. But simultaneously it restrained the development of sectoral specialisation and rational production ties between enterprises in different economic areas. Its main shortcoming was that it ignored the interests of entire industries, which prevented the application of a single technological policy.

The system of managing industry through economic councils undoubtedly promoted parochial tendencies. Such "localism" was displayed, for example, in that economic councils and supplier factories frequently provided goods to enterprises of "their own" economic area above the allotted quantities, and at the same time failed to make deliveries to "outside" economic areas. Concern for the needs of one's own area is legitimate but only if it does not turn against the needs of society as a whole. Recognition of the priority of the general state interests is the only true criterion for determining the boundaries in which local interests are legitimate.

General interests of the state can be opposed not only by local but also by narrowly understood departmental interests. Industrial management on the sectoral principle, now introduced in the Soviet Union, makes it possible better to consider the interests of the given sector and consistently to apply specialisation in production. Consequently, it meets more fully the requirements of technological progress. However, it can also give rise to departmental disunity of enterprises, which breaks the economic ties between them. That is why the Central Committee of the C.P.S.U. at its Plenary Meeting in September 1965 directed attention to the need for rationally combining the sectoral principle of industrial management with broad initiative of the republics and local economic agencies.

Improvement of the management system, if we speak not only of rectifying mistakes, is determined by the development of the productive forces itself. Big economic reforms, substantially altering the systems of planning and manag-

ing industry, have been implemented in recent years in the Soviet Union and other socialist countries. For all their specific features in each country these reforms have essential common features. These are first of all, greater employment of economic instruments (cost accounting, profit, price, credit, and so on), more consistent material stimulation of production, granting greater economic independence to enterprises, enhancement of the scientific level of planning, and wider application of the sectoral principle in industrial management. These measures are designed to put an end to the prevalence of purely administrative methods and reinforce economic methods of management. The economic methods are based above all on consideration for, and proper combination of, the interests of all production links.

Combination of the personal, collective and social interests directly affects the growth of production. For production to develop swiftly and uninterruptedly the interests of a separate enterprise must be dovetailed with the interests of the national economy, and within an enterprise, the interests of the individual worker with those of the enterprise and the state.

Life shows that the unwise setting of plan targets counterposes the interests of an enterprise to the interests of society, and personal interests to the general interests. Indicators for assessing the operation of an enterprise, divorced from the interests of the economy as a whole, inflict great harm on the state and frequently lead to economic paradoxes. Let us cite some examples from recent economic practices in the Soviet Union. The operation of motor transport organisations was usually measured in ton-kilometres. This made them interested in long-distance haulage, while the interests of the national economy require a saving of transport expenses. The use of prefabricated elements cut the share of transport expenses in construction costs from 14-15 per cent to 8 per cent. This was a tremendous saving to the economy, but made for a lower indicator of operation of motor transport organisations measured by the ton-kilometre gauge.

Contradictions between the interests of an enterprise and the interests of the country most frequently arose where gross output was the only indicator for assessing operation.

Fulfilment of the plan for gross output often concealed disregard for the assortment and quality of the goods. Evaluation of an enterprise's operation according to gross output also ran counter to the requirements of technological progress. In some branches of the engineering industry output was calculated in tons, with the result that enterprises sought to produce heavy machine tools, and this increased the expenditure of raw materials and hampered the development of technically more improved machines.

The elimination of such contradictions necessitated the elaboration of economic criteria for evaluating the operation of enterprises in which the interests of an enterprise would coincide with the interests of the entire economy. In this connection the question arose of the role of the profit factor in assessing the economic efficiency of an enterprise. Profitability as one of the prime economic indicators is of tremendous significance for the socialist economy. The use of this indicator necessitated granting enterprises more initiative and independence in operating on the basis of the state plan.

The relation between the economy and separate enterprises is the relation between a whole organism and its parts. The interests of society are embodied in the general state plan which determines the bounds of an enterprise's activity. But within these bounds an enterprise must have definite independence. Under the old system of planning and management when the independence of an enterprise was exceedingly restricted, concern for the interests of the whole frequently infringed the interests of its parts, and this ultimately harmed both. But the independence of an enterprise must not be unlimited. A definite measure is needed here. To grant unrestricted independence to an enterprise, generally abandoning state assignments to factories, would mean to give free rein to spontaneous development with all its adverse consequences and to create the possibility of counterposing, from another angle, the interests of an enterprise to the interests of the entire society. Such a fallacy is inherent in the concept of the "self-regulating economy", which in effect leads to renouncing the advantages of a planned economy.

Proper combination of the planning principle and local initiative can be attained only by introducing the most

efficient indicators for assessing the operation of an enterprise, which make it possible closely to link the interests of society and of a separate enterprise. A flexible mechanism for managing production can be created in this way.

Development of the socialist economy is not determined by the spontaneous "play of interests" which comprises the mechanism of the capitalist economy. Socialist planning excludes anarchy and spontaneity, but it does not at all rule out the use of the interests of people, which helps to achieve more rapidly the necessary economic results than bureaucratic super-centralisation. Not to regiment each step of people—this in general is impossible—but to place them in conditions in which their work prompted by their immediate interests would not act contrary to their basic interests, to the interests of the entire society—here is the crux of the matter.

That is why in introducing the new system of economic management, socialist countries emphasise the need for applying the principle: "What is of benefit to society must be of benefit to an enterprise and to the individual." This principle is formulated, for example, in the programme of the Socialist Unity Party of Germany, where conformity between the social needs and the interests of individual workingmen and collectives is regarded as a major driving force of economic and social development.[1]

The entire system of planning and indicators for assessing the work of the diverse links of the economy must make them interested in achieving the most efficient results with the least expenditure.

During the transition period Lenin regarded the ability to find the proper degree of combining the private interests of the peasants with the general interests of the state as a guarantee of success in building socialism. At that time it was harder to find the proper measure for combining diverse interests than today because it was necessary to combine the private interests of the peasant, a small commodity producer, with the general interests of the state. At the present stage of communist construction, when a single socialist economy exists, it is necessary properly to combine interests which are not so diverse, interests which arise on a common basis. But even in these conditions it is necessary to consider thoroughly the diverse interests of people and the proper measure of combining them, the measure of subordinating personal and group interests to the general interests of the people. To ignore this task, to think that communism can be built by relying solely on the enthusiasm of the people, to counterpose moral stimuli to material interests would mean to repeat the mistake of utopian socialists.

Mistakes in economic policy, neglect of the people's interest may considerably undermine the stimulating role of progressive production relations. That is why the efficiency of socialist production relations depends on how rationally the economy is organised, how the economic policy enhances the interests of people in expanding production and, lastly, how fully the working people are aware of their basic interests. Proper consideration for the interests of people, finding the forms of combining those which are most expedient for the given conditions and employment of the stimulating role of interests for developing socialist society, are essential links of the mechanism for utilising the laws of social development under socialism.

Moreover, the importance of rationally combining the diverse interests of the people is far from being exhausted in considering the sphere of production. The further development and strengthening of the socio-political and ideological unity of socialist society also depends on it. It also exerts a tremendous impact on moulding the psychology and consciousness of people and changing their moral aspect.

[1] *Twenty Years of the Socialist Unity Party of Germany*, Russ. ed., Moscow, 1966, p. 142.

Chapter III

FROM CLASS DIFFERENCES TO SOCIAL HOMOGENEITY

A scientific analysis of the development of socialist society demands a study of its social structure and ascertainment of the place held in it by classes and class distinctions which have not yet disappeared at the first phase of communism.

The transition from capitalism to communism means the replacement of a class society with its deep differentiation by a classless society with its complete social homogeneity. Socialism is a necessary stage on the road to classless society. It is the first phase of communism, at which the antithesis of classes and fundamental social differences have already been abolished but classes have not yet disappeared. Under socialism, not only individuals and collectives of working people, but also classes are the subjects of historical action. That is why problems of the relationship between the working class and the peasantry and also between manual workers and brain workers, who form the intelligentsia, are very important in the life of socialist society. A sober account of the stage socialist society has reached on the road toward complete social homogeneity is a prerequisite for its objective scientific analysis.

1. The Sources and Essence of Class Distinctions in Socialist Society

The abolition of classes is a very intricate and drawn out process which is not completed with the victory of socialism. There are no exploiting classes at the first phase of communism but some class distinctions are still preserved

because socialism is a society which did not develop on its own basis and bears the "birthmarks" of the past.

By their nature the social distinctions between the workers and the peasants and also between these classes and the intelligentsia, preserved at the first phase of communism, are a legacy of class society. Socialism does not create any new class differences; on the contrary, it abolishes those inherited from the past. The building of the first phase of communism is an important stage on the road to classless society. While the transition period from capitalism to socialism is a period of abolishing class antagonisms and the exploitation of man by man, socialism is a stage in society's development when basic class differences have disappeared and only some non-basic distinctions remain. Socialism can no longer be regarded as a class society because the main attributes of a class society—its division into antagonistic classes and the exploitation of man by man—have been abolished. But it also cannot be regarded as a classless society because class distinctions have not yet disappeared.

In contrast to the preceding class societies, the social structure of socialist society differs first of all because all social groups in it are equal in their relation to the main, decisive means of production; certain distinctions in the relation to the means of production between the working class and the collective-farm peasantry, owing to the existence of two forms of socialist property, do not negate the fact that the relation to state property unites all members of socialist society.

Furthermore, another important distinction of the social structure of socialism is that here society is no longer divided into antagonistic classes, into haves and have-nots with their opposite interests. This affords socialist society tremendous advantages as compared with capitalism.

The ousting from the historical scene of reactionary classes means that society no longer has class forces hindering its progress. The abolition of the exploiting classes relieves society of the burden of parasitic consumption. It will be recalled that in pre-revolutionary Russia the exploiting classes—15.9 per cent of the country's population—appropriated about 75 per cent of the entire national income. With the abolition of the exploiting classes, the entire national income is placed at the disposal of the working people and

goes for improving their material well-being and expanding socialist production. The elimination of class antagonisms and the attainment of the socio-political and moral unity of the entire society are also of decisive significance for accelerating social development. The social unity of the people also determines the abolition of national antagonisms and forms a solid basis for a community of nations.

All these new features which characterise the social structure of socialist society do not imply the complete disappearance of social distinctions. These distinctions are inevitable because the legacy of class society is not yet fully eliminated at the first phase of communism.

Lenin foresaw that the abolition of classes would be a very long process. In the first years of Soviet construction, in his "A Great Beginning" he noted that to abolish classes completely it is necessary not only "to abolish *all* private ownership of the means of production, it is necessary to abolish the distinction between town and country, as well as the distinction between manual workers and brain workers. This requires a very long period of time."[1]

The experience of socialist construction in the Soviet Union proves that the abolition of classes is a long process and at the same time it made it possible to determine more specifically at what stage of society's development class distinctions would be eliminated. In the mid-1930s capitalist elements were finally abolished in the U.S.S.R. This, however, did not signify the disappearance of all classes. Socialism in the U.S.S.R. was built in the main at that time, but classes of workers and collective-farm peasants continued to exist. This practical experience furnishes the grounds for the conclusion that friendly classes remain in socialist society.

The experience of other countries also demonstrates that social and class distinctions do not disappear completely in a country where socialism has triumphed. Inasmuch as socialist society inherits these distinctions, their magnitude depends on the legacy it received. When the Soviet Union, for example, began to build socialism, it was still an agrarian country in which small producers (peasants and artisans) made up about three-fourths of the population.

[1] V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 29, p. 421.

In the course of socialist construction, both the face of various social groups and their correlation radically changed.

The change in the social composition of the population in the U.S.S.R. is graphically shown in the following table (per cent).

	1913	1928	1939	1959	1968
Entire population (including non-working family members)	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Factory, office and other workers	17.0	17.6	50.2	68.3	77.70
of whom factory workers	14.0	12.0	32.5	48.2	54.8
Collective-farm peasantry and artisans united into co-operatives	—	2.9	47.2	31.4	22.27
Individual peasants and artisans	66.7	74.9	2.6	0.3	0.03
Bourgeoisie, landowners, merchants and kulaks	16.3	4.6	—	—	—

These data show that the working class has increased substantially and has become the largest group of the population in the U.S.S.R.; the intelligentsia is also rapidly growing in size and proportion of the total population. As for the peasantry, its proportion in the population in the Soviet Union is gradually declining and now comprises a little more than one-fourth of the total.

Among the countries of the socialist community there are some which began building socialism when they were already industrial states and the share of the peasantry in the total population was relatively small. In 1965, in Czechoslovakia, factory, office and other workers made up 87.3 per cent of the population (including non-working family members), of which workers comprised 58.1 per cent; peasants united in co-operatives and workers of producer co-operatives, 9.7 per cent; individual peasants, artisans and persons engaged in private enterprises, 2.9 per cent; members of the liberal professions, 0.1 per cent.[1] In the German

[1] *Rude Právo*, December 23, 1965.

Democratic Republic, factory, office and other workers (not counting members of their families) comprised 82 per cent of the gainfully employed population in 1963; members of producer co-operatives (agricultural and artisan), 13.5 per cent; individual peasants and artisans, 2.8 per cent; managers of semi-state enterprises and shops working on contract with the state, 0.5 per cent; private wholesale and retail tradesmen, 0.6 per cent; members of the liberal professions, 0.3 per cent.[1] A comparison of these data indicates that in Czechoslovakia and the German Democratic Republic the percentage of factory, office and other workers is higher than in the U.S.S.R., although these countries are at an earlier stage in building the new society. This is explained above all by the fact that socialist construction in these countries was begun with a higher development level of the productive forces than the Soviet Union had.

Socialist production relations, firmly established in the countries where socialism triumphed, are of one type and this determines the qualitative homogeneity of their social structures; their population consists of the working class, peasants united in co-operatives and the intelligentsia. But the numerical relationship of these social groups is not the same; it depends on differences in the development of the productive forces, the sectoral pattern of the economy and the historical heritage received by each country.

Evidently, differences in the concrete conditions of development of various socialist countries may determine the stage at which the remaining social distinctions will be obliterated. Possibly, in some developed countries the distinctions between workers and peasants may be effaced more rapidly. But some social distinctions (for example, between manual workers and brain workers) will remain even after the disappearance of class distinctions between the workers and the peasants. Lenin stated that the intelligentsia as a special social stratum will be preserved "until we have reached the highest stage of development of communist society".[2]

Be that as it may, at the stage of socialism all countries will have social distinctions, remnants of the class division

[1] *Handbuch der Deutschen Demokratischen Republik*, Staatsverlag der DDR, Berlin, 1964, S. 836.

[2] V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 33, p. 194.

of society. That is why it is exceedingly important soberly and objectively to consider the remaining social distinctions, neither ignoring nor exaggerating them.

The existence of social groups under socialism is an indisputable fact admitted by all Marxists. But some of them hold that social groups in socialist society can no longer be called classes. The notion that classes in general will vanish as the antithesis between classes disappears is too simplified. Although with the abolition of capitalism there is no longer room for the antithesis between classes in society, class distinctions between the working class and the peasantry remain.

A specific feature of classes in socialist society is that these are no longer classes in the strict sense of the word; they are disappearing classes, classes which cease to be such. Lenin defined classes in the strict meaning of the word as "groups of people one of which can appropriate the labour of another owing to the different places they occupy in a definite system of social economy".[1] "What are classes in general?" he asked. "Classes are that which permits one section of society to appropriate the labour of another section."[2] Socialist society no longer has such classes. That is why the very concept of classes undergoes definite change, just as the concept of the state is changed. But the class attributes to which Lenin pointed in "A Great Beginning"[3] are applicable in the main to the classes in socialist society. They represent social groups united by the socialist economic system, state ownership of the means of production and joint labour, but which still differ according to their relationship to the means of production, their role in the social organisation of labour and forms of distribution of income.

These, of course, are not fundamental distinctions, they are gradually obliterated; a process of disappearance of class distinctions and transition to a society in which there will be no classes in general, is under way. Nevertheless, it would be a mistake to consider that class distinctions have already disappeared or are inessential, and place them in

[1] Ibid., Vol. 29, p. 421.

[2] Ibid., Vol. 31, p. 292.

[3] Their relation to the means of production, role in the social organisation of labour, the method of receiving social wealth and the share they dispose of.

the same rank as distinctions between workers in different sectors (for example, the metallurgical and mining industries) or between professional groups. Workers and collective farmers differ from each other not only in the nature of industrial and agricultural labour but above all by the relationship to the means of production, which is not quite the same and is a result of the existence of two forms of socialist property. Consequently, the basic class-shaping attribute—difference in relation to the means of production—has still not lost its significance, although, this is already a non-basic distinction, inasmuch as it concerns only varieties of socialist property.

The abolition of classes is above all connected with changes in property relations. "The abolition of classes," Lenin wrote, "means placing *all* citizens on an *equal* footing with regard to the *means of production* belonging to society as a whole. It means giving all citizens *equal* opportunities of working on the publicly-owned means of production, on the publicly-owned land, at the publicly-owned factories, and so forth."[1]

The main, decisive thing in solving this problem is achieved at the first phase of communism. Abolition of private property in the means of production eliminates the division of the members of society into people who own and do not own means of production. But at the stage of development now achieved by the Soviet Union it is impossible to say that all citizens have been placed fully in equal relation to the means of production. There are distinctions in the existence of two forms of socialist property—state property owned by the whole people, and co-operative, group property. Even state property, although it is owned by the whole of society, is still not utilised in an equal measure in the case of factory and office workers, on the one hand, and peasants united in co-operatives, on the other. Actual distinctions in the use by workers and peasants of state property for accomplishing economic and social tasks (investments in the economy and culture, distribution of incomes, development of social consumption funds and so on) have not yet disappeared.[2]

[1] V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 20, p. 146.

[2] Another point of view on this question is also voiced in Marxist literature. A number of interesting ideas about the factors which determine distinctions between social sections and their interests under socialism were expressed in a paper of the Polish sociologist W. Wesolowski, presented to the 6th International Congress of Sociology. In his opinion, the relationship to the means of production no longer determines social distinctions under socialism; the latter are determined by distinctions in distribution, living conditions, social prestige, etc. (W. Wesolowski, *Strata and Strata Interests in Socialist Society*, 6th International Congress of Sociology, Evian, September 4-11, 1966, pp. 3-4). In our opinion, it is true that distinctions in the relationship to the means of production are gradually obliterated and their role correspondingly declines, but they have not yet lost essential significance. Under socialism, the relationship to the means of production is determined both by common statuts of workers and peasants (inasmuch as they are co-owners of the property of the whole people and both forms of socialist property are of one type and are interconnected) and also by preserved class distinctions between them.

Under socialism, the class distinctions existing between workers and peasants are connected not only with their relationship to the means of production which is not fully equal, but also with their role in the organisation of social labour, with the forms of obtaining income, which also are not quite the same.

These distinctions are determined both by the existence of two forms of socialist property and the unequal development level of the economy and culture in town and country, upon which the living conditions of the workers and the peasants depend.

That is why the complete obliteration of class distinctions involves a tremendous growth of the productive forces, an advance of the economy and culture, which will gradually eliminate differences in the forms of property, in the nature and conditions of social labour in town and country.

The experience of the Soviet Union demonstrates that the effacing of distinctions between town and country and, even more so, between manual workers and brain workers demands a much higher stage in the development of production and of the entire society than the abolition of private property in the means of production. Historically, the appearance of the social division of labour preceded the rise of private property and division into classes. Now this development proceeds in reverse order: abolition of private property precedes the disappearance of the remnants of the old forms in the social division of labour—between industrial and agricultural labour and mental and manual la-

bour. Whereas private property was abolished in the U.S.S.R. in the transition period from capitalism to socialism, the distinctions between town and country, between manual and mental workers remain under socialism. The elimination of these distinctions is a long process; moreover not all the parts of this task can be achieved simultaneously. The Programme of the C.P.S.U. charts the prospects for the obliteration of the most essential distinctions between town and country, and gradual transition to one property of the whole people in the course of building communist society in the U.S.S.R. As for distinctions between manual and mental workers, they can be eliminated only in the process of completing communist construction.

This conclusion stems from the actual stage reached by the Soviet Union on the road to classless society. It warns against running ahead, against ignoring the surviving class distinctions, which may lead to an underestimation of the big and intricate problems which have to be solved in the course of building communism. At the same time, it shows that we should not cling to the past, should not ignore the fundamental changes which have occurred in the social structure of society following the victory of socialism, should not confuse the society of the transition period with the fully shaped socialist society which advances toward communism.

Community of the two forms of socialist property has brought the working class and the peasantry closer together, strengthened their alliance and made their friendship unbreakable. While in the past, in the transition period from capitalism to socialism, the existence of the two classes was based on two different sectors of the economy, socialist and small-commodity production, today in socialist conditions they are united by a single socialist economic system.

In socialist society the working class is employed at enterprises which are the property of the whole people. Completion of socialist changes in the economy resulted in the disappearance of the stratum of workers engaged at capitalist enterprises, working on kulak farms, and so on. The division of the working class into two parts, employed and unemployed, inherent in capitalism, also disappeared: socialism ensures the full employment of the working class. In particular, it abolished unemployment which existed in the U.S.S.R. up to the early 1930s. The national composition

of the working class also changed in the course of socialist construction. While formerly it was predominantly Russian, it became multi-national because skilled workers were trained in all the Soviet republics. This raised the influence exerted by the working class on the multi-national peasantry. Big changes, associated with technological progress and the cultural and technical advance of the workers also occurred in the vocational composition of the working class.

The peasantry has undergone even deeper changes in the course of socialist construction, changes connected not only with the social but also the technical reconstruction of agriculture. While the labour of the worker was socialised already under capitalism, the labour of the peasant began to be socialised on a large scale in the U.S.S.R. only with the transition from small-scale private farming to large-scale collective production. Collectivisation turned the peasantry from a class of small owners and commodity producers into a new peasantry united in co-operatives, for whom joint labour and collective ownership of the means of productions is the economic basis of life. Collectivisation abolished the division of the peasantry into different social strata (well-to-do, middle and poor) and eliminated the causes of differentiation which in the past led to the emergence of capitalist elements from among the peasants. The uniting of peasant farms into co-operatives opened up wide scope for the application of modern machinery in the countryside. This machinery is gradually turning agricultural work into a variety of industrial work. This involves the cultural and technical advance of the peasantry which also brings it closer to the working class. A new, socialist intelligentsia has been formed in the Soviet Union from among the working class, peasantry and other sections of the population. The rise of the new intelligentsia has bridged the former abyss between workers by hand and by brain.

These changes in the social structure of Soviet society drew closer together all its social groups and resulted in socio-political and ideological unity of society.

But even now when the process of obliterating class distinctions has advanced so far in the Soviet Union, it cannot be said that class distinctions have lost their essential significance. The relationship of classes, specifically of the

working class and the peasantry, remains a matter of prime importance.

To maintain that class relations have lost their essential significance would mean to relegate to the background questions of the alliance of the working class and the collective-farm peasantry and the leading role of the working class in the building of communism. Yet the working class remains the most advanced and most organised force of society in conditions of communist construction, too. The working class is directly connected with a higher form of the social economy than the collective-farm peasantry, because the workers are employed at state-owned enterprises which predominate in the socialist economy. Industry, which employs the greater part of the working class, is the leading force in the development of the entire economy. Lastly, the working class remains the most organised class, possessing the greatest revolutionary experience, political schooling and consciousness. It is likewise wrong to ignore the remaining class distinctions because in politics account must be taken of the specific interests of various classes and social groups. It is impossible to pursue a correct policy without considering the class distinctions, and if the specific interests of classes and social groups are ignored.

2. Class Interests Under Socialism. Combination of Class and National Interests with the General Interests of the People as a Prerequisite for Strengthening and Developing the Socio-Political Unity of Society

Interest always acts as a motive to action in the struggle of any class. Relations between classes, whether relations of struggle or alliance, or some combination of struggle and alliance, are also determined by the contradictions and interconnection of their interests. That is why historical materialism demands precise account of the interests of all classes and their relationships in a given society, regarding this as a prerequisite for formulating a scientifically based policy.

The alliance of the working class and the working peasantry—the classes which are basic in the transition period

from capitalism to socialism and the only ones in socialist society—is of decisive significance in building the new society. That is why the C.P.S.U. considers the consolidation and development of this alliance a basic principle of its policy. An alliance of classes can be consolidated and developed only if their interests are properly considered and combined. No measures—organisational, ideological or any other—will produce beneficial results if the interests of any one of the friendly classes are ignored or infringed.

Social relations which arose in socialist society will be preserved and further developed at the higher phase of communism. These are: dominance of social property in the means of production, universality of labour, subordination of the economy to the task of ever more fully satisfying the material and cultural requirements of the people, and so on. Community of the fundamental interests of all social groups arises from these relations. Their common interests consist above all in the rapid development and improvement of socialist production, in strengthening the socialist system and its growing over into the communist system.

At the same time socialist society is only the first phase of communism, which is not yet free from many features inherited from class society. As pointed out earlier, remnants of the old division of labour are preserved and expressed in essential distinctions between town and country and between mental and manual labour; the division of society into classes and social strata is not fully eliminated; some differences in the level of economic and cultural development of separate areas remain; lastly, distinctions between nations exist and will persist for a very long time. All these and other distinctions are the source of the diverse specific interests of separate groups and sections of society. And since specific interests exist objectively, determined by certain differences in the position of people in society, contradictions between them are not precluded. They must be taken into account and resolved in the process of advance to communism. The socialist system creates the objective basis for resolving such contradictions. But this does not happen automatically and requires consistent application of a correct policy.

Specific interests are particular interests which do not affect the main thing in relations between people in socialist

society. Whereas under capitalism the interests of opposed social groups diverge in the main, fundamental things, under socialism where there are no such social antagonisms, the interests of all sections of society converge in the main thing —in their attitude to the social system. But it would be wrong on these grounds to ignore specific interests. Although these are not fundamental interests, they, undoubtedly, play an essential part.

Interests of different classes, social groups and also of different nations are of essential significance among the diverse interests which should be rationally combined in socialist society. The combining of these interests is a major prerequisite for the further strengthening of the socio-political unity of society, the alliance of the working class and the collective-farm peasantry, of their co-operation with the intelligentsia and of the community of the Soviet peoples.

Let us examine more concretely from these positions the community of, and distinctions between, the interests of the working class and the collective-farm peasantry. Let us note, first of all, that their interests have been drawn more closely together by the socialist remaking of the economy. Previously, too, there were no irreconcilable contradictions between the basic interests of the peasantry and the ultimate aims of the working class, because the peasantry could get rid of exploitation and win conditions for a free and well-to-do life only with the help and under the leadership of the working class. But in the transition period from capitalism to socialism the working class and the peasantry based their life on two different sectors of the economy—socialist and small-commodity production—which gave rise to different tendencies: socialist among the working class and commodity-capitalist among the peasants. With the victory of socialism, the socialist economic system became the economic basis of the life of these classes. As a result, the development and thriving of the socialist economy became their common interest. But the existence of two forms of socialist property—state and co-operative—and also the historically shaped distinctions in the economic and cultural development of town and country tend to bring out certain specific features of the interests of the workers and the peasants. This is seen chiefly in the economic relations, but also makes itself felt in the cultural sphere and partly in political life.

The *economic interests* of the working class and the collective-farm peasantry coincide in the main. This is determined primarily by the dominance of state property in the means of production, which embraces the overwhelming mass of the country's fixed productive assets and ultimately also determines the development of collective-farm property.

State property belongs, however, not only to the working class, but to the whole people, including the collective-farm peasantry. It is created by the labour of workers and peasants. Alongside the surplus product created in industry, construction and other sectors, the state uses for the general needs of the people part of the surplus product created in the collective farms and placed at its disposal mainly through the system of purchases. Of great importance here is what share this part represents, and this is determined above all by the level of purchase prices. It will be recalled that for years the level of prices of many agricultural products in the U.S.S.R. was such that they did not compensate for the actual outlay on their production. Naturally, part of the resources accumulated by the state was returned to the collective farms, inasmuch as the state makes investments in agriculture which are utilised by the collective farms (construction of irrigation and drainage systems, electric power stations, roads, and so on). But for a number of reasons the capital investments in agriculture were inadequate.

The entire complex of economic relations connected with the production and distribution of the national income, with the investment policy, and so on directly affects the interests of the working class and the peasantry and has to be so regulated that it should not infringe the interests of either class and the living standard of both should steadily rise.

Distribution of the national income between these classes also depends on the relationship of sales prices of manufactured goods and purchase prices of agricultural produce. The collective farms are the buyers of machinery, chemicals, fertilisers and other goods produced by industry and suppliers of raw materials for industry and foodstuffs for the population. Naturally, their immediate interests call for lower prices of manufactured goods and higher prices of agricultural produce. The relationship of these prices has been adjusted several times in recent years by raising purchase prices. In 1962 the purchase prices of animal prod-

ucts were raised simultaneously with an increase in retail prices of meat and butter which naturally affected the budgets of factory and office workers, while in 1965 the increase in purchase prices of the main cereals and livestock, without any rise in retail prices, was effected at the expense of the state.

The contradictions here are indisputable, but they do not affect the fundamental interests of classes. In the long run, an increase in the purchase prices of agricultural produce meets the interests not only of the collective-farm peasantry but also of the whole people. The working class, if we consider its basic interests, is also interested in the advance of agriculture and, consequently, in creating conditions for it.

On the other hand, the collective-farm peasantry is ultimately interested in its incomes rising not only through higher purchase prices, because this meets only its immediate interests, but chiefly by raising labour productivity and reducing costs. This meets the basic interests of the collective-farm peasantry, since a stable and continuous advance of their living standard cannot be achieved in any other way. The peasantry is also interested in the development of industry, upon which the mechanisation and intensification of agriculture depend. The development of industry and the advance of agriculture and the fixing of economically justified prices of manufactured goods and agricultural products meet the basic interests of both the workers and the peasants.

The material interests of the collective-farm peasantry are linked not only with the collective farms but also with their personal subsidiary farming. The relation between incomes received from the collective farm and personal subsidiary farming differs considerably in various areas and also within each area in different collective farms. But generally the income from personal subsidiary farming is still important for the collective farmers. Since the collective farmer receives in kind a sizable part of his income from the collective farm and the entire income from personal subsidiary farming, he sells his surplus produce on the market. At this market the collective farms and their members are the sellers, while factory and office workers are the buyers. Here naturally there is also some ground for a divergence of their interests. But these contradictions cannot be eliminated by restricting the opportunities which the

collective farms and their members have for selling their surplus produce on the market or the possibility of collective farmers to engage in personal subsidiary farming within the fixed limits.

Attempts to reduce to nil the personal subsidiary farming of the collective farmers, to "get rid" of it as rapidly as possible, were condemned in the Soviet Union not only because they run counter to the personal interests of the peasants themselves and reduce the incentive to expand production, but also because they impose on the collective farms the burden of satisfying all the personal needs of their members which is still beyond their strength. This would also reduce their marketable output. The proportion of personal subsidiary farming in the output of certain agricultural commodities, especially animal products, is still quite substantial.

Mistakes in economic policy, which inflicted harm on the interests of the collective-farm peasantry, were the result of a subjectivist approach and had no objective basis. They were rectified in recent years. Nevertheless certain contradictions between the partial, temporary interests of the working class and those of the collective-farm peasantry still exist owing to the differences in their economic position. What is important is to detect in good time and, when possible, to prevent their appearance or to take measures for resolving them without allowing them to grow and to harm the friendly relations between these classes.

If these contradictions are not resolved in time for some or other reasons, or if the mistakes are not rectified, they produce spontaneous adverse consequences. Violation of the principle of the material interest of the collective farms and their members resulted in a lag of agriculture, the spontaneous exodus of the population from the countryside to the cities, a decline of labour discipline on the collective farms, and so on. A release of part of the rural population from agricultural production and its drawing into industry is a natural result of the mechanisation of labour in the countryside. But when this process is engendered not by the growth in the productivity of agricultural work, but, on the contrary, by the lagging of agriculture, the outflow of the population reflects dissatisfaction of rural dwellers with their living conditions.

Elimination of disproportions between the development

of industry and agriculture is a primary means for resolving such contradictions. As far back as the first years of socialist construction, the C.P.S.U. pointed out that "the relations which exist in our country between the working class and the peasantry in the final count rest on the relations between industry and agriculture".[1]

Production and distribution of the national income and the improvement in the living standard of the working class and the peasantry depend on the relationships between industry and agriculture, on their growth rates. Although on the whole, the more rapid development of industry is natural, especially in the period of a country's industrialisation, a gap between the growth rates of industry and agriculture, if it becomes excessive, may turn into a brake on the development of the entire economy.

A substantial lag of agriculture behind industry occurred in the U.S.S.R. in the post-war period. Following the Plenary Meeting of the Central Committee of the C.P.S.U. (September, 1953), measures taken by the Party considerably accelerated the growth of agriculture. Between 1955 and 1959 the average annual increase was 7.6 per cent. But these achievements were not consolidated and, as a result of the mistakes made, annual growth rates decreased to 1.9 per cent in the following five years (1960-1965). This dictated the adoption of important measures to ensure the advance of agriculture and lay a solid economic basis for it. In 1966-1970, capital investments by the state for construction purposes and the purchase of new machinery in the countryside were increased to 41,000 million rubles, that is, were approximately doubled as compared with the preceding five years. New machinery flowed in a large stream from industry to collective and state farms. Suffice it to say that by 1969 the country had 3.6 million tractors (in terms of 15 h. p.), or five times more than in 1940. Soviet agriculture employed over three times more harvester combines and five times more lorries than in prewar. The delivery of mineral fertilisers doubled in 1970 as compared with 1965 and total consumption of electric power in agriculture approximately trebled.

Land reclamation is of great importance for ensuring high

[1] *KPSS v resolyutsiyakh...*, Part I, p. 687.

and stable crops and for boosting yields. Work on raising soil fertility and the efficiency of farming in all zones is conducted on a nationwide scale. More than 10,000 million rubles were spent in five years to carry out an extensive land reclamation plan. This is 80 per cent more than was spent for these purposes in the preceding 20 post-war years.

These are merely some of the figures indicating the scale of assistance by the town to the countryside, by industry to agriculture, in order to place agricultural production on a modern industrial basis.

Important changes have also been introduced in the system of planning agriculture and the purchases of its produce by the state with the object of properly combining the general interests of the state with the interests of the collective farms.

Having put an end to the subjectivist approach to economic problems, the Party and the Government took measures to improve planning and economic stimulation of agriculture. In 1965, a fundamentally new system of purchases of agricultural produce was established. Feasible stable plans of purchases were set for five years, enabling the collective and state farms to know in advance their obligations and to determine the scale of production. Alongside the increase in purchase prices, higher prices were introduced for the main cereals sold to the state above the plan. At the same time prices of many goods for production purposes and the rates for electric power consumed by collective and state farms were reduced. Prices of manufactured goods and foodstuffs sold in the countryside were lowered and brought into line with urban prices. The income tax paid by collective farms was cut almost by half.

Some discrepancy between the incomes of peasants and workers is still preserved in the U.S.S.R. This is due to the lagging of agriculture behind industry. Although the incomes of peasants grew somewhat more rapidly than the incomes of workers in the last 25 years[1] the average level of a collective farmer's income has been lower than that of the worker. Elimination of remnants of such inequality is part

[1] From 1940 to 1968 the real incomes of factory and office workers, per employed person, increased 2.7 times and the real incomes of peasants rose 4.1 times. See *Narodnoye khozyaistvo SSSR v 1968 godu* (Soviet Economy in 1968), Moscow, 1969, p. 572.

of the task of obliterating the essential distinctions between town and country.

This inequality, naturally, cannot be removed by a simple redistribution of the incomes of peasants and workers. It ultimately is a result of the fact that the productivity of agricultural work and the skill of the persons engaged in agriculture are still lower than those in industry. That is why reducing the gap between the incomes of peasants and workers involves a rise of labour productivity in agriculture at a faster pace than in industry. The growth of labour productivity in agriculture at a higher rate than in industry makes it possible to eliminate the lag of agriculture behind industry and gradually reduce the difference between the incomes of peasants and workers. Correspondingly, the average incomes of collective farmers should rise more rapidly than the incomes of workers. Drawing together the living standards of different social groups helps strengthen their community and co-operation.

There is also the big problem of evening out the incomes of collective farmers. Owing to differences in natural and other conditions, the incomes of collective farmers in various areas vary greatly. Within areas there are also considerable differences in the incomes of collective farms, depending partly on their proximity to cities and, to a still greater extent, on their economic condition. Raising of the economically backward collective farms to the level of advanced farms is a prerequisite for the drawing closer together of the incomes of the peasants and the workers.

The system of labour remuneration is also of great importance. Here, too, progressive changes which bring collective farmers and workers together, are under way. Guaranteed pay for the work of collective farmers on the basis of wage rates and output quotas of the corresponding categories of state-farm workers has been introduced. This has become possible as a result of the considerable increase in the incomes of the collective farms and their economic consolidation. The policy of the socialist state with regard to the collective farms is based on combining the general interests of the people with the material interest of the collective farms and their members in the results of their labour. The state is helping to expand the productive forces of the collective-farm system and advance all collective farms economically, but at the same time the collective-farm peasantry is making an ever bigger contribution to building communist society.

The interests of classes are displayed not only in the economy but in other spheres of social life. Although economic interests, according to the materialist understanding of history, play the decisive part, it would be wrong to reduce the interests of people, classes and society as a whole only to material interests. Alongside material needs people have *spiritual* requirements, cultural needs. Under capitalism, for example, struggle to win broader opportunities for spiritual development holds a considerable place in the working-class movement. Workers call for the democratisation of education, for the creation of conditions necessary for cultural advancement, and so on. Spiritual, cultural interests, just as material interests, are objectively determined by the position of a given class in society, the historically shaped cultural development level of society, and so on.

In socialist society, too, at each stage of its development the level of material and cultural needs is also historically determined: it depends in a given country on the development of its productive forces, on the material and living conditions, the culture of the population, historical traditions, and so on. The essential distinctions between town and country also make themselves felt in the way of life and culture, particularly in the housing conditions of the urban and rural population, the development of public catering, medical services, and so on. In this sphere, too, the task is to even out the living conditions of peasants and industrial and office workers. Distinctions between town and country are particularly big in countries that had to eliminate the backwardness inherited from the past.

The task of drawing closer together the living standards of the urban and rural population is being solved comprehensively. This is being done not only by increasing the labour remuneration of the collective farmers, but also by developing all the services in the countryside at an accelerated pace. Rural trade, housing construction in state farms, consumption of electric power for household needs will develop more rapidly than in the cities. On the whole, the volume of services rose approximately by 150 per cent in 1966-1970, but in the countryside it increased by more than

200 per cent. The system of old-age pensions for factory and office workers is extended to collective farmers and minimum age and disability pensions for collective farmers have been raised. The building of cultural and service establishments in collective and state farms will be greatly extended. Many rural schools, kindergartens and nurseries, cultural centres, libraries, cinemas will be erected.

In the course of this development the degree of satisfaction of cultural needs in cities and rural communities is gradually evened out. Let us take, for example, the cinema. The difference between the average annual number of cinema visits of the rural and urban population considerably decreased: in 1940, the number of cinema-goers in towns was six times that in the countryside and in 1968, 1.16 times.

The picture is about the same as regards the educational level of the rural and urban population, especially workers and collective farmers. The main index is the number of persons with a higher, secondary and incomplete secondary education per 1,000 gainfully employed people. If we take the index for workers as 100, the level of education of the collective farmers was about 22 in 1939, 58 in 1959 and 66 in 1967.[1]

Under socialism, where there are no class antagonisms, the remnants of social inequality are largely connected with the nature of labour and the cultural and technical level of people. Greater possibilities for acquiring an education play a big part, alongside the change in the nature of labour, in levelling out the material and cultural standards of various sections of the working people. They undoubtedly are interested in the development of the educational system and in the creation of equal opportunities to obtain a secondary and then a higher education for the rural and the urban dweller, for the person growing up in a family of a collective farmer, or a worker, or intellectual. In the near future, transition will be made to universal complete secondary education.

The interests of classes are expressed in the most concentrated form in politics. This holds good for socialist so-

[1] *The U.S.S.R. and Other Countries After the Victory of the Great October Socialist Revolution* (Statistical Returns), Russ. ed., Moscow, 1970, p. 210.

ciety as well, but here the essential difference is that what stands out most in politics is the unity of the interests of classes. This is understandable, because in this sphere we deal with the most important, basic interests of the workers and peasants and they coincide in socialist society. The policy of a socialist state expresses the common interests of the working class, the collective-farm peasantry and the intelligentsia, their interest in the development and consolidation of the socialist system, in maintaining the country's defence potential at the appropriate level, and in strengthening peace. Lenin pointed out that "economic interests and the economic position of the classes which rule our state lie at the root of both our home and foreign policy".[1]

The drawing together of the working class and the collective-farm peasantry as regards their economic conditions has also affected society's political life. With the victory of socialism in the U.S.S.R., the temporary advantages at the polls which previously consolidated the leading role of the working class in the system of its dictatorship became unnecessary. The further strengthening and development of socialism resulted in the fact that the state of proletarian dictatorship in the U.S.S.R. has turned into a state of the whole people. Acting as an organ which expresses the interests and will of the entire people, the socialist state, however, cannot develop without ensuring the leading role of the working class, which remains the most advanced class directing the movement of the entire society toward communism. The exercise of this function in socialist conditions no longer involves overcoming the resistance of vacillating sections of the peasants and other petty-bourgeois sections of the people, as was the case during the transition period. But now, too, the working class still has to educate the broad sections of the people.

The specific interests of all the social groups making up socialist society, naturally, must be considered in politics as well. Proper combination of centralised guidance with stimulation of the initiative in the localities, at enterprises, collective farms and so on, is a requisite for successful advance to communism. Initiative can be stimulated to the full only by ensuring the steady exercise of socialist democracy. The

[1] V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 27, p. 365.

new system of planning determines what products and in what quantities the collective and state farms should sell to the state. As for disposition of the sown area and the maintenance of different livestock, these questions are settled by the collective farmers and state-farm workers themselves who best of all know local conditions.

As the alliance of the working class and the collective-farm peasantry is consolidated, these classes extend their co-operation with the intelligentsia which now comprises (together with office employees) more than one-fifth of the working population in the Soviet Union.

Proper combination of interests is also essentially important for the relations between manual and mental workers. The measures taken by the Soviet Government to reduce the gap between maximum and minimum wages of different categories of workers promote co-operation between workers by hand and by brain. Simultaneously with eliminating the excessively high pay of some categories it raises wages in the lower brackets to bring low-level incomes closer to the higher levels. The latter task is of decisive significance and it is being accomplished as the economy grows, depending on the rise in labour productivity.

Proper combination of the interests of manual and mental workers is also facilitated by the provision of more favourable conditions for raising the skill and cultural standard of people engaged in unskilled or low-skilled labour. In the absence of antagonisms in the relation of people to the means of production, the remnants of inequality between them are largely connected with unequal skill and, consequently, with all the conditions needed for acquiring higher skill and education.[1] The development of education acquires special significance in socialist society which removes all barriers to the advancement of people. During the building of communism, depending on the decrease of the differences in the skill and labour productivity of various categories of workers, differences in the level of their pay will also be

[1] Some actual differences in opportunities to acquire an education by people living in town and country, in places near, or far from, large cultural centres have not yet disappeared in Soviet society. Differences in the living conditions of children who grow up in families with unequal material and cultural standards are still making themselves felt. Thus, a social study made in Gorky showed that the share of

gradually reduced. That is why the cultural and technical advance of manual workers is of essential significance for their vital interests. In its plans for the development of education, the Party takes into account both the general interests of entire socialist society and the interests of separate social groups.

* * *

The socio-political and ideological unity of society is consolidated by properly combining the interests not only of various social groups but also of different nations. True, the importance of these problems is not the same in all countries. Relations between social groups are a common problem for all socialist countries because certain social distinctions remain at the first phase of communism. Relations between nationalities naturally are especially important for multi-national countries. In a country like the Soviet Union, which has over 100 nations and nationalities, the establishment of friendly relations between them has been, and remains, a matter of prime importance.

Community of basic interests is the decisive objective prerequisite in accomplishing this task, just as in ensuring co-operation between different sections of the working people. The socialist system, as foreseen by the founders of Marxism-Leninism, creates a genuine community of the interests of nations. In a speech delivered at an international meeting in London in 1847 Marx said: "For nations to unite, they must have common interests. For their interests to be common, the existing property relations must be abolished because they make for the exploitation of some nations by others. . . ."[1] By abolishing private property and introducing social ownership of the means of production, the working class for the first time has created a strong economic basis, which determines the community of the fundamental interests of all peoples in the U.S.S.R.

Because of many historically shaped conditions the solution of this problem was extremely difficult. It was complicated above all by the fact that at the moment of the Oc-

children whose parents were highly skilled workers was greater in senior forms of a secondary school than in junior forms. See *Rabochy klass i tekhnichesky progress* (The Working Class and Technological Progress), Nauka Publishers, 1965, pp. 257-58.

[1] Marx/Engels, *Werke*, Bd. 4, Berlin, 1959, S. 416.

tober Revolution the peoples of Russia stood at different levels of socio-economic development; moreover, part of them (making up about one-fifth of the country's total population) had not passed the capitalist stage of development. This gave rise, alongside the community of basic interests, to certain contradictions between their specific interests. These contradictions were resolved by applying a policy of accelerated economic and cultural development of the borderlands with the help of the more developed central areas of the country. In 1968, gross industrial output of Soviet industry was 79 times that of 1913. The increase was much greater in the formerly backward areas: in Kazakhstan industrial output grew 125 times, Kirghizia 152 times, and Armenia 146 times.[1] The social composition of nations has also been evened out to a certain extent. The country's industrialisation and collectivisation provided the basis for abolishing the exploiting classes, which in the past were the main sources of national hostility and strife. A working class has grown up in all Soviet republics, including those which formerly had no working class of their own at all; they have also developed their own intelligentsia. According to returns of the 1959 census, the proportion of the working class in the country's population was 48.2 per cent, while in the various Union republics it ranged from 21 per cent (Moldavia) up to 55.2 per cent (Estonia) and 58.4 per cent (Kazakhstan). The share of office employees and intellectuals, which amounted to 21.1 per cent on the average, fluctuated from 11 per cent (Moldavia) to 23.6 per cent (Estonia) and 24 per cent (Georgia).[2]

The cultural development of the Soviet peoples has also been considerably evened out. In the past many peoples in Russia's borderlands, particularly the Far North and Central Asia, were almost totally illiterate. The level of literacy of Russia's population was 28.4 per cent in 1897, while the differences between areas ranged from 2.3 per cent in Tajikistan to 96.2 per cent in Estonia. In 1959, 98.5 per cent of the entire population between the ages of 9 and 49 were able to read and write; differences in the literacy level of the population in various Union republics

[1] *Narodnoye khozyaistvo SSSR v 1968 godu*, p. 188.
[2] *Itogi vsesoyuznoi perepisi naseleniya 1959 goda* (Returns of the U.S.S.R. Population Census, 1959), Summary Volume, p. 93.

did not exceed 3-4 per cent.[1] The number of people having a higher, secondary and incomplete secondary education in the total population rose for the country as a whole 3.4 times from 1939 to 1959; among the Kirghizes, the number increased 22 times, Tajiks and Turkmen 17 times, Uzbeks 14 times and Kazakhs 8.3 times. As a result differences in the educational level decreased, but of course have not yet disappeared. For example, among Georgians persons with a higher, secondary or incomplete secondary education made up 37.5 per cent of the total in 1959; Letts 36.9 per cent, Estonians 30.7 per cent, Russians 29.5 per cent, Kazakhs 18.2 per cent, Lithuanians 17 per cent, and Moldavians 15.5 per cent.[2]

The interests of nations, just as of classes, are manifested in the economy, politics and culture. Under socialism, the unity of the basic interests of nations in these spheres is determined above all by the community of their economic basis: dominance of social ownership of the means of production. From this follows the economic need of developing the socialist economy as a single whole. "Communism," Lenin wrote, "requires and presupposes the greatest possible centralisation of large-scale production throughout the country."[3] That is why in 1918 Lenin objected to the proposals of the commission which drew up the draft "Regulations for the Management of the Nationalised Enterprises". He declared that "to deprive the all-Russia centre of the right of direct control over all the enterprises of the given industry throughout the country ... would be regional anarcho-syndicalism, and not communism".[4] Centralisation of production, if effected in due measure, meets the interests of all republics, regions and nations because it enables them to utilise to the utmost the economic advantages of large-scale production in the common interest.

Moreover, the unity of the interests of nations is dictated by the objective need for economic ties between them, inasmuch as the socialist economy can successfully develop only given the mutual assistance and co-operation of all the peoples inhabiting a country. The same also applies to

[1] Ibid., p. 89.
[2] Ibid., p. 234-35.
[3] V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 42, p. 96.
[4] Ibid.

the cultural co-operation of nations, which results in the mutual enrichment of their socialist cultures.

Lastly, the community of interests of nations is also determined by the need for their mutual support in the political sphere. It is impossible to face the capitalist world single-handed. It is the mutual assistance of the Soviet peoples that determines the defensive might of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and its economic independence from the capitalist world. The formation of the U.S.S.R. mirrored the unity of the basic interests of all the republics, of all the peoples of the country.

Development of the socialist economy steadily extends the mutual contacts of the Soviet peoples, unites them ever more strongly by common vital interests into one family. This is promoted by the extension of economic ties between republics and the development of industry, the power and transport systems, by the joint effort of the peoples, the greater mobility of the population and broader exchanges of material and spiritual wealth between nations. The division of labour between republics, certain specialisation of their economies (for example, cotton growing in the Central Asian republics) determines the extension of economic ties between them. As socialist society develops and the interdependence and mutual assistance of the Soviet republics grows, the community of their interests will further rise.

At the same time the community of nations can grow stronger only if specific interests are carefully considered. The sources of these interests are first of all the different levels of economic development and the different sectoral structures of their economies owing to the historically shaped and geographical conditions. Differences in the size of their territory and population, language and national traditions also influence the specific interests of nations.

The Leninist policy in the sphere of national relations is based on a rational combination of the interests of the entire state with the interests of each Soviet republic. Initially, the application of this policy demanded great attention to the real interests of the nations and nationalities, especially those who inherited economic and cultural backwardness; even their prejudices had to be considered, because they could not be simply ignored, but had to be eliminated by very patient educational work. Only such a flexible policy

helped to remove the remnants of former mistrust and hostility between nations. The forms of organisation of a multinational federal state were adapted to representing in the highest organ of power both the general interests of the Union and the interests of each republic (two chambers in the Supreme Soviet of the U.S.S.R.—the Soviet of the Union and the Soviet of Nationalities).

The Party continues the same policy in conditions of the gradual transition to communism. In the economic sphere it comprehensively develops the economy of the republics and improves the socialist division of labour between them. The remnants of economic and cultural inequality between nations are being fully eliminated in the process of building communism. The C.P.S.U. Programme points out: "The Party will continue its policy ensuring the actual equality of all nations and nationalities with full consideration for their interests and devoting special attention to those areas of the country which are in need of more rapid development. The wealth increasingly created in the course of communist construction must be fairly distributed among all nations and nationalities."[1]

The rights of the republics in guiding the economy and culture and also in state development have been greatly extended. All this strengthens friendship between the peoples, stimulates initiative and greater activity of each republic and helps eliminate survivals of a parochial approach and national egoism.

Survivals of chauvinism and nationalism, quite tenacious in general, may be reanimated by any violation of the proper interconnection between the general state and republican interests. The abolition of these survivals is in the interest of all the nations and nationalities of the U.S.S.R.

Thus, the further development and strengthening of the socio-political and ideological unity of society is basically a matter of properly combining the interests of people, first of all the interests of classes and nations. This chiefly determines the unity of action by the people, their activity and initiative. And the rates of advance to communism depend on the activity of the people in building the communist economy.

---

[1] *The Road to Communism*, Moscow, p. 561.

3. Tendencies in the Social Structure of Socialist Society

A concrete analysis of the social structure of socialist society requires consideration for distinctions not only between classes, but also between sections within classes, and other social strata in society. Social distinctions do not fully coincide with class distinctions. The latter are necessarily connected with relations of property in the means of production (and also with other attributes directly following from property relations). But social distinctions in the broader sense exist within the bounds of an equal relationship to the means of production. They, however, are always, in one way or another, linked with features inherited from a class society which have not yet been overcome. For example, distinctions between the working class and the peasantry, on the one hand, and the intelligentsia, on the other, are determined by the legacy of class society which socially separated manual labour from mental labour.

Social distinctions also exist within classes, inasmuch as the social division of labour encompasses also relations within classes, giving rise to certain distinctions in the social position of separate sections, in their material condition and, consequently, in their interests.

A proper methodological approach to analysing the social structure requires the singling out of the *main* social groups which at the same time include the overwhelming majority of the population. This, of course, does not rule out an analysis of smaller sub-divisions; on the contrary, it makes it possible to assess their place in society.

Social distinctions between people, still preserved in socialist society, can in the main be sub-divided into the following types: 1) distinctions between classes (the working class and the peasantry united in co-operatives); 2) distinctions between the urban and the rural population (including, for example, between workers in industry and in state farms); 3) distinctions between manual workers and brain workers; 4) distinctions between groups within the working class, the peasantry, among the intelligentsia and office employees.

These sub-divisions intersect each other. For example, distinctions between workers and peasants, on the one hand, and the urban and rural population, on the other, do not fully coincide. The rural population consists not only of peasants but also of state-farm and other workers and intellectuals. That is why the problem of eliminating the lag of the countryside behind the town in the economy, culture and way of life also affects the living conditions of part of the state-farm and office workers. Account should be taken of the growing proportion of farm, office and other workers in the rural population. In 1959, state-farm and other workers (and their dependents) made up 42.2 per cent of the rural population and in 1966, 51.4 per cent. These data show that farm, office and other workers now numerically prevail in the countryside, too.

The most essential social distinctions are produced not by socialism, but by preceding societies whose legacy in this sphere has not yet been fully overcome. In his interesting book *Political Economy of Socialism*, the Polish economist B. Minc states that the words of Ludwik Krzywicki are fully applicable to contemporary socialism: "Each new link in material conditions brings to the historical scene another stratum (or other strata), eliminating the old ones, giving rise to new contradictions between interests and to a new struggle between different views." Proceeding from this Minc considers it possible to speak of the "formation of two classes on the basis of socialist property in its two forms: the class of workers in the socialist state sector and class of workers in the socialist co-operative sector".[1]

Without dealing so far with the definition of these classes, let us note that the very thesis about the rise of new classes under socialism should be challenged. In our opinion, we can speak about new classes in socialist society only in the sense that they are such only as they are characterised by new features, but not at all in the sense that they are created by socialism. Of course, in the process of socialist construction the numerical strength and proportion of some social sections increase; this is true above all of the working class and the intelligentsia. In a number of areas in the

[1] B. Minc, *Ekonomia Polityczna Socjalizmu*, Warszawa, 1963, pp. 788, 794.

Soviet Union where there was no national working class in the past, it has now developed. A socialist intelligentsia, new in composition and in its role in society, has also arisen. But, in our opinion, these processes cannot be regarded as the appearance of new class and social distinctions. All these new features, characteristic of the working class, the peasantry united in co-operatives and the intelligentsia, do not separate but draw the social groups closer together. This, as Minc himself rightly remarks, is a movement towards a classless society and not the creation of another class society. That is why, it seems to us, it would be wrong to draw an analogy between the birth of socialism and the birth of preceding societies which brought with them a new division of society into classes.

Ascertainment of the main trend of the changes is needed for a proper approach to analysing the social structure of socialist society. Social life is extremely involved and it is impossible to understand the real significance of one or another social distinction and the trend of its development without a historical approach. Whither socialist society—toward the attainment of greater unity and social homogeneity or, on the contrary, toward a new differentiation that comes to replace the gradually disappearing class differentiation? An answer to this question is vital for a proper analysis of socialist reality.

Proponents of the "single industrial society" theory are trying to prove that the trends of socialism and capitalism are identical. They claim that under both systems property in the means of production loses its importance for characterising social distinctions. In reality, although some processes (for example, automation of production) which follow from the development of the contemporary productive forces are common, their social consequences are opposite. Similarly opposed are the trends of changes in the social structure of society. Capitalism's development deepens social differentiation in general. Improvement of the socialist society is, on the contrary, a movement from class distinctions to complete social homogeneity. While private property in the means of production is the basis for class differentiation, social property becomes the basis for obliterating distinctions between classes and for drawing together all social groups.

The main lines of this process which emerged in the Soviet Union are as follows:

First, and this is of decisive significance for elimination of class distinctions, the workers and peasants draw closer together in their position in the system of economic relations, in their relation to the means of production. This is expressed in greater socialisation of labour on the collective farms, an increase in their fixed assets and changes of their composition, in the development of inter-collective-farm economic ties and also ties between collective farms and state enterprises.

Second, workers, peasants and intellectuals gradually draw closer together in the nature of their labour. Distinctions between all these social groups are ultimately determined by the remnants of the old forms of the social division of labour, expressed in essential distinctions between agricultural and industrial, manual and mental labour. Communism obliterates these distinctions, converts agricultural work into a variety of industrial work and organically fuses mental and manual labour in the productive activity of people.

Third, together with evening out the nature of labour there is a process of drawing together of the cultural and technical level of the peasants and workers and that of both of these classes with that of the intelligentsia. This signifies a general cultural advance of all the people.

Fourth, prerequisites for the elimination of distinctions in the conditions of distribution and the way of life of all social groups are gradually created during the advance to communism by raising labour productivity and effacing distinctions in the cultural and technical levels.

All these processes are intertwined but the sequence and periods of their completion are far from being the same. Their development depends above all on the degree of maturity of the productive forces and culture needed for accomplishing various tasks of communist construction. To sever the development of social relations from the process of creating the material and technical basis of communism, to set social tasks in isolation from economic tasks would mean to allow a subjectivist approach to problems of communist construction.

Attention is focussed on the foreground problems whose

solution is vital for socio-economic development. Although property relations form the basis for class distinctions and, consequently, social distinctions between workers and peasants will disappear with the transition to one property of the whole people, the primary task now is to bring closer together the living and working conditions in town and country.

Such a formulation of the question is quite natural. The possibilities for the development of the productive forces inherent in both forms of property—state and co-operative have been far from fully utilised. Both the collective-farm and the state-farm forms of organising production in the countryside have to be further consolidated and improved. The drawing together of the two forms of socialist property can be only a gradual and lengthy process, which is fully determined by the development of the productive forces. To be over-hasty in this process would be even more incorrect because the distinctions between the two forms of socialist property do not hamper Soviet society's advance at the present stage.

As a matter of fact, development is impeded by the lag of agriculture behind industry, the insufficiently high labour productivity in farming and the consequent considerable distinctions between living and working conditions in town and country. That is why the 23rd C.P.S.U. Congress concentrated attention on ensuring high and stable growth rates in agriculture, improving the working and living conditions in the countryside with the object of gradually drawing closer together the living standards of the rural and urban population. In the course of solving these problems both forms of socialist property will be strengthened by advancing the productive forces, and their drawing together will be continued.

Today, collective farms are large-scale enterprises. On the average, every collective farm has four times more agricultural land than it had in 1935, the non-distributable assets multiplying eight times since that time. This is a striking evidence of the growing concentration and socialisation of production in the collective-farm sector. The economic ties between collective farms and between them and state enterprises are on the increase. Nearly all collective farms have joined in inter-collective-farm associations. The development of inter-collective-farm associations, the building

and joint use of various enterprises by the state and collective farms, the gradual, economically expedient setting up of agrarian-industrial associations will help to raise the level of socialisation of collective-farm property and draw together this property and public property.

The new Model Rules of the Collective Farm adopted by the Third All-Union Congress of Collective Farmers in 1969 serve to improve further the social relationships in the countryside, to strengthen and multiply collective-farm property.

Alongside the obliteration of distinctions between the working class, the collective-farm peasantry and the intelligentsia, the drawing together of various strata within these social groups is of great importance. Criteria for delimiting these strata have not yet been sufficiently elaborated, although in recent years more attention has been paid in Soviet scientific literature to a concrete analysis of the composition of the working class, the peasantry and the intelligentsia.

In any case we consider it necessary to define strata or groups within the working class, the peasantry and the intelligentsia according to objective attributes. Such attributes can be, for example, distinctions in the sectoral aspect (to differentiate workers engaged in industry and in agriculture or groups of intellectuals engaged in production and technology, culture and education, administration, and so on).

In some cases it is necessary to consider the distinctions in the labour and living conditions of workers at large and small enterprises, which also differ for their technical facilities. Among the collective-farm peasantry distinctions are still making themselves felt between members in advanced, average and lagging collective farms. Such distinctions disappear as the lagging farms are raised to the level of the advanced ones, but so far they are still considerable. In this connection the composition of the collective-farm peasantry remains more heterogeneous than the composition of the working class.

Lastly, it is necessary to distinguish strata within the working class, the collective-farm peasantry and the intelligentsia, depending on the nature of their labour, and incomes; moreover, all these features should be taken in their interconnection.[1]

[1] S. Widerszpil, a Polish sociologist, pointed out in his paper submitted to the 6th International Congress of Sociology that Polish

In socialist society, the technical equipment of various sections of labour is not the same. The skill of the workers and the relationship between skilled and unskilled labour depend on the technical facilities. With payment according to work differences between skilled and unskilled, arduous and light, mental and manual labour are also reflected in the distribution of goods and benefits and the way of life. Moreover, differences in living conditions in town and country are also making themselves felt in the way of life. Consequently, under socialism the unequal nature of labour determines definite social distinctions. This, by the way, sets socialism apart from communism where distinctions in occupations will no longer affect the position of people in society and their material welfare.

Although the skill of workers has generally risen, distinctions between separate groups are still considerable. The stratum of workers of relatively low skill is still high but it is gradually decreasing. On the contrary, the stratum of skilled workers is rapidly expanding. Operations involving mental labour frequently prevail in the activity of highly skilled workers, and in level of education they also differ little from technical personnel of average skill. For example, according to data of the Economic Studies Laboratory at Leningrad State University, in the labour time of a jobsetter of an automatic line 55 per cent is taken up by supervision and control of the production process, 22 per cent by setting up the equipment, 18 per cent by repair of the equipment and only 5 per cent by loading the blanks and removing the finished parts. At the Mogilev synthetic fibre factory 56.3 per cent of the labour time of the operator is taken up by control and supervision of the production process.[1] Elements of engineering and technical labour are becoming prevalent in the activity of highly skilled workers. The development of such a stratum among the workers embodies the process of bringing the working class closer to the intelligentsia; while remaining workers, this group acquires many features of engineers and technicians.

Quite a large section of machine operators stands out among the collective-farm peasantry, alongside the main mass which is still engaged in jobs requiring manual labour. The importance of this section is growing as agricultural work is gradually converted into a variety of industrial work. Machine operators are the most skilled, educated and at the same time the more prosperous part of the collective-farm peasantry. The development of this stratum embodies the process of drawing together the collective-farm peasantry and the working class. But farm machine operators so far make up a smaller part of the collective-farm peasantry.

A concrete analysis of the obliteration of distinctions between classes also presupposes a study of the development of strata within classes; without this it is impossible to gain a real idea of the scope of the tasks which have to be accomplished to make the transition to a classless society. Without knowing, for example, what part of the Soviet workers and collective farmers is engaged in unskilled labour, it is impossible to show concretely the magnitude of the tasks of obliterating distinctions between workers and peasants in this respect.

Do distinctions within the main social groups grow stronger? Neither theoretical considerations nor the facts offer grounds for such a conclusion. It goes without saying that technological and social progress causes changes in the vocational composition of the labour force; some vocational groups disappear, others come into being. This process, however, must not be identified with social differentiation.

Division of labour and social differentiation are not identical concepts. The social division of labour gives rise to social differentiation only through the relations of proper-

workers have distinctions which follow from: 1) the type and sector of the economy in which they are engaged; 2) content of their labour (degree of complexity, development of a creative element and responsibility, which depends on the technical level of the enterprise, machinery and manufacturing processes, and the position in the technical division of labour); 3) level of skill and general education; 4) forms of property at enterprises and their ties with agriculture. Empirical studies made by Polish sociologists, show, according to Widerszpil's opinion, that the level of production skill is the factor which exerts the greatest influence on the socio-vocational position of the worker in Poland (S. Widerszpil, *The Change of the Worker's Social Position in the Social Structure of Contemporary Poland*, p. 14).

[1] See *Sotsialniye izmeneniya rabochego klassa Byelorussii v protsesse stroitelstva kommunizma* (Social Changes in Byelorussia's Working Class in the Process of Building Communism), Minsk, 1965, p. 233; *Rabochy klass i tekhnichesky progress* (The Working Class and Technological Progress), Moscow, 1965, pp. 260-62.

ty, exchange and distribution, when it is linked with a rise in differences between people according to their position in society. If this is not taken into account it is easy to confuse the vocational composition of the population with its class composition.

Tendencies in the development of the vocational and social structure may not coincide, as is the case at the present stage of socialist society in the U.S.S.R. A tendency toward differentiation prevails now in the vocational structure. Here an intensive process of the birth of new specialities is under way, although at the same time there is also a drawing together of certain vocations and their unification as a result of technological progress. A movement toward social homogeneity prevails in the social structure. A deepening of social distinctions is not characteristic of socialist society. On the contrary, as the main social groups draw together strata within these groups are also brought closer together.

Let us take, for example, such indices as the level of education and incomes. In 1939, according to data of the U.S.S.R. population census, the number of people with a higher and secondary (including incomplete secondary) education per 1,000 of employed persons was 6.3 times higher among office employees than among workers and 28.8 times higher than among collective farmers. When the next population census was taken in 1959 it revealed that the gap had been narrowed: the education index of office employees was 2.3 times higher than that of the workers (in other words, the gap between them was cut by nearly two-thirds as compared with 1939) and the collective farmers, 3.9 times (the gap was reduced by more than 85 per cent). In 1967, the educational index of office workers was 1.8 times that of the industrial workers and 2.7 times that of the collective farmers.[1]

Within these social groups the gaps in the educational level also tend to shrink. Let us take the working class. In 1939, of each 1,000 workers 82 had a higher and secondary (including incomplete secondary) education, while in 1959 the number increased to 386. In other words, their proportion increased 4.7 times. Comparing the educational level of workers engaged chiefly in manual labour in different

[1] Calculated according to data of *Itogi vsesoyuznoi perepisi naseleniya 1959 goda*, p. 116; *Soviet Union 50 Years*, p. 282.

trades, we can notice that it has risen mostly among workers of lower skill in the past. On the average, the educational index of manual workers rose 7.3 times from 1939 to 1959. Among drop-hammer men it increased 10 times, some categories of textile workers 22 times, agricultural workers 17 times, and so on.[1]

A certain inequality in distribution under socialism is gradually being smoothed over on the basis of a general increase in technical facilities and labour productivity. The differences between incomes of peasants and workers, workers in the lower and higher brackets, and between incomes of the population in various parts of the country, are being reduced. This process affects the main social groups and also different strata within these groups. As for the latter, the drawing together of their living standards is above all a result of raising the wages of workers in the lower and middle brackets. The development of social forms of satisfying the people's requirements is operating in the same direction. Free education and medical service, the maintenance of children free of charge or for a small fee in nurseries and kindergartens smooth over to a certain extent the differences in the welfare of large, small and childless families. This is of particular importance for workers in the low and middle brackets.

It should be noted, however, that under the current economic reform some distinctions, both in direct payment for work (bonuses) and in income from the social distribution funds, between workers of separate enterprises might increase. The economic reform raises the dependence of the income of the personnel on the results of their labour, which will be of essential significance for stimulating production.

At times the question is raised, how can the movement toward communist equality be combined with the stimulation of production? Is there no contradiction between the material incentive principle and the elimination of social inequality?

A proper understanding of this question first of all demands that inequality in distribution should not be identified with the stimulation of production. Communism, where complete social equality will be attained, will not eliminate stimuli to the development of production and preserve the social mate-

[1] *Itogi vsesoyuznoi perepisi naseleniya 1959 goda*, pp. 116, 177-79.

rial interest in the fruits of common labour defining the welfare of all society and hence of every individual. Furthermore, not every inequality in conditions of distribution under socialism stimulates the development of production. On the contrary, unjustified inequality of incomes which does not conform to the principle of distribution according to work done impedes society's advance.

A stimulating role under socialism is played only by such inequality in distribution which follows from a differentiated payment for work in accordance with differences in its productivity that depend on the labour effort of the workers, the complexity of their activity, skill, and so on. But these distinctions in payment for the work done can act as a stimulus only if the proper proportions are observed. Both an excessive gap between remuneration of workers of different categories and inadequate differentiation in payment for work of differing skill and productivity, can hamper the development of socialist production.

When material and cultural benefits are unequally distributed, certain contradictions of interest among different sections of society are inevitable.

The principle of "to each according to his work" presupposes that the share of a worker in distribution corresponds to his labour contribution to social production. This contribution depends, naturally, both on the efforts of each worker himself and on the organisation of production and labour, the efficiency of the entire collective to which he belongs. The labour of all producers goes into the common fund and from it, after assigning the corresponding part for accumulation and social needs, the consumed part is distributed among different sections of society. Certain contradictions arise, as pointed out in the previous chapter, already in dividing the total income into the accumulation fund and the consumption fund. The distribution of the consumption fund between various classes, between strata within classes, for example, skilled and unskilled workers, also engenders certain contradictions. Both the "overpayment" and "underpayment" of some categories of workers might exacerbate these contradictions.

But contradictions are produced not only by deviations from the principle of distribution according to work done. A contradiction is inherent in the principle itself, which

follows from the unity of equality (equal pay for equal work) and inequality. The latter is determined by the fact that in payment according to work an equal measure is applied to actually unequal people who differ for their energies, capabilities, and so on, so that a greater working capacity turns out to be, as it were, a natural privilege of some of the workers. Moreover, in paying people according to their work, society is forced to ignore other distinctions between them (for example, their family status), which results in the fact that even if they equally participate in creating society's consumption funds, their share in consumption actually proves to be unequal. By itself the socialist principle of distribution does not create this inequality. It only fixes and reflects in distribution relations the actually existing differences in the productivity and complexity of labour and skills of various categories of workers. That is why inequality in distribution, although it is smoothed over to a certain extent by social measures (for example, distribution through the social consumption funds) cannot be basically eliminated otherwise than through a growth in the skills and labour productivity of the lagging workers and by raising them to the level of the highly skilled workers. Only on this basis can the realisation of the social ideal of communism, communist equality, be combined with the development of the personal material incentive and the provision of greater stimuli to work.

The problem of the collective material interest of enterprises, firms, and other economic associations, in our opinion, should be approached in the same way. In view of the unequal results of their economic activity, distinctions in the degree of the material welfare of their workers can increase. This, however, does not eliminate the problem of advancing toward complete social equality. The direct and indirect incomes of the collectives of enterprises can be evened out only by bringing up the lagging enterprises to the level of the advanced ones. Differentiation of incomes under the new economic management system is not an end in itself but a means for the general advance of production, which ultimately will promote society's movement towards social equality.

Thus, changes in the social structure of Soviet society lead toward: a) greater social homogeneity, which will result in

eliminating all the remnants of the division into classes; b) achievement of communist equality and elimination of all remnants of social inequality that still exist under socialism.

The position of the intelligentsia and office employees in socialist society has to be specially analysed in this context. At times the formation of the socialist intelligentsia is regarded as an indicator of greater differentiation of social strata. In bourgeois literature which specialises in criticising socialism this view is carried to the point of claiming that a new élite, or even a new class is formed in socialist countries.

That the intelligentsia rapidly grows, absolutely and relatively, under socialism is beyond dispute. But this process reflects not the isolation of the intellectual forces from the people but, on the contrary, greater access of the people to spiritual activity. The working class and the peasantry united in co-operatives administer society and production through their own intelligentsia. In present-day conditions the intricate process of administering socialist society, specifically the national economy, requires, as long as all the working people are still unable directly to take part in the administration, the existence of a special stratum of people who perform executive functions. Without this stratum, the functioning of socialist society is impossible.

Let us notice, however, that this section must not be identified with the intelligentsia in general. The concepts "intelligentsia", "office employees" and "executive personnel" do not coincide.

Most of the intelligentsia consist of office employees. These include all mental workers employed at state enterprises, offices, and so on. There is also a part of the intelligentsia employed in collective farms who are their members. Moreover, there is also a certain number of the so-called workers in the liberal professions (lawyers, writers, composers, and so on) who do not work for hire and consequently are not employees.

On the other hand, not all office employees can be classed as intellectuals. There are also many employees in whose activity mental labour does not prevail (for example, sales clerks, and so on).

But even among intellectuals far from all of them perform executive functions. Most of the intelligentsia consist of workers in education, science, medicine, accounting, and so

on, who do not perform any executive functions. The most rapid numerical increase is registered by such groups of the intelligentsia as engineering and technical personnel (an increase of 3.6 times in 1967 as compared with 1939), research workers (almost 2.5 times), medical workers (3.7 times). The number of executives in state and economic management agencies and enterprises has increased to a smaller extent (less than 50 per cent), although the scale of production has greatly risen during these years.[1] The proportion of managerial personnel (including also executives of health, educational and trading establishments and organisations) among all mental workers decreased from 13 per cent in 1939 to 10 per cent in 1959. From these data the conclusion may be drawn that the overwhelming part of the Soviet intelligentsia are not executives and organisers of social labour. If we also bear in mind that most of the intelligentsia is not in a privileged position as regards labour remuneration compared with skilled workers, the absurdity of the attempts to picture the Soviet intelligentsia as the "new élite" becomes absolutely clear.

It should be added that the socialist intelligentsia is not a closed section access to which is difficult for workers and peasants and their children. On the contrary, it has been formed and is replenished mainly by workers and peasants. Although some actual advantages for children of the intelligentsia in obtaining a higher education still exist, the educational system as a whole does not consolidate but tends to eliminate social distinctions.

It is a specific feature of socialist society's structure that it has no closed social groups which would be reproduced within their own bounds. Alongside the working class, mental workers make up the most rapidly growing section of Soviet society. In 1926, there were 2.6 million people engaged in mental labour in the U.S.S.R.; in 1959, they numbered 20.5 million, and at the beginning of 1969, 29.9 million—an increase of more than 11 times.[2] Such huge growth would be impossible through the "self-reproduction" of the intelligentsia; it is chiefly a result of the replenishment of its ranks by workers and peasants and their children. According to data of a survey made by Leningrad sociologists at the city's en-

[1] *Soviet Union 50 Years*, p. 231.

[2] *Narodnoye khozyaistvo SSSR v 1968 godu*, p. 35.

gineering plants, 54.2 per cent of the executives came from families of manual workers and collective farmers; about half of them started out as workers.[1]

In socialist society where leadership of state affairs and the management of social production are concentrated in the hands of the working people, the stratum of executives acts in the general interests of the people.

While in socialist society the intelligentsia must not be counterposed to the working class and the peasantry, on the other hand, it would be wrong to dissolve it in these classes. Some authors propose that the intelligentsia be regarded as a component of or a stratum within the working class or the peasantry united in co-operatives. But such an approach would mean that the socialist intelligentsia is divided into two parts, workers and collective farmers, between which there are class distinctions. Moreover, part of the intelligentsia (men of the liberal professions, and so on) cannot be put in either class and, therefore, do not fit into such a classification.

In the opinion of some authors, the inclusion of the intelligentsia in the working class (and likewise in the class of the collective-farm peasantry) conforms to the nature of contemporary production and society's organisation because present-day socialist production rests on the close co-operation of workers, technicians, engineers, and other mental workers. It is indisputable that the conversion of science into a direct productive force and the automation of production which turns technicians or engineers into the personnel who directly service intricate machines, extends the ranks of the working class. But this is a tendency in the development of modern production and not a consummated process. To picture the situation as if distinctions between the workers and technical personnel have already vanished would mean to remove a very important and intricate practical task, the accomplishment of which demands a long time and persistent effort—the task of eliminating distinctions between the intelligentsia as a special social stratum and the workers and peasants. Such a task cannot be achieved by "listing" the intelligentsia among the working class or the peasantry; it presupposes the actual elimination of essential distinctions between workers by hand and by brain. This

[1] *Voprosy filosofii*, No. 1, 1967, p. 39.

involves both a change in the nature of their labour on the basis of scientific and technological progress and an advance in the cultural and technical level of workers and peasants to the level of engineers, technicians and agronomists.

Distinctions connected with the content of work, skill and functions in the labour process undoubtedly last longer than class distinctions. As class distinctions are obliterated in socialist society these other distinctions will increasingly come to the foreground. At the same time in the process of advance toward communism classes as structural units of society will gradually lose their place in social life. Other communities and associations of people will arise. That is why it is important even now to consider the existence not only of classes but also of all other diverse forms of the community of people created by the economic organisation, division of social labour, territorial relations, and so on. People are members of production collectives, they are connected by their work with definite economic areas and by their place of residence, with one or another territorial unit. Moreover, as pointed out in Chapter II, in the first phase of communism each of these forms of community possesses, alongside the basic general interests, also its specific interests, which must be taken into account and utilised for the most rapid development of society as a whole. Study of the multifarious relationships between people arising because of this "cell-like" structure of society is of great interest both for sociological theory and for communist construction.

But we must not look upon a study of labour collectives and their relationships as an alternative to an analysis of class relations. As long as class distinctions exist, the labour collectives themselves must not be studied without considering the social groups they consist of: workers, peasants, office employees, specialists.

Socialist society is in the process of being transformed into a classless society. This process is far from complete as yet. An analysis of the stage of development attained in this process, of the position and relationship of classes and social strata making up socialist society is a prerequisite for a proper determination of the nature of political relations, the state of the political superstructure and the role of politics in the life of socialist society.

Chapter IV

THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN POLITICS AND ECONOMICS UNDER SOCIALISM

The nature of socialism as the first phase of communism makes the political organisation of socialist society necessary. But this political organisation is fundamentally new and different from that of former societies. The socialist state, the embodiment of political power, is not divorced from the people and in fact increasingly merges with them. But socialism does not yet eliminate the difference between society and the state, and it cannot therefore be a stateless society. The first phase of communism is insufficiently mature to get along without an administrative machinery of state. Because of this, political relations make up an essential part of the social relations of socialism. The class structure of socialism, and also its position among other societies, are expressed in the system of political relations, internal and external. What determines the direction in which these relations develop, and what part is played by political methods in communist changes? These questions are of prime importance for a scientific understanding of the functioning of socialist society and its advance toward communism.

1. Change in the Relationship of Politics and Economics Under Socialism

In the plan for his article "On the Question of the Role of the State", Lenin gave the following definition of politics: "Politics is participation in the affairs of *STATE*, direction of the state, definition of the forms, tasks and content of state activity."[1] This definition singles out the main thing in politics—the question of power, the content and trend of state activity. The content of state activity is determined first of all by the class nature of state power and the relations that exist between the classes in a given society. Lenin in fact defined politics as the relations between classes. Of course, he did not mean all the relations between classes, since classes are connected in the sphere of production by economic relations, but class relations in the struggle for power, and for determining the trend of state activity.

Politics express not only the relations between the classes of a given society, but also those between different nations and states. But the latter also stem from relations between classes and are fully determined by the class content of politics.

The basic interests of classes, those that ensue from their economic position, are expressed in politics. That is why Lenin regarded politics as a concentrated expression of economics. From this it follows that politics are determined by economics, but being at the same time a concentrated expression of economics, exert a tremendous influence on the latter's development. Day-to-day changes may occur in the economy under the direct influence of the development of the productive forces but really deep-going, fundamental changes in the economic system, though prepared for by the development of the productive forces, cannot take place except under the influence of politics, i.e., without utilising political power to transform economic relations.

Politics play a special part in the socialist remaking of the economy. In a socialist revolution the political upheaval precedes the economic. The socialist state is employed by the victorious working class as a powerful instrument in abolishing capitalist relations of production and instituting socialist ones, in remoulding the small-commodity production of peasants and artisans, and in converting the multisectoral transitional economy into a monolithic socialist economy. In short, political power reinforces the new economic relations introduced by the revolution and accelerates the reconstruction of the economy.

---

[1] V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 41, p. 382.

From this fact the false conclusion is at times drawn that politics supposedly act as a cause bringing the economy into being, i.e., politics directly generate economics. This wrong understanding of the relationship between politics and economics is one of the sources of subjectivism in the analysis of the development of socialist society. Proponents of subjectivist views, for example, Mao Tse-tung and his group, assert that politics act as a commanding force in relation to economics. In their opinion, the socialist superstructure is no longer determined by its basis; on the contrary, it determines and creates the basis itself. Such assertions distort the actual changes in the interaction of the basis and the superstructure which take place during the building of socialism and communism.

The starting point of the Marxist understanding of the relationship between politics and economics is the recognition of the fact that politics, as part of the superstructure of society, are determined by the economic system of society and by the economic positions of the classes which carry out given policies. This general proposition is fully applicable to the development of socialist society, notwithstanding all its diversity (which diversity must, however, be taken fully into consideration).

The active role of the state in building the socialist economy by no means signifies that it is the *cause* of new economic relations. In reality their cause lies in preceding economic development, in the conflict between the productive forces which developed within capitalist society and their shell of private capitalist relations of production. The inevitable transition to social ownership of the means of production is dictated by the development needs of the productive forces themselves; political power is merely the *instrument* for the realisation of this necessity and not its cause.

It would also be wrong to think that the socialist state, on coming into being, at first exists without an economic basis. Had the working class not expropriated the capitalists and the landowners in the course of the revolution, and had it not turned the confiscated means of production into socialist property, it would not have been able to maintain political power for any length of time. Only by relying on the socialist sector of economy as its economic basis can

the new political power gain in strength and successfully reconstruct the economy of a country as a whole along socialist lines.

Lastly, the direction of development of the state activities of the new political power and the nature and possibilities of its influence on the economy are determined by the needs and level of development of the latter. To look upon politics as the "commanding force" which directs economic development at will is to entertain a dangerous illusion. Only *correct* policies can produce desired results and contribute to the victory of socialism. And the only correct policies are those that help to carry out economically mature and necessary changes and take into account actual economic conditions and possibilities, and which are based on a sober estimate of the true relationship of class forces.

The active role of politics was expressed in the well-known statement of Lenin's about politics taking priority over economics. It is sometimes said that this proposition relates only to the special features of a society building socialism and communism, i.e., that it applies only to a socialist country. This is not correct, however. As far back as the period of struggle against the Economists Lenin voiced the idea that the political struggle of the classes takes priority over their economic struggle. Criticising the Economists, who, on the grounds that the economic interests of classes play a decisive part in history, overemphasised the importance of the working class's economic struggle, Lenin wrote: "The fact that economic interests play a decisive role *does not in the least imply* that the economic (i.e., trade union) struggle is of prime importance; for the most essential, the 'decisive' interests of classes can be satisfied *only* by radical *political* changes in general. In particular the fundamental economic interests of the proletariat can be satisfied only by a political revolution that will replace the dictatorship of the bourgeoisie by the dictatorship of the proletariat."[1] The same idea of the priority of politics over economics was voiced by Lenin during the discussion on the trade unions held in 1920-1921. He called this proposition the ABC of Marxism.

---

[1] V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 5, pp. 390-91.

The priority of politics over economics as understood by Marxism-Leninism means: 1) recognition of the decisive importance of winning and consolidating political power in order to realise the basic economic interests of a given class and accomplish its economic tasks; and 2) recognition of the consequent need to adopt a political approach to all economic, cultural and organisational matters. In the discussion on the trade unions Lenin objected to the eclecticism of N. Bukharin, who placed the political and economic approaches to the trade unions on the same level. Lenin stressed the priority of the political approach, for if the working class had pursued a wrong policy toward the trade unions, such as the Trotskyites (among others) had tried to impose on the Party, it would have been unable to retain power in a peasant country and to solve economic problems.

The new feature in the relationship of politics to economics after the working class won power is not recognition of the priority of politics. This, as we have seen, is a general proposition of Marxism-Leninism. The new feature is that the basic question of politics, the question of power, has now been settled in favour of socialism, so that economic questions, the organisation of the national economy and the management of production, naturally move into the foreground.

Lenin wrote in his original version of the article "The Immediate Tasks of the Soviet Government": "The task of administering the state, which now confronts the Soviet government, has this special feature, that, probably for the first time in modern history of civilised nations, it deals pre-eminently with economics rather than with politics."[1]

The question arises: are not these propositions contradictory? If politics is of such paramount significance, if, to use Lenin's expression, it decides "the fate of our Republic[2]", why did he at the same time say that the focus was shifting onto the economy?

In reality there is no contradiction between these propositions; since the October Revolution had settled the basic question of politics—the question of power—in favour of socialism, the centre of attention shifted to the organisation of the economy.

To win political power was the central question for the

[1] V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 42, p. 71.
[2] Ibid., Vol. 32, p. 228.

party of the working class before the socialist revolution. All the work of the Party was subordinated to it. At that time the capitalists and the landowners dominated the economy, and that is why the party of the working class could do no more than outline the general prospects of the future transformation of the economy. The economic activity of the Party was then concentrated chiefly on the struggle for the daily economic needs of the workers, a struggle which in the final analysis was subordinated to the political tasks of the working class. Workers' control over production, nationalisation of the banks and syndicates, and so on, became practical questions only when the bourgeois-democratic revolution developed into a socialist revolution and the saving of Russia from the chaos of the war and impending economic catastrophe became an urgent matter.

Having become the directing force in politics, the working class employed state power for reconstructing the economy along socialist lines. "According to the bourgeois world-outlook," Lenin stated in 1920, "politics was divorced, as it were, from economics. The bourgeoisie said: peasants, you must work for your livelihood; workers, you must work to secure your means of subsistence on the market; as for economic policy, that is the business of your masters. That, however, is not so; politics should be the business of the people, the business of the proletariat."[1] Lenin further noted that economic construction must become the chief policy of the Soviet people.

After the establishment of the dictatorship of the proletariat, the fate of socialism depended on the reconstruction of the economy, the defeat of the bourgeoisie in the economic sphere, and the further development of the economy in order to lay the economic foundation of socialism. That is why from the very first days of the socialist revolution Lenin constantly emphasised that it was necessary to concentrate special attention on management of industry, on nationwide and comprehensive accounting and control of production and distribution, on disseminating the best economic experience, and so on. Naturally, during the Civil War, when hostile classes again and again sought to win back the power they had lost, questions of economic construction were frequently

[1] Ibid., Vol. 31, p. 371.

relegated to the background. But, as Lenin pointed out at the end of 1920, each big victory at the front "gradually shifts the focus of the struggle to economic policy".[1] Lenin saw in the socialist reconstruction of the economy, an extremely involved and difficult matter (particularly for a country such as Russia was), the very essence of the transition from capitalism to socialism. In this connection he pointed out in the original version of the article "The Immediate Tasks of the Soviet Government" that after the winning of power by the proletariat, political tasks took a subordinate place in relation to economic tasks.

A correct policy is a decisive prerequisite for success in the struggle for socialism. If such a policy is drawn up and applied it becomes possible to concentrate efforts on economic construction. That is why Lenin stressed that opposition which sought to impose a wrong policy on the Party was dragging it back. "I have always said, and will continue to say," Lenin declared in the discussion on the trade unions, "that we need more economics and less politics, but if we are to have this we must clearly be rid of political dangers *and political mistakes*."[2]

And so, Lenin considered it necessary to have definite conditions in order that the Party should be able, after winning power, to shift the focus of the struggle to the solution of economic tasks. This became possible when political questions had been solved.

Putting problems of economic construction to the fore in the activity of the Party and the socialist state, Lenin stressed that their solution required a practical and business-like approach. The slogan of a business-like approach, which formerly, when the aim was to destroy capitalism was not popular among revolutionaries, became the main and urgent slogan of the day when constructive tasks were tackled. Lenin persistently demanded a concrete business-like approach to all questions of economic development, thorough study of the experience of the best factories and co-operatives and the wide dissemination of this experience throughout the country. "Under the bourgeois system," Lenin said, "business matters were managed by private owners and not by state

[1] V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 31, p. 371.
[2] Ibid., Vol. 32, p. 85.

agencies; but now business matters are our common concern. These are the politics that interest us most."[1] In its initial period the socialist state had to devote considerable effort to suppressing the resistance of the exploiting classes, but even then one of the main functions of the socialist state, the organisation of the economy, came to the fore and was developed to a great extent. It increased in scale as the proletariat successfully coped with the tasks of the class struggle.

The dictatorship of the proletariat brought into being a fundamentally new type of state, the socialist state with its new intrinsic functions. Under state-monopoly capitalism the bourgeois state is also compelled to perform certain economic functions. It utilises a number of economic instruments to redistribute the national income in favour of the monopolies and to step up exploitation. But suppression of the exploited people, i.e., the majority of the population, and protection of the mainstays of the capitalist system remain the main thing in the activity of the bourgeois state. On the contrary, in a society which is building socialism state activity, administration of the country, turns into constructive activity, whose content is the planned organisation and development of the national economy in the interest of the working people.

This constructive activity assumes a wide scale in the transition period from capitalism to socialism and it is fully developed with the victory of socialism when its significance rises still more. The growing importance of economic organisational work under socialism is due to the radical change in both the economic system and society's class structure. With the abolition of the exploiting classes the function of suppressing their resistance withers away. The main functions, organisation of the economy, and cultural and educational work, become comprehensively developed in the activity of the socialist state.

The shifting of emphasis to these functions is also linked with the transition from the multi-sectoral economy to the monolithic socialist economy. In his article "Economics and Politics in the Era of the Dictatorship of the Proletariat" Lenin described the main forms of the social economy in the transition period from capitalism to socialism: the socialist

[1] Ibid., p. 430.

sector, small-commodity peasant production and the capitalist sector. While the socialist sector in Soviet Russia represented the organising, directing element in the economy, the other two sectors represented the spontaneous element. The Soviet socialist state exerted influence on their development, gradually steered peasant farming into the socialist channel, restricted and gradually ousted the capitalist sector. But the possibility of directly managing the country's economic life appeared only when a single socialist economic system was created. When social property encompasses all the major means of production and turns into the economic basis of the entire society, planned organisation of production and distribution of goods becomes necessary and in socialist society this is done only by the state. In these conditions management is not only and not so much an administrative function as economic organisational activity and planned guidance of the entire economy and culture.

The economic activity of the Party and the state is of decisive significance above all because the economy is the main sphere of struggle for communism. To speak about the transition to communism without linking it with the all-round development of production and a rise in labour productivity would be a serious deviation from Marxism-Leninism. Communism can be built neither on the basis of poverty nor on the equalitarian division of the accumulated wealth. It requires a tremendous expansion of social production capable of ensuring abundance of material and spiritual wealth for satisfying the needs of the people. That is why the Party put forward the building of the material and technical basis of communist society as the prime prerequisite for the transition to communism. The development of socialist into communist social relations depends on the laying of such a basis. The obliteration of essential distinctions between town and country, between mental and manual labour is likewise possible only if the economy and culture advance tremendously. A rise in the living standard of the Soviet people and fuller satisfaction of their material and spiritual needs entirely depend on the development of production. For this reason the Party focuses attention on these matters.

The decisive significance of the economic activity of the Party and the state also follows from the international conditions of the Soviet Union's development, the conditions of

the competition between socialism and capitalism. Lenin stated that victorious socialism would exert its main influence on world events through the successful development of socialist society, its economy first and foremost. It is the economic advantages of the new social system that ultimately ensure its victory over the old system. That is why struggle for the most rapid economic growth of the Soviet Union, for a rise in labour productivity is at the same time struggle for the victory of socialism over capitalism. The successful economic and cultural development of Soviet society creates the basis for reinforcing the Soviet Union's defence potential, for guaranteeing the reliable defence and security for the entire socialist community. At the same time it reinforces the positions of the world socialist system in its competition with the world capitalist system.

Only people who substitute petty-bourgeois adventurism for Marxism-Leninism, such as Mao Tse-tung and his group, can allege that recognition of the decisive importance of economic achievements for victory over capitalism is a repetition of the thesis of the Economists who assigned a secondary part to the political struggle and advanced the economic struggle by the working class to the first place.

Competition between the two systems in the economic sphere and the economic struggle of the working class in capitalist countries are two entirely different things. Their identification merely confuses the problem. The relationship between different forms of struggle in the working-class movement is determined by the fact that the political struggle expresses the fundamental interests, while the economic struggle expresses the partial interests of the working class (i.e., its interest in higher wages and better working conditions). But in the international scene, the economic competition between socialism and capitalism is not a mere struggle for partial interests. It is a struggle in the sphere where the fate of socialism and capitalism is being decided and upon which the military and political might of each system ultimately depends. The successes of socialism in the economic competition against capitalism are of the greatest political significance: they not only change the world balance of class forces in favour of the working people, but also create more favourable conditions for spreading the political class

struggle of the proletariat in the capitalist countries and the movement of the oppressed peoples for national liberation.

This means that both the internal and external conditions of the Soviet Union's development put into the foreground the advance of the socialist economy and the attainment of labour productivity higher than that under capitalism.

In socialist society, economics and politics form an indivisible unity. The solution of big economic and other problems assumes political significance and is linked with the competition, the struggle of the two systems, socialism and capitalism, in the international arena and with the strengthening of the world socialist system. It is also politically important from the viewpoint of internal relations, inasmuch as class distinctions have not yet disappeared in the U.S.S.R. and the development of the economy and culture in one way or another affects relations between classes and between nations (and it is in politics that these relations are expressed).

Let us take as an example the question of deploying the productive forces. The territorial organisation of labour is planned on the basis of its regional specialisation for the purpose of achieving maximum efficiency. For example, industry is brought closer to raw-material sources to avoid irrational and excessively long freighting; economic areas are specialised with an eye to their natural resources. But the Soviet people have not been able to guide themselves solely by considerations of economic efficiency in choosing one or another variant of deploying the productive forces. An essential part has also been played by political considerations, particularly by the need to solve the national question and eliminate the economic and cultural inequality of peoples inherited from the old system. During Soviet years the country's borderlands were industrialised. As a result, the peoples who had fallen behind in their economic and cultural development were able to rise to the level of the more advanced. Clearly, it would have been wrong to solve problems of deploying the productive forces merely on economic grounds and to ignore their political significance. In such cases it is necessary to combine economic efficiency and political expediency.

Politics express the general aim of planning. But the attainment of this aim necessitates the choice of the most

efficient variant for developing certain sectors of the economy, setting proper proportions between sectors of social production, for combining expansion of production with advance in the living standard of the people. Economic considerations should not be taken in isolation from politics, and, on the other hand, a political approach to economic problems should not replace a concrete economic analysis; on the contrary it should be organically combined with the latter. The ability properly to determine the efficiency of capital investments, to achieve the utmost results in production at the lowest cost is a must for guiding the economy in our days; without it there can be no correct policy either.

The economic plans of the Soviet Union represent a unity of economic and socio-political tasks. The rise in the efficiency of social production is dovetailed with important socio-political tasks, with progress in tackling such prime social problems as eliminating the essential distinctions between town and country and between mental and manual labour, strengthening the alliance of the working class and the peasantry, and developing fraternal friendship between the Soviet peoples.

The tasks of economic and cultural development acquire political significance in socialist society not only because they are connected with the relations between classes and nations. What also makes them politically important is that they are accomplished in the struggle against the survivals of capitalism which make themselves felt in the economy, the way of life and the minds of people. The Party sees to it that the general interests of the state and the people are observed and discourages manifestations of a parochial attitude which harm these interests. The tasks of communist construction also require constant unflagging care for reinforcing labour discipline, and this presupposes the need, alongside extensive educational work, to employ coercion with regard to drones and loafers. Lastly, of essential significance in the cultural sphere is struggle against indifference to politics and ideology and against the ideological influence of the capitalist world ideology on people with insufficient political schooling. In these conditions questions of cultural development must not be divorced from ideological problems. All this shows that under socialism the economy and culture remain closely linked with politics.

2. Tendencies in the Development of the Socialist State

Problems of the development of the socialist state include many specific questions, for example, the functions and forms of the socialist state and ways of improving socialist democracy, which cannot be specially examined in this work. We single out here only two questions which, in our opinion, are of general methodological significance for solving other, more specific problems: the connection between class relations and political power in socialist society and the relationship between the state and society in the process of advancing toward communism. As socialist society advances to communism the intrinsic features of class society gradually wither away, and this also influences its political organisation.

A class approach is a prerequisite for a scientific analysis of the state. This radically sets apart the Marxist-Leninist approach from the bourgeois-liberal, reformist attitude. The bourgeois and reformist fabrications about a state of the "whole people" under capitalism are laid bare by Marxists-Leninists who present an analysis of the class essence of bourgeois power. The bourgeois reformist illusions about "general human" ideas and ethical principles are blasted by a Marxist examination of their actual class content. "People," Lenin wrote, "always have been the foolish victims of deception and self-deception in politics, and they always will be until they have learnt to seek out the *interests* of some class or other behind all moral, religious, political and social phrases, declarations and promises."[1]

During the transition from socialism to communism when class distinctions within society are gradually obliterated and obviated, the socialist state increasingly acts as an organisation of all the members of socialist society, as a representative of the entire society. It would, however, be wrong to assume that in these conditions a class approach to problems of the socialist state loses force. On the contrary, the changes which occur in the process of development of the socialist state can be properly understood only as reflections of the changes in economic and class relations. The trend

[1] V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 19, p. 28.

of the state's activity must not be regarded in isolation from the tasks of the class struggle for communism. As long as class distinctions have not disappeared within society, as long as the class struggle between the forces of socialism and capitalism proceeds in the international scene, a class approach to an analysis of political and social problems remains obligatory for Marxists-Leninists.

Undergoing changes as part of the superstructure, the socialist state is improved together with the development of society itself and its class structure. It is a state of a new type from its very inception. That is why throughout its development—from its birth and up to its withering away—it preserves essential general features which do not disappear as long as a need for state authority is preserved.

The first and most general feature of the socialist state at all stages of its development is that it serves the working people. For countless centuries the state has been a weapon in the hands of the exploiting minority. Thomas Moore aptly defined it as a conspiracy of the rich who are defending their personal benefits in the name and under the guise of the state. Only the victory of the proletarian revolution brought into being a new type of state and it began to serve the working people.

Another common feature of the socialist state at all stages of its development is the fact that its historic mission is to abolish classes. The dictatorship of the proletariat is the beginning of the solution of this epochal task and the transition to communism completes it. This aim also determines the fundamental difference between the socialist state and all its predecessors. The socialist state does not strive to perpetuate the existing political power, but regards it as a historically transient stage in the organisation of social life needed for transition to a society without classes and without a state.

The abolition of classes is possible only if the working class exercises its leading role in society. This is the main thing in proletarian dictatorship whose essence Lenin saw in the organisation and discipline of the working class. The leading role of the working class might assume different forms depending on the stage of development achieved by society and the historically concrete conditions in a country; it may or may not be consolidated by law and by the system

of electing the organs of state power. Be that as it may, this role determines the trend of activity of the socialist state as an instrument for achieving communism.

The main content of activity of the socialist state at all stages of its development is constructive work, the building of the new society. Even when exploiting classes existed, when suppression of their resistance claimed vast energies, the main and most characteristic feature of the socialist state was constructive, creative work; even then the proletarian dictatorship acted as an instrument for building the new life. This feature is further developed with the victory of socialism when the scale of constructive endeavour is tremendously extended, when the state acts as an instrument for building communism.

As the socialist state develops, democracy of a new type, inherent in proletarian dictatorship from the very beginning, is unfolded. Lenin regarded the dictatorship of the proletariat as a state which is democratic in a new way—*for* the working class and the working people in general, and which is dictatorial in a new way—*against* the bourgeoisie. He repeatedly stressed that the main thing in proletarian dictatorship is not coercion, although coercion is a necessary element of dictatorship, but guidance by the working class of the broad masses, above all the peasantry, on whose support it relies. That is why without securing real democracy for these masses the socialist state can neither exist nor improve. It goes without saying that the measure of democracy at each stage of society's development is determined by the objective conditions, first and foremost the acuteness of the class struggle. That is why it does not remain unchanged. But the general tendency, the law governing the development of socialist society, is to extend and deepen democracy as society advances to communism.

The possibilities for the extension of democracy are determined by the class nature of the state, by its social basis. However much present-day bourgeois ideologists and reformists orate about the conversion of the capitalist state into a people's state, a "welfare" state, this is a myth of their own invention. The real changes of the bourgeois state in the epoch of imperialism tend to narrow its social basis, to convert it into a "committee for managing the affairs of the bourgeoisie", into an instrument of domination by a narrow

stratum of the capitalist upper crust, of a handful of the biggest monopolies. Of course, the struggle of the working class and the working people in general is capable of effectively resisting the curtailment of democracy, of wresting some or other democratic rights and freedoms from the ruling classes. But this struggle does not broaden the social basis of bourgeois rule, because the democratic forces stand in opposition to it.

The dictatorship of the proletariat develops in a diametrically opposite direction. From the very outset it expresses the interests of the overwhelming majority of society. Its social basis is steadily widened and at the same time its intrinsic socialist democratic nature is improved. In this quantitative process there is one qualitative aspect linked with the completion of the transition period from capitalism to socialism and the building of the first phase of communism. As this landmark is reached, the change in the economic and class structure of society is so deep that it signifies a qualitatively new stage in the development of its political superstructure.

Let us recall the nature of the changes which occur in society's life. The transition period from capitalism to socialism is a period when the economic system is multi-sectoral, class antagonisms are still preserved within a country and there is still ground for the birth of capitalist elements. The class struggle proceeds in new forms as compared with capitalism, but historically it is inevitable. In view of this, during the transition period the state of the working class remains a weapon of its class domination over the exploiting classes which have been overthrown but not yet fully abolished.

But the period of the development of socialism into communism is another, qualitatively different period in the society's development. Instead of the multi-sectoral economy, society has a single rapidly developing socialist economy. The socialist remaking of the economy has eliminated the internal sources which engendered the threat of capitalism's restoration. Socialist society is not divided into antagonistic classes, it has no class conflicts. Relations between the social groups making up Soviet society are relations of friendly co-operation, and not of class struggle. In view of this, the state ceases to be an instrument for the domination of some

classes over others within the country. At this stage of development the social basis of the state is so broadened that it practically encompasses all social groups.

It is this that denotes the growing over of the state of proletarian dictatorship into a socialist state of the whole people. The latter, as we have demonstrated, is a natural development and continuation of the main features inherent in the state of proletarian dictatorship. The state of the whole people is not a new type of state, but a new stage in the development of the selfsame state which was brought into being by the victory of the proletarian revolution. Some of the features and functions of the state of proletarian dictatorship (above all the function of suppressing the resistance of the overthrown classes within a country) are obviated, wither away, while others are comprehensively developed (especially constructive functions, and democracy which is converted from democracy for the majority into democracy for all).

The state of the whole people is a new historical phenomenon. It is not an organ of power of one class, it expresses the will and interests of the whole people: the working class, the collective-farm peasantry and the intelligentsia. Whereas the combination of dictatorship over the exploiters, the minority, with democracy for the majority, for the working people, was characteristic of the state of proletarian dictatorship, the state of the whole people is no longer an organ for the suppression of some class; here dictatorship is not exercised over anyone (in the sense of class domination).

The objection is at times raised that in general there cannot be a state of the whole people; so long as the state is needed it expresses the domination of one class, and when it expresses the will of all, there is no need for it. To corroborate this statement reference is made to the fact that Marx and Engels objected to the slogan of a "state of the whole people".

True enough, the founders of Marxism rejected this slogan and criticised Lassalle and other German Social-Democratic leaders who claimed that a "people's state" would take the place of the bourgeois state as an instrument of class rule. In contrast to this, Marx and Engels stressed that the bourgeois state would be replaced by the dictatorship of the proletariat, which is an instrument of class domination of

the exploited, and not of the exploiters. They looked upon the dictatorship of the proletariat as an authority relying on the support of the majority of the working people, but which for its class essence represented the political rule of one class.

The Marxist proposition that the bourgeois state is replaced by the dictatorship of the proletariat, and not by a state of the whole people, remains correct. Under definite historical circumstances, the power of reactionary classes can be replaced by a democratic power representing a bloc of various classes united in a popular or national front. But such a power is also an instrument of class rule and cannot take the place of proletarian dictatorship as an instrument for accomplishing socialist tasks. "Soviet experience has shown," it is pointed out in the Programme of the C.P.S.U., "that the peoples are able to achieve socialism only as a result of *the socialist revolution and the establishment of the dictatorship of the proletariat.*"[1]

From all this, however, it does not follow that recognition of the state of the whole people in general runs counter to Marxism. Under capitalism, in a society divided into antagonistic classes, the state of the whole people is impossible. But this does not mean that it is also impossible under socialism, in a society which has no class antagonisms. It goes without saying that such a state would be impossible if, as Marxists assumed in the past, the conversion of the state into a representative of the entire society would directly coincide with the withering away, the disappearance of the state as such. But for a number of reasons, both internal and external, the withering of the state does not occur so swiftly. The need for class rule within society disappears earlier than the need for state power as such.

The founders of Marxism-Leninism did not foresee such a situation. But they made a number of statements which offer grounds for assuming that they differentiated between the dictatorship of the proletariat and the withering statehood of communist society. In the *Critique of the Gotha Programme*, Marx formulated the following classic proposition:

"Between capitalist and communist society lies the period of the revolutionary transformation of the one into the other. There corresponds to this also a political transition period

[1] *The Road to Communism*, p. 462.

in which the state can be nothing but *the revolutionary dictatorship of the proletariat.*

"Now the programme (the Gotha Programme of the German Workers' Party—*G.G.)* does not deal with this nor with the future state of communist society."[1] This statement shows that Marx did not identify such concepts as the dictatorship of the proletariat and the future state of communist society.

The transition period which lies, according to Marx, "between capitalist and communist society" is a period which ends in the lower and not in the higher phase of communism. The founders of Marxism-Leninism looked upon socialism not as a stage of the transition period, but as the first phase of communist society. That is why Lenin, analysing the above-quoted proposition of Marx in Chapter V of the book *The State and Revolution,* singled out the following stages in the development of society, devoting to each a special section: "The Transition from Capitalism to Communism" (§2); "The First Phase of Communist Society" (§3); "The Higher Phase of Communist Society" (§4).

Stages in the development of the state also correspond to periods in the development of society. At the first stage, i.e., during the transition period from capitalism to the lower phase of communism, to socialism, the dictatorship of the proletariat is needed. This, according to Lenin's definition, is a "state of the transitional type". It is a dictatorship over the minority, over the overthrown exploiting classes, and democracy for the people, for the overwhelming majority. Here there is "democracy for the poor, for nine-tenths of the population. . .", "democracy almost complete, restricted only by the *suppression* of the resistance of the bourgeoisie".[2]

With the establishment of socialism there is no need for dictatorship over any classes, but the state does not disappear as yet. There remains, as Marx put it, "the future state of communist society". Lenin emphasised that under socialism democracy is really complete and turns into a habit. The state withers away, inasmuch as there are no capitalists and class antagonisms are absent. But it does not wither away completely because there remains a need to protect social property, to exercise control over the measure of labour and

[1] K. Marx, F. Engels, *Selected Works,* Vol. II, pp. 32-33.
[2] V. I. Lenin, *Complete Works,* Russ. ed., Vol. 33, p. 181.

measure of consumption, over the application of the socialist principle "he who does not work, neither shall he eat". Lenin noted that "for the state to wither away completely, complete communism is necessary".[1]

Recognition of the state of the whole people in socialist conditions does not run counter to the general proposition of Marxist-Leninist theory about the class nature of the state. Marxists have always regarded the state as an organ of class domination. Lenin repeatedly pointed out that the state in the strict sense of the word is an instrument for the suppression of one class by another. But already the state of proletarian dictatorship, although it also represents an organ of class rule, expresses the domination of the majority over the minority. For this reason alone Lenin called it a semi-state. The state of the whole people reflects another stage in the advance toward a classless and, ultimately, a stateless communist society.

And so, an antagonistic class society has a state in the strict sense of the word; the establishment of the dictatorship of the proletariat is a transition to a semi-state, and the birth of a state of the whole people shows that a number of intrinsic attributes of the state will gradually fall away. From the dictatorship of the proletariat to a state of the whole people and from the latter to communist self-administration—such is the road of the development and the withering away of the socialist state.

The socialist state is a withering state by its nature. But this process so far has not developed on a wide scale and at an accelerated pace for a number of reasons: first, because classes still remain within socialist society, which was not foreseen by Marxists in the past (the existence of certain class distinctions and also survivals of the past make the state organisation of socialist society necessary); second, because the capitalist world continues to exist and, consequently, the class struggle continues on the international arena, and it is necessary to defend the socialist countries; this dictates the maintenance of an army and other state agencies; third, because the socialist world itself exists in the form of a system of states and relations between them require state regulation.

[1] V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works,* Vol. 25, p. 468.

Whereas the socialist state acts vis-à-vis capitalist states as an instrument for defending the gains of socialism, within the socialist community it serves as an instrument of political, economic and cultural assistance between countries. The relations between socialist countries are a fundamentally new type of international relations based on fraternal co-operation between peoples building socialism and communism. But these relations are of a state character and will remain such for a long time.

At times the necessity for a state organisation of society under socialism is linked with the need for an organ that could direct the national economy and culture. True enough, the socialist state performs such functions. But the need to administer the national economy and cultural affairs will also remain under communism, when these functions will no longer bear a political character, and will be exercised by stateless communist social self-administration.

In future when communism is finally established on a world scale, economics will remain and politics will wither away. The need for the conscious management and planned organisation of the economy and for society's guidance of cultural development will remain under communism, too, but this organisational-economic and cultural-educational work will be done by society itself, by agencies of communist social self-administration, and will lose its political nature. Organisation and guidance of economic life will not require any political power and the attendant compulsory sanctions of the state. In these conditions, the administration of people, as Engels put it, will be replaced by the administration of things and production processes.

The situation is different today in Soviet society which is building communism under definite internal and external conditions, when a hostile capitalist world still exists. In these conditions state guidance of the economy and culture is called upon to ensure the building of the material and technical basis of communism, the remaking of socialist into communist relations, to exercise control over the measure of labour and measure of consumption, to protect socialist law and order and socialist property, to educate the masses in the spirit of a conscientious attitude to labour. The need for a state is also determined by external conditions which call for a political organisation capable of reliably safe-

guarding the country's defence and security, of upholding the cause of peace and developing fraternal co-operation with other socialist countries.

That the guidance of the economy under socialism is a state function is no doubt also associated with the existence of class distinctions. Since there are classes it is necessary to regulate their relations, to take into consideration, as noted earlier, their interests in implementing an economic policy and properly combine them. The same also applies to nations.

Examining this question on a broader plane, we can note that the socialist state regulates relations between all forms of communities of people and groups of which society is made up. We have mentioned in previous chapters the need for properly combining the multifarious interests of people. A solution of this problem in the first phase of communism where there is as yet no full abundance of consumer goods, requires the organisation of political power and this power is represented by the socialist state. That is why the organisational, economic and other functions of the state bear a political nature. Moreover, since there are survivals of capitalism and carriers of these survivals, the need for state compulsion remains. These functions are discharged by the state expressing the will of the whole people.

Thus, from the angle of socialist society's internal conditions of development, the need for the state is determined above all by the fact that at the first phase of communist society not all the remnants and traces of class society have been fully obliterated. The productive forces have not yet reached the high level ensuring complete abundance of goods and labour has not yet become the prime vital necessity of all members of society. In view of this, control must be exercised over the measure of labour and the measure of consumption of each member, and common property in the means of production protected. There also remains the need for a certain compulsion to work which is effected in accordance with the principle "he who does not work, neither shall he eat". One must not think, Lenin stressed, that after overthrowing capitalism people will at once learn how to work for society without any rules of law; moreover, the abolition of capitalism does not at once provide the economic prerequisites for such a change. From this

Lenin drew the conclusion that "the state will be able to wither away completely when society adopts the rule: 'From each according to his ability, to each according to his needs', i.e., when people have become so accustomed to observing the fundamental rules of social intercourse and when their labour has become so productive that they will voluntarily work *according to their ability*".[1]

Creation of developed communist society is the internal prerequisite for the complete withering away of the state; victory and consolidation of socialism on a world scale is the external prerequisite. This shows that the existence of the state of the whole people, as of any other, is linked with class relations. Hence it is wrong to regard recognition of the socialist state of the whole people as renunciation of a class approach to the problem.

The socialist state remains a class state and continues to oppose the capitalist world as an organisation of the class struggle. On a world scale, relations of the two systems, the socialist and the capitalist, are relations of class struggle whatever form, armed or peaceful, it may assume. Peaceful coexistence consistently advocated by the socialist states is a specific form of the class struggle between socialism and capitalism. The external functions of the socialist state have been further developed, but not one of the external functions of proletarian dictatorship has become superfluous; the socialist state of the whole people continues to discharge them.

The situation is different as regards the internal functions characteristic of the state of proletarian dictatorship. Lenin regarded the dictatorship of the proletariat as a weapon of its class rule, as an instrument of the class struggle. But socialist society no longer has classes with regard to which it would be necessary to employ a dictatorship, and, correspondingly, these functions of suppression have fallen away.

Under socialism too, of course, it is necessary to combat survivals of capitalism, the old habits and customs, utilising in this struggle means of state compulsion. But this is no longer a struggle between classes and social groups of which socialist society is made up. The workers, collective farmers and intellectuals jointly combat the carriers of old survivals which drag society backward.

[1] V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 25, p. 469.

During the transition period from capitalism to socialism, the exploiting classes hostile to the proletariat stood behind the carriers of capitalism's survivals and they at times utilised the politically backward sections of the working people and set them against the dictatorship of the proletariat. In essence, this was a struggle between the working class and the exploiting classes for influence over the masses. Today, however, this is struggle of the people's advanced forces against anti-social actions, customs and prejudices of men infected by bourgeois habits, above all struggle for the re-education of backward persons, which increasingly demands, alongside state compulsion, the employment of public influence.

At the same time it would be wrong to close one's eyes to the fact that this struggle has a definite class content, because it is waged against traditions of the old society and inasmuch as the survivals of the past are supported and reanimated by the outside capitalist world.

This implies the leading role of the working class in the state of the whole people. The working class remains the chief mainstay of the socialist state, it displays its initiative in labour, is the sponsor of many undertakings of the whole people. But the main thing in which the leading role of the working class is manifested is the conversion of its ideology and policy into the ideology and policy of the whole people. From this angle the broadening of the social basis of the socialist state attests not to the weakening, but to the strengthening of its influence on the entire people. Gradually the working class has been winning over to its side ever wider sections of society until all of society, all its social sections have been rallied around the working class.

The leading role of the working class is actually revealed through the Party which guides the implementation of the programme of the working class and organises the building of communism. Intellectuals, reared by the working class, including those who do not come from workers' families but have deeply assimilated the ideology and policy of the Party, also help in discharging the leading role of the working class. Since this role is not consolidated by the state organisation, special attention must be paid to raising the activity of the working class and the influence it exerts on the entire life of the state and society.

Behind the theoretical propositions about the socialist state of the whole people stand real changes in the life of Soviet society which, in turn, involve further changes in the content of the activity and forms of organisation of the Soviet state. The growing over of the state of proletarian dictatorship into a state of the whole people leads to such a development of socialist democracy which converts the functions of administration into a cause of the whole people. During the advance to communism society will gradually carry out Lenin's behest—to draw literally the entire adult population into the work of administration. The latter promotes the further drawing together of the state and society.

The founders of Marxism-Leninism characterised the historical development of the state as a process of its ever greater alienation from society. A diametrically opposed tendency is true of the socialist state. Ever since the state began to serve the people, its development has led to its increasing fusion with society. There is also the notion that every state has a tendency to alienate itself from society and become an independent force which places itself above the classes that created it.

Is state power alienated from society under capitalism? Most certainly. The founders of Marxism already spoke of the state as a force which emerges from society, but places itself above it and increasingly alienates itself from it. They stressed that both rivalry between states, "competition in conquests", and the exacerbation of the class struggle within capitalist countries steadily expand the state machine and its military and police agencies, whose maintenance absorbs ever greater resources of society. This process is particularly stepped up in the epoch of imperialism and is expressed in the growth of state-monopoly tendencies. But only sophists can draw from this the conclusion that the state rises above classes and becomes independent of the dominating class. As for the biggest monopolies, the independence of state power from them is a sham. Alienation of the state from society signifies in reality stronger antagonism between the dominating class, whose instrument of power the state is, and the overwhelming majority of society's members. In the present era, this is only another expression of the fact that the interests of the biggest monopolies, of which the state is the defender, prove to be in irreconcilable contradiction

not only with the interests of the working class, the peasantry, the urban middle strata (artisans, small tradesmen, intellectuals), but also clash even with the interests of part of the bourgeoisie (petty and middle sections).

This also gives rise to opposite tendencies, extension of the forces resisting the omnipotence of the monopolies. While the executive branch is increasingly turned into a tool of monopoly domination, the pressure of the masses in a number of countries opens up possibilities for the ever wider use of representative bodies to carry out progressive measures in the interest of the majority of the people.

The process of alienation of political power from society is inevitable for the bourgeois state which stands above the people. It is also inevitable because of the antagonism between the state power of the minority (exploiters) and the overwhelming majority of society's members. But it is not and cannot be an inevitable natural process in the socialist state where political power represents and expresses at first the will of most members of society (the working people) and then of all members of society.

Of course, a boundary between state power and direct social power remains in socialist society, too. A machine of political power and people who serve this machine are necessary. Examining this question from the viewpoint of the relationship of interests regulated by the socialist state, it may be said that its designation is to ensure the rational combination of the interests of the whole people and the interests of various social groups. The socialist state expresses the interests of the whole people. But since the civil servants engaged in the work of administration also have their own interests, instances are possible when some of them may place their own interests above those of the entire people. For this reason alone it is impossible to rule out the possibility of their becoming divorced from the people, especially when socialist democracy is violated or is not adequately developed. Socialist society, however, has reliable means for preventing such phenomena. These means are the consistent implementation of the principles of socialist democracy, especially the provisions that government officials are accountable to the people and can be replaced, greater public control over the state machine, systematic struggle against bureaucracy, enlistment of ever more people into administering

state and social affairs. The Soviet state apparatus is called upon not only to administer society's affairs in the interest of the people, but also to serve as a school of state administration for the masses.

Divorce from the masses and other adverse phenomena can be forestalled by the guiding activity of the Communist Party which, being an advanced detachment of the people, the highest form of organisation of the working class, is free from any departmental, parochial and other narrow interests. The high level of consciousness of the members of the Party, which unites the most progressive men and women, and its role as the leading and most authoritative organisation of society make the Party capable of controlling the organs of power, of ensuring their accountability to the people, capable of resolving, in the interest of the people, the contradictions arising between the interests of various groups, organisations and departments.

We also must not forget that a possibility is not an *inevitability*. The tendency toward a divorce from the masses is not inherent in the socialist state. The formation of a state of workers and peasants by itself signifies a decisive step in eliminating the alienation of state power from the mass of the population, a step of epochal importance. The further development of the socialist state is aimed at the ever greater enrolment of the working people in administration. As time goes on, work in the administrative apparatus will cease to be a special profession. The functions of managing the economy, of administering social affairs will become accessible to an ever wider range of people, and with the disappearance of class distinctions, with the complete victory of communism, will lose their political character. This will ultimately result in the conversion of organs of state power into organs of social self-administration. To look upon the matter differently would mean to obliterate the fundamental antithesis between the laws of development of the socialist and the bourgeois state. That is why attempts to consider the existence of the state and political power in general as a form of "alienation" are wrong.

As for the withering away of the state this process can be characterised as follows.

First, the function of the military suppression withers away, the sphere for the application of state compulsion is

curtailed in general and, hence, the need for agencies which apply it gradually disappears.

Second, the withering away of the state presupposes the conversion of its guidance of economic and cultural affairs from political into social functions. The withering away of the state is expressed not in that economic functions in general are curtailed, but in that these functions lose their political nature. The latter becomes possible when class distinctions disappear and the remnants of capitalism are eliminated in the economy, in the minds of people and the way of life.

Third, withering away of the state presupposes the enlistment of all people into managing production, in deciding social affairs. From this follows the gradual disappearance of the need for an apparatus of political power. The withering away of the state is a process of development and extension of democracy in all spheres of social life.

The existence of the state is connected with the need for compulsion, effected by organs of political power. When this need vanishes, the state will no longer be necessary. It is also clear that as the socialist system is strengthened and the socio-political and ideological unity of the people is consolidated, the sphere for the application of state compulsion within a country gradually shrinks.

It would, however, be a gross error to draw from this the conclusion that the time has come for curtailing state compulsion and its agencies. The fostering of a new social discipline is not a simple process. The break-up of the old discipline based on the cruellest class oppression does not automatically produce a new, conscious discipline. It has often been observed that men who have discarded the yoke of the old discipline and have not acquired a new one become the carriers of anarchic behaviour which strikes at the very foundations of socialist law and order. Contempt for social duties and rules by anarchic-minded men and at times by outright offenders results in a conflict between them and society. In such cases society must not only employ persuasion, but also resort to compulsion through state agencies. This in no way runs counter to the perspective that the sphere for applying state compulsion is reduced as society advances to communism.

With the elimination of the survivals of the old world in all spheres of social life, the sources of anti-social actions

will disappear. People, as Lenin wrote, will gradually become accustomed to observe public order and the rules of social life without any compulsion, without any special machine of political power. It is this that will signify, given the necessary external conditions, the withering away of the state.

Diverse forms of compulsion are employed in socialist society: state administrative, social and economic. Their relationship does not remain unchanged. It stems from the concrete situation which determines the efficacy of various measures. Social studies conducted at a number of factories in various cities showed that administrative means still prevailed in the struggle against violators of labour discipline (for example, a reprimand by the shop superintendent, and so on), but they were the least effective. Violators of labour discipline fear most of all public measures of influence (discussion of a misdeed at a meeting of the workers, public censure) and also economic sanctions (loss of bonus, loss of the right to better housing accommodation, and so on).

In present-day conditions struggle against anti-social actions demands not only the firm application of means of compulsion. It is important not only to punish misdeeds, but also to prevent them. This is achieved above all by consolidating social discipline, making higher demands as regards discharging duties to society and fostering a sense of civic responsibility.

Democracy is not a mere sum-total of rights. It is also a totality of duties of the individual to society. Without awareness by every citizen of the socialist state that he is responsible for order in society, there can be no real civic activity and, consequently, no real development of democracy as such. In socialist society democracy presupposes the bringing up of people who consider themselves masters of the country, masters who not only enjoy rights, but are also responsible for everything.

The transition from socialism to communism is inextricably linked with the further development of socialist democracy. Communism is unthinkable without a high level of development of the economy and culture, without the comprehensive stimulation of the initiative and activity of the people. Whereas capitalism cannot exist without suppressing the political activity of the working people, communism cannot function normally otherwise than by stimulating the activity of the masses and drawing them into deciding all affairs of

society and the state. This is of no less significance for building communism than laying its material and technical basis. Socialist democracy is the means which ensures the continuous advance in the activity of the masses and the enlistment of ever wider sections of the people into the conscious making of history.

The practical meaning of the proposition about the state of the whole people is that socialist democracy must be developed to the utmost during the transition to communism. Everything hindering the development of democracy must be eliminated and the working people must be widely drawn into administering the state.

The Programme of the C.P.S.U. defines as follows the main trends in the development of socialist statehood in the period of building communism: utmost extension and improvement of socialist democracy, active participation of all citizens in administering the state and in guiding economic and cultural affairs, improving the work of the state apparatus and increasing the control of the people over its activity.

Development of democracy during the transition from socialism to communism must not be reduced to handing over a number of state functions to mass organisations. This, of course, is an important process which has already begun, but it cannot develop to the full at the present stage of socialism. That is why emphasis must not be shifted to turning over the functions of state agencies to mass organisations. Such a formulation of the question could actually bring about an undesirable weakening of state agencies (for example, in maintaining public order). This can be done only to the extent that social relations mature and only in such a way as not to weaken the socialist state. Communist social self-administration arises not outside state agencies and not alongside them, but out of them.

Development and improvement of socialist democracy proceeds along two lines; first, by further democratising state agencies and enlisting ever more people in their work; second, by enhancing the influence of mass organisations and their role in guiding society's life.

The task of raising the role of the Soviets is put into the foreground. The Soviets are an all-embracing organisation of the people, an embodiment of their unity. The Soviets of Working People's Deputies are not only state, but social

organisations. That is why to elevate the role of the Soviets means also to increase the influence the people exert on state affairs.

Various social organisations and activists take part in the work of state agencies. More than 23 million persons participate in the activity of the standing commissions of the Soviets, ten times the number of deputies in the Soviets. A study by Sverdlovsk sociologists showed that the activists make up not less than 15 per cent of the adult population (total number of voters); their number has increased several times in recent years. People's control is one of the important forms of participation by citizens in administering the state. This control is one of the forms of genuinely mass participation of the whole people in deciding social affairs.

Utmost development of democracy prepares the conditions for the direct growing over of socialist statehood into communist social self-administration. But at the present stage of socialist society the practical task is the first and not the second side of this process. To shift the main emphasis now to self-administration would obviously mean to run ahead.

Marxism-Leninism regards the withering away of the state as a natural process which comes after the socialist state will have accomplished its intrinsic tasks. Thus, the function of suppressing the overthrown classes within the country was obviated, withered away, in the Soviet Union. This was a natural and inevitable result of abolishing these exploiting classes. It is clear that before this change was wrought in the class structure of society the function of suppressing the exploiting classes could not disappear. To call for abolishing it would have meant to disarm the working people in face of their class enemies.

This example shows that the withering away of the state and its functions cannot be accelerated by any artificial measures. It is not a prerequisite for success in building socialism and communism, but its consequence. The withering away of the state is a natural result of the changes which take place in socialist society in the course of its advance to communism. This process depends above all on the economic and cultural maturity of society. That is why to understand it properly it is necessary to take into account not only changes in the economy, but also changes in culture, in the spiritual life of socialist society.

Chapter V

THE ECONOMY AND THE NEW MAN

The process of changing social life covers both the material side of the social organism (known as the material culture of society), the entire system of social relations (in the economy, politics, daily life, and so on) and, lastly, people themselves (their consciousness, customs, habits and spiritual culture). All these changes form a single whole but they have their own distinct features in each social sphere. In contrast to a revolution in material, economic relations which, as Marx put it, can be ascertained with the precision found in natural science, it is incomparably more difficult and intricate to ascertain and measure changes in the minds of people. These changes, as a rule, are slower and entail greater obstacles than changes in the economic conditions of production. But this is as necessary a part of society's communist regeneration as the transformation of its material life. That is why a scientific conception of socialist society and its development into communism necessarily includes an analysis of the laws governing the changing of man's consciousness. This is particularly important if we consider the special role of consciousness in socialist society.

1. The Role of Objective Conditions and the Subjective Factor in Changing Human Consciousness

The diary of Jules Renard, well-known French writer, has the following entry: "To create an ideal community is wonderful, but out of what?"[1]

[1] Jules Renard, *Journal*, Paris, 1935, p. 810.

The dream of developing a new man has seemed unfeasible to many cultural leaders, even progressive ones. Where is the new man to come from if life engenders so much evil, fosters in men brutality, selfishness and other vices?

Many attempts were made to remake life along purely ideal lines but they invariably failed. Nor was their failure accidental. It resulted from inability to understand how to combine the change of objective conditions in which people live with a change in people themselves.

Many of the pre-Marxian theories of education were predicated on the correct idea that man is a product of the circumstances and that, consequently, to change him it is necessary to change the circumstances beforehand. To educate the new man it is necessary to make the environment itself humane. But when the question arose, how to change the environment, it was discovered that people themselves change it; consequently, to create truly humane circumstances *homo sapiens* has to be turned into a real man.

"The coincidence of the changing of circumstances and of human activity or self-changing can be conceived and rationally understood only as *revolutionising practice.*"[1] This is how Marx cut this Gordian knot.

The fundamental difference of Marxist theory from the preceding theories of education formulated by the 19th-century utopian socialists consists above all in that Marx rejected the substitution of education for the actual process of transforming society and disclosed the utopian nature of notions that society could be changed merely by improving the educational system.

Marx eliminated the duality of the earlier theories which at first separated the circumstances and the people and examined them as separate entities, being unable to understand their dialectical unity. They then inevitably arrived at the division of society into two parts—those who had to be educated and the educators, with the latter actually being placed above society.

Thus, the naturalistic notion that the conditions in which people live are independent of their practical activity ultimately led to the idealist view that the transformation of

[1] K. Marx and F. Engels, *The German Ideology*, p. 660.

people and then also of the conditions of their life is effected by some chosen élite. In contrast to this, Marx proceeded from the principle that history should be examined as the process of the self-generation of man effected in the course of his practical activity and transformation of the objective world.

For Marx education was not reduced to the influence of the environment on the moulding of some or other traits of man, as for example, Robert Owen believed. The latter asserted that "the whole character of man ... is formed *for him*", that "his whole character, physical, mental and moral, is formed *independently of himself*".[1] Education is a process of self-change of people in the course of their own activity. The practical activity of people is a real school of life in which characters are moulded.

Marx demonstrated that revolutionary practice is a process of people changing both the world around them and themselves. Overthrowing capitalism in a revolutionary way and building a new, communist society, the masses headed by the working class undergo a great schooling and are cleansed of the entire filth of the old society.

Marx, lastly, stressed the thought that it was "essential to educate the educator himself".[2] From this it follows that the forces capable of directing and heading the process of moulding the new man cannot come from the outside but are created as society itself develops, are born in the class struggle; it is only in this struggle that an advanced party, the vanguard of the working class, can grow and gain in strength. Only this formulation of the question pictures the moulding of the new man as a real process which is an integral part of the building of communism.

Marxism-Leninism rejects any attempt to separate the education of people from practical work for communism. Such separation inevitably deprives education of its material basis and reduces it to futile preaching of morals. Failures of utopian attempts to develop the new man in phalansterian colonies and communes which engaged in moral self-perfec-

[1] Robert Owen, *The Book of the New Moral World, Containing the Rational System of Society, Founded on Demonstrable Facts, Developing the Constitution and Laws of Human Nature and of Society*, London, 1836, pp. 65, 63.

[2] K. Marx and F. Engels, *The German Ideology*, p. 660.

tion have always been exploited to challenge the very possibility of remaking the minds of men. This is utilised by conservatives to prove the impossibility of changing human nature. After the adoption of the new programme of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, the *New Statesman*, a weekly of the British Labour Party, alleged that it was faced by one of the oldest challenges, that "socialism cannot change human nature". The weekly asserted that "in the latter passages of this Programme, all the traditional goals of Socialist utopians are called in aid. For the next two decades all the apparatus of the Soviet system is to be used to educate its citizens to live by a new code that might in part have been taken directly from Morris's *News from Nowhere*".[1]

All the arguments of the *New Statesman* are based on a very old idea about the anti-social essence of human nature which supposedly will always make itself felt under any social system. Hence, the notion that the rules of communist morality will have to be imposed on people from the outside, with the help of "all the apparatus of the Soviet system".

Such a notion, however, is alien to our understanding of the process of moulding human traits. We are not utopians and do not deny the need to apply coercion against malicious violators of public order, against anti-social elements. But for coercion to be effective it must rest on moral authority, on support of the people.

It goes without saying that to remake the minds of people who grew up under the old system and are not free from survivals of the past, is incomparably more difficult than to pick hundreds of especially devoted men and place them in phalansteries or other such hothouses. But, as Lenin explained in the first years of the October Revolution, this is not only a difficulty in building communism but also a guarantee of its feasibility. The building of socialism is begun by people, whose psychology has been shaped by centuries of private ownership, oppressed by capitalist exploitation and at the same time hardened in the struggle against it. That is why there is no need to put off the building of socialism to the time when especially devoted and cultured people will appear, which in essence is what the reformists

[1] *New Statesman*, Vol. LXII, No. 1586, August 4, 1961, p. 145.

advocate. This in general would mean to give up the revolution and communism because such people will never develop under capitalism, as long as they are not born of the struggle for communism itself. But it would be similarly wrong to think that communism can be built without the new people, that it is possible to confine the matter to building its material basis.

The fact that the change of circumstances and the change of people themselves coincide does not signify the complete merger of the two sides of this process, the objective and the subjective. Their dialectical unity is a contradictory phenomenon, whose different sides develop unevenly. Time and again life demonstrates the lag of the subjective side behind the objective. Thus, people, who objectively are the builders of the new world, are not always aware of this in full measure and, consequently, do not apply all the effort and energy needed for discharging their historic role. The subjective factor is frequently not utilised in education with adequate efficacy to influence the minds of people. But to rely on spontaneity in this matter, not to take care of the ideological, moral and cultural growth of people, the builders of communism, would not only retard the building of the new society but also doom it to failure in many respects.

Without the new man, communism is impossible, just as it would be without a powerful material and technical basis. His moulding is a prerequisite for the development of communist social relations and the application of the basic principle of communism. The first part of the principle of communism, "from each according to his ability", presupposes the all-round development of man's ability needed for achieving the highest labour productivity, in other words, improving not only technology, but also man himself. The second part of this principle, "to each according to his needs", is in general unfeasible if people do not learn to work for society to the full without expectation of reward, if the communist attitude to labour and to social property does not become the decisive trait of their moral outlook. Communism also presupposes the withering away of the legal mechanism of the state for regulating behaviour which was set up by socialist society, considering that people have not yet been emancipated from the legacy of the past in their way of life and thinking, and have not become accustomed

to work for society without definite rules of law. That is why the higher phase of communism, in contrast to the lower, is incompatible with the existence of the old customs, with survivals of the past in the behaviour of people and necessarily presupposes the cleansing of their moral and cultural aspect from the burdensome legacy of the past.

* * *

Notions about the immutability of human nature are refuted by life itself. Millions of people who are already following the moral commandments of socialism are best proof that as the social conditions change so does man's consciousness. The birth of the new man is a real process taking place with the practical participation of the masses in building communism. It is enough to visit any construction site in the U.S.S.R. to realise that here not only electric power stations, factories and buildings are created but also the new man, a collectivist by nature, who explodes the fabrications about the anti-social substance of human nature.

The new man on the regenerated land is the main achievement of the October Revolution. Economic and political transformations have determined deep changes in social consciousness. The more deeply the revolution tackled the great cause of regenerating the world, the wider became the circle of its participants. This was both a result and a prerequisite for the successful revolutionary remaking of society. To achieve socialist industrialisation, to convert the country in the shortest time from a backward, agricultural land into an advanced, industrial state millions of workers and other working people had to take part in this historic undertaking. The collectivisation of agriculture drew into socialist construction the working peasantry, the largest section of the population at that time. Soviet society is now enjoying the fruits of the titanic work of the people. But no less important are its spiritual fruits: the confidence of the people in their strength and awareness that they have become the makers of their own destiny.

For thousands of years, the people were brought up to feel lowly and insignificant. Religion fostered a scorn for earthly goods and the futility of struggle for a better life. "He who despises life on earth, shall win eternal life." The exploiters assured the workingmen that they were unable to run the

economy themselves, to administer the state and claimed that all civilisation would perish if the ignorant, dark masses were to take power. "And before long thou, the people, who holds nothing sacred, will be driven by the rod back into the old manger," the poetess Z. Gippius prophesied shortly after the victory of the October Revolution.

But the reactionaries, despite all their fury, were unable to turn back the wheel of history. The people awakened by the revolution straightened their backs, discarded the yoke of exploitation, felt their strength and demonstrated to the world their constructive powers. Working people who in the past had been considered "little men", learned to administer the state without exploiters, to build factories and electric power stations, to create the new world. The October Revolution has put an end to exploitation in the Soviet land for ever, has revealed the greatness of the people, and made them aware of their own strength. Herein is the source of its powerful influence on the spiritual world of man.

Without a radical social transformation no increase in man's power over nature can make him confident of his own strength and his future. One keynote—complaints about the instability of life—often resounds in the works of many philosophers, writers and publicists in Western countries. Günther Anders, a philosopher and publicist, begins his meditations with the following assertion: "If there is anything that modern man regards as infinite, it is no longer God; nor is it nature, let alone morality or culture; it is his own power.... The Promethean dream of omnipotence has at long last come true, though in an unexpected form...."[1] But it turns out that this omnipotence is relative, that man is helpless in face of his own handiwork, for example, the atomic bomb, which can cause his ruin, that people are alienated from one another. Anders concludes by stating: "...Each of us is like a worm artificially or spontaneously divided into two halves, which are unconcerned with each other and move in different directions."[2]

But who is man—Prometheus who has realised his dream or a helpless worm? To this question the capitalist world

[1] *Man Alone. Alienation in Modern Society*, edited by Eric and Mary Josephson, New York, 1962, p. 288.
[2] Ibid., p. 298.

cannot give a simple answer because this world is deeply contradictory, it has been rent asunder and split. Man needs a new society to put an end to the alienation of the fruits of his labour and to become a master of his actions. This is a society in which the means of production and products of labour are not separated from the producers, which is not dominated by spontaneity and anarchy and has no class barriers between people. The working people, who began by winning political power, then introduce the planned development of the economy and all sides of social life, create the material and cultural conditions for the all-round development of their intellect, capabilities and talents. The old saying, "man is the maker of his own destiny", acquires its true meaning for the first time.

The relations between society and the individual are shaped in a new way. The entire way of life in the world founded on the principle of private property restricted the people's world outlook. The old world fostered in man the illusion that he could achieve happiness only by himself. "A happy man is an enemy to all people," so says the title character in Gorky's novel *Foma Gordeyev*. This is not surprising: what other view could exist in a society where competition dominates, where every happy man looks upon all others as his rivals anxious to rob him of his well-being and of life itself? But such happiness is unstable and illusory. It turns into a misfortune for the overwhelming majority.

Socialism creates a society whose prosperity is the main condition for the well-being of each person. The concern of everyone for the welfare of the entire society and the concern of society for each of its members—this is a distinguishing feature of the socialist way of life. The new relations between society and the individual cannot but be reflected in the spiritual world of man. The social interests hold infinitely greater place in his thoughts and emotions than in the mind of preceding generations. People here are accustomed to live at one with the life of the entire country and not to confine themselves to a narrow philistine world. And if there are still philistines in socialist society, this in no way refutes the tremendous shifts in the minds of the people, brought about by the Great October Socialist Revolution.

Alan Sillitoe, a British writer, aptly noted that in the Soviet Union the broadest social interests are included in the spiritual world of the people. When visiting Bratsk he constantly heard the typical remarks: " 'We are constructing houses here,' or 'We are putting up a factory' or 'We have constructed a dam.' In England it is always: 'Have you heard, they're going to start building that new estate next year?' I would say to a workingman in Nottingham: 'What are you building here, mate?' And he would answer: 'They're building a new power station. They are building a block of offices.' In Soviet Russia I never heard anyone say 'they'. It was always 'we'—from the writers, the deputy mayor, the student, the woman resetting tiles in the power-station floor at Volzhsk."[1]

The secluded and limited spiritual world of the peasant, whose interests often did not go beyond the bounds of his village, are well known. Pierre Pascal, a French scientist who visited Russia in the 1920s, gave the following description of the way of life and thinking in Blokhino, a small village on the Volga. "Ignorance prevails as regards everything that does not concern the world of agriculture," he wrote. "The peasants have no idea of the location of European countries, which they know more or less only by name, and even their notions of history of Russia are very meagre.... Due to lack of information they are ready to believe any absurd rumours. Superstitions persist, they fear sorcerers and look for them. They imagine (when they think of it) that the earth rests on an immense ocean."[2]

V. Kondakov, a correspondent of *Komsomolskaya Pravda* who visited the same village 40 years later, did not venture to speak of the ocean "on which the earth rests", as he was afraid he would sound ridiculous. Today all children attend school and illiteracy among adults was wiped out as far back as the 1930s. There are newspapers and magazines and radio sets in every home and many have TV sets. The library has a stock of 7,650 books. English and French literature is represented here by the works of Shakespeare, Dickens, George Bernard Shaw, H. G. Wells, Galsworthy, Balzac, Sten-

[1] Alan Sillitoe, *Road to Volgograd*, London, 1964, p. 134.
[2] Pierre Pascal, "Mon village russe il y a quarante ans", *Cahiers du monde russe et soviétique*, Vol. VII, juillet-septembre 1966, p. 308.

dhal, Zola, Hugo, Dumas and many others. Films are shown in the club three times a week. The correspondent relates his conversations with peasants showing their great interest in events in the country and abroad. Speaking of K. T. Kuzmichev, a 78-year-old peasant, Kondakov writes: "It is not enough to say that he has a clear idea of major political events in foreign countries. The entire world is the sphere of the peasant's social interests and he tries to extend his knowledge of international affairs in every way."

All this undoubtedly reflects the influence exerted on the spiritual world of the people by the socialist way of life, the general cultural and educational advance of the population as a result of the cultural revolution in the U.S.S.R.

Many changes in the morality of the Soviet man are a consequence of the special significance of work in his life. According to Maxim Gorky, one of the greatest crimes of the old society was the fact that it killed in men awareness of the greatness of their work. Of course, in the past, too, men knew the joys of labour, but these were isolated episodes submerged in the stream of daily toil which sapped their strength and dulled their minds. The worker considered the time spent on the job as lost for his life, which began only after the end of the shift. Harvey Swados, an American writer who himself worked at a factory, speaks ironically of those who consider that today the worker in the capitalist world hardly differs from the bourgeois, from the "middle class".

"But there is one thing that the worker doesn't do like the middle class: he works like a worker," Swados stresses. "The steel-mill puddler does not yet sort memos, the coal miner does not yet sit in conferences, the cotton millhand does not yet sip martinis from his lunchbox. The worker's attitude toward his work is generally compounded of hatred, shame and resignation. . . .

"The plain truth is that factory work is degrading. It is degrading to any man who ever dreams of doing something worthwhile with his life; and it is about time we faced the fact. . . . The immigrant who slaved in the poorly-lighted, foul, vermin-ridden sweatshop found his work less degrading than the native-born high school graduate who . . . works in a fluorescent factory with ticker-tape production-control machines. . . .

"Almost without exception, the men with whom I worked on the assembly line last year felt like trapped animals."[1]

Labour as a trap, labour as a stultifying occupation which prevents a person from doing something worthwhile in life —such ideas are completely alien to the Soviet worker, no matter what job he does. He may be satisfied to a different extent by the concrete content of his labour, by his trade, but he knows that his work always has social significance, that he works for his own society and ultimately for himself.

The enemies of socialism often say: "You live in order to work, while we work in order to live." What nonsense! We do not at all think that the meaning and purpose of life are reduced to work. But for us work and life are not opposites as is the case for the worker in the capitalist world, because the world of socialism restores to the worker the joy of labour, turns labour into creative endeavour, into a form of displaying his capabilities and talents. "Creative labour" is a concept which formerly was considered applicable only to the activity of a few—composers, writers, artists. Today it precisely defines the nature of the labour of millions of workers and peasants, rationalisers, inventors and trail-blazers in production. Is it surprising that for such people life without their favourite occupation, without the possibility of working creatively and bringing benefit to society seems meaningless.

Work chiefly determines the place held by man in socialist society, and this favourably affects all social morality.

However much the defenders of capitalism play up certain adverse phenomena in the life of socialist society, they cannot conceal the fact that for socialism such phenomena are something running counter to its foundations, while for capitalism they are its inevitable product. There is reason why, according to Max Lerner, the author of *America as Civilisation*[2] it is possible to speak of "structural corruption" in American society, which organically stems from its mainstays, from the recognition of money as the sole, indisputable criterion of success in life.

Socialism gives the individual other guidelines in life. Here there is no gap, no abyss, between moral standards and

[1] *Man Alone. Alienation in Modern Society*, pp. 107, 111.
[2] M. Lerner, *America as Civilisation*, New York, 1959, pp. 664-66.

the conditions for success in life. Personal work, capabilities, awareness of civic duty provide the only, most reliable way to success. Personal well-being no longer runs counter to social well-being but, on the contrary, merges with the conditions for the development and prosperity of the entire society.

All this creates a solid basis for the moral progress of the entire society, however long and intricate this process. That is why the gains of socialism open up the possibility for the further advance of the communist consciousness of the people, for the bringing up of men who combine ideological principledness, industry and organisation, spiritual wealth and moral purity.

* * *

One of the prerequisites for a scientific analysis of socialist society is a sober, realistic account of the degree of economic and cultural maturity it has reached. The same must be said about the degree of maturity of social consciousness.

A distinguishing feature of social consciousness under socialism is that traits of the new and the old are intermingled in it. It is clear, for example, that although socialist consciousness has a number of traits which will also be characteristic of the higher phase of communism, they do not yet develop to the full under socialism. Many traits of communist consciousness (for example, the release of man from material concern for his personal existence) will arise only after the need for distribution according to work, money, for rules of law, is obviated.

The degree of maturity of social consciousness depends on the maturity of social relations themselves: the forms of property, exchange and distribution, and so on. The higher development level of the socialist consciousness of the working class as compared with the collective-farm peasantry is explained by the fact that the working class has greater experience of the revolutionary struggle and richer traditions, that the socialist changes in industry were effected earlier than in agriculture, that socialist relations themselves in the state sector attained greater maturity than in the collective-farm sector. The fact that the collective farmer engages in personal subsidiary farming, which at the present stage is economically necessary, that he sells on the market the

produce he obtains from the collective farm or in his farmyard plot undoubtedly affects his psychology and may slow down the elimination of the survivals of a private-property mentality. Similarly, the existing separation of mental from manual labour, the individual nature of the labour of some categories of the intelligentsia (the so-called liberal professions), may to a certain extent retard the elimination of the remnants of individualism from their psychology. Undoubtedly, for the degree of maturity of collectivist psychology, the working class is ahead of these categories of the intelligentsia, although the latter stand at a higher cultural level.

Present in the picture is the growth of consciousness of the masses, and many people in their behaviour approach the standards and ideals of communist society. Anton Makarenko, the well-known Soviet educator, voiced the idea that education should be oriented on such models. "Our moral code must be ahead of both our economic system and our laws, it must look to still higher forms of society."[1] As far as an ideal of education is concerned Makarenko's thought is fully justified. But just as law can never rise above the existing economic relations, similarly social consciousness, the morality of society taken as a whole, reflect—even with a certain lag—the degree of maturity attained by social relations. This does not preclude the possibility of the rise and development among the masses of shoots of a higher moral consciousness, but they cannot become the prevailing ones as long as the living conditions of people themselves do not change.

Thus, for example, the shoots of an attitude to labour as life's prime requirement develop already under socialism. But such an attitude to labour can become the rule for all members of society only when the material and technical basis of communism is built, when arduous and unskilled work disappears.

The existence of survivals of the past under socialism attests to the lagging of changes in the minds of people behind changes in their living conditions. But these facts require a more concrete analysis. Here first of all we must

[1] A. Makarenko, *Kniga dlya roditelei* (Book for Parents), 1949, p. 51.

differentiate between the epistemological and social sides of the problem. If we consider the epistemological side (consciousness, being secondary, reflects changes in social being not at once and not fully) there will always be such a lag, even under communism. The higher level of scientific cognition makes it possible to reduce the extent of this lag, to discover the tendencies maturing in life and to foresee their further development, but not to eliminate it completely. The preservation in social life of obsolete views, rules, customs, which no longer correspond to the altered conditions of life, is a different matter. Such remnants of the past will disappear in time or in any case will not be preserved and will not burden social life. They are survivals already under socialism, because classes that would consolidate or uphold the obsolete views and customs no longer exist. But they are quite tenacious and often, far from disappearing, are even re-animated.

Anti-social phenomena are not engendered by the socialist system. This, however, does not mean that they have no grounds in the objective conditions. A. B. Sakharov rightly pointed out in the symposium *The Building of Communism and the Spiritual World of Man*, that the objective conditions are not identical with socialist being.[1] The objective conditions which influence the minds of members of Soviet society include not only socialist social relations but also survivals of the past in the economy and the way of life, the level of production which is insufficient so far.

Eradication of the survivals of capitalism can be slowed down by economic difficulties and disproportions in the economy which are capable at times of re-animating and even stimulating the growth of adverse phenomena. That is why the struggle against the survivals of the past can be successful only through the further advance of the socialist economy and the improvement in the living standard of the people. The Programme of the C.P.S.U. draws attention to this point, linking the final eradication of crime with a rise in the material and cultural standards and consciousness of the working people, that is, with both objective changes in

[1] *Stroitelstvo kommunizma i dukhovny mir cheloveka* (The Building of Communism and the Spiritual World of Man), Nauka Publishers, 1966, p. 350.

the living conditions of people and changes in their spiritual life.

The influence of the capitalist world comes within the objective conditions which hinder the elimination of capitalism's survivals in the minds of members of socialist society. This influence is displayed in the fact that the threat of military attack by the imperialist states to a certain extent slows down the economic and social development of socialist society and may also give rise to sentiments of uncertainty and a passive attitude among insufficiently staunch and schooled people. The capitalist world is able to influence the minds of some members of socialist society because the latter has triumphed not in the most developed capitalist countries and has not yet surpassed them in per capita production and the living standard. This is utilised by the imperialists in their anti-communist propaganda aimed at using the glitter of the bourgeois way of life and culture to dazzle men who are insufficiently staunch ideologically.

Alongside objective conditions which can slow down the overcoming of survivals of capitalism in the minds of people or re-animate them, reasons of a subjective order also play a big part. Among these reasons are shortcomings in applying the socialist principles, in exercising control over the measure of labour and consumption, in organising labour and distribution, in accounting. Any violation of socialist principles inflicts on society not only material but also moral harm.

Let us take, for example, various violations of the socialist principle of distribution according to work. When the conformity between the measure of labour and consumption is violated—either in a way that conscientious labour is rewarded insufficiently or, on the contrary, poor work is remunerated excessively—this exerts a very harmful influence on the minds of people. Thus, anomalies in labour rating and payment for the production of different articles results in jobs being divided into "advantageous" and "disadvantageous". This can impel a worker to pit his personal interests against the interests of the enterprise. Directives of the Central Committee of the Hungarian Socialist Workers' Party on questions of ideological work (1965) point out: "Mistakes in material stimulation at times result in a harmful way of thinking. If some persons, to the detriment of the social interests, receive undeserved payment not in accordance with

the work done, but as a result of a biased, subjective opinion, this necessarily tends to increase petty-bourgeois sentiments. To eliminate such undesirable phenomena effectively it is necessary to see to it that the work actually done should be more appreciated and respected."[1]

Shortcomings in labour organisation, remuneration and distribution are harmful because they provide loopholes for abuses, and this results in a kind of extended reproduction of attitudes alien to socialism. The Soviet press has reported that shortcomings in the accounting system and excessively big rates of natural shrinkage of some goods on sale offer dishonest persons loopholes for enrichment. Of course, such shortcomings by themselves do not engender dishonesty. But they enable dishonest persons to draw into their machinations men who were normally honest but insufficiently staunch morally and could not resist the temptation of easy pickings.

Mistakes in economic, cultural and educational activity also contribute to spreading anti-social phenomena. For example, shortcomings in educational work both in school and in the family tend to foster adverse sentiments among young people. At times the school does not pay due attention to fostering respect for "ordinary" work, which gives rise to a striving among some young people to engage in all kinds of "exciting" vocations. On the other hand, some parents who shelter their children from all kinds of difficulties develop in them, not wishing or realising it, a tendency to expect society to take care of them, without, however, feeling obligated to reciprocate by working for the good of society.

Lastly, shortcomings in ideological work and its weaknesses which are frequently exploited by the enemies of communism, are a major subjective factor which slows down the elimination of survivals of capitalism.

From this brief analysis it follows that the uprooting of the survivals of capitalism and the moulding of a new, communist consciousness are possible only if the roles of both the objective conditions and the subjective factor are properly considered.

[1] *Some Urgent Ideological Tasks of the Hungarian Socialist Workers' Party. Directives of the Central Committee. Information Bulletin*, Central Committee, H.S.W.P., Budapest, No. 3, 1965, p. 13.

* * *

The influence of the objective conditions on the minds of people can either run counter to or, conversely, in the same direction as, the operation of the subjective factor. This largely determines the efficacy of the subjective factor. For example, in a factory where production is improperly organised and wasteful, the most impassioned calls for thrift, for an improvement of quality will be futile. Alongside explanatory, ideological work it is necessary to take measures for improving the organisation of production. Only unity of the objective conditions and the action of the subjective factor can ensure the overcoming of the old and development of the new, socialist traits of consciousness.

Of decisive significance among the objective conditions for the building of communism is the creation of its material and technical basis and the development of corresponding economic relations. The economy influences the moulding of the new man in a variety of ways.

By their nature the economic relations of socialist society furnish a basis for developing in people such traits as collectivism, comradely mutual assistance, a thrifty attitude to production, and so on. The improvement of socialist production relations, for example, the introduction of cost accounting, yields not only an economic effect but also helps to make the workers more interested in bringing to light and utilising the potentialities of production, awakens in them a sense of their responsibility for the work of the enterprise. Work at socialist enterprises, provided it is properly organised, becomes a school for the economic and civic education of the people.

Improvement of the socialist organisation of production, greater efficiency of production, the introduction of scientific achievements and the best labour methods, also greatly influence the development of people. Tendencies such as socialist co-operation in labour, exchange of experience, emulation and the drawing together of mental and manual labour are characteristic of production under socialism. At capitalist enterprises a worker who masters new methods frequently keeps them secret from his fellow-workers. At socialist enterprises, on the contrary, a front-ranker considers it his moral duty to pass on his experience to others. Not only the best workers but also entire collectives help those lagging

behind. This is how exchange of experience and comradely mutual assistance become a standard of life and work for millions of people.

The organisation of labour is improved as technological progress spreads. It will be recalled that at many enterprises, alongside a high degree of mechanisation of the main jobs, many auxiliary operations remain unmechanised, and their performance offers no scope for the worker's capabilities. At times production operations are unnecessarily broken down, which makes labour monotonous.

In conditions of rapid technological progress it becomes possible for workers to replace each other, and periodic changes of operations performed by each team member are arranged. This raises labour productivity and at the same time promotes the cultural and technical development of the workers, the prime productive force of society.

Further improvement of the living standard is one of the decisive conditions for moulding the new man.

In socialist society the improving living standard creates better conditions for fostering communist consciousness and eliminating survivals of capitalism. Some bourgeois politicians and sociologists are trying to assure Soviet people that a higher living standard will lead to the "bourgeoisification" of the population of socialist countries and to the loss of their revolutionary spirit. These views are shared by the Left-wing opportunists who pose as ultra-revolutionaries and advocate asceticism in order to preserve the "revolutionary purity" of people. To take such a stand means to proclaim as nonsense the activity of the working people aimed at building socialism and communism, at securing a well-to-do and cultured life.

Advances in the living standard of the people also tend to promote their education, stimulate their labour activity, and help to eradicate negative phenomena, which in the past were bred by poverty and ignorance. That is why the rapid expansion of production and a rise in the living standard are of great importance for consolidating socialist elements in the minds of people; they create a basis for eliminating many negative phenomena inherited from the past. The living standard advances on the basis of socialist economic relations and leads to improving the living conditions of all, that is, of society as a whole.

This, however, does not signify that a rise in material welfare automatically strengthens socialist consciousness. If it is not combined with an adequate organisation of distribution and the way of life, with ideological, educational work, it may lead to increasing selfishness, money-grubbing and greed among some people. It should be also taken into consideration that higher personal earnings in conditions where there is a lag in culture and an absence of real concern for meeting cultural requirements and organising recreation facilities may lead to some adverse phenomena, for example, an increase in drunkenness. Therefore, to eliminate the survivals of the past in the minds of people it is necessary, alongside an advance of material welfare, to raise their cultural level and education and, consequently, to develop the educational system and the network of cultural and educational establishments.

In the process of transition to communism, alongside payment for work which remains the main form of distribution, the social consumption funds gain in importance. This involves a gradual reorganisation of the way of life. With the growth of social funds the system of social upbringing of children, public catering and other services are greatly extended. Ultimately they will create the possibility for replacing domestic work by social forms of satisfying family needs. A reorganisation of the way of life, of course, will also influence family relations. It will help eliminate the remnants of actual inequality between woman and man, emancipate the woman from domestic drudgery which hinders her spiritual development. Solution of the housing question will also contribute to improving morals and the relationships of people in daily life.

The development of social consumption funds is linked with the increasing introduction of genuine collectivism in the daily life of people. Many requirements which are now satisfied individually will increasingly be met by various social establishments and institutions (canteens at factories, offices and housing estates, holiday homes, clubs, and so on). This will facilitate more diversified and richer contacts of people.

Together with changes in the forms of distribution, the forms of personal ownership of consumer goods, as well as its scope, will also change. Contrary to simplified notions,

Marxism-Leninism does not regard personal property in socialist society as a source of individualism and selfishness.

The source of individualistic aspirations is not personal property in consumer goods, but property acquired not through labour but in circumvention and violation of the socialist principle of distribution, property utilised for enrichment at the expense of others. That is why the task is not to abolish personal property but to remove loopholes for its abuse, for violating socialist principles. At the same time socialist society fosters in people devotion to communism, extends their horizon and broadens their spiritual needs so that they should not become the "slaves" of their own personal property.

An increase in wages, paid according to the work done, naturally leads to an increase in the personal property of citizens. In future, as social forms of satisfying people's requirements develop, certain types of personal ownership will become unnecessary and will gradually wither away.

Economic progress influences the moulding of the new man not only directly by changing his working and living conditions. The possibility of reducing labour time and increasing free time depends on the development of the productive forces and above all on a rise in the productivity of social labour. In the U.S.S.R. the average length of the working week in the national economy was 39.4 hours in 1968. Alongside the general increase in free time, of great importance is an improvement in the services (transport, retailing, public catering), which will cut the irrational expenditure of free time. This will further increase the leisure of people and open up broad vistas for the development of their capabilities. Leisure time will be taken up by social activity, cultural, scientific, technical and artistic creative endeavour and sports.

The moulding of the new man is organically linked with the process of creating the material and technical basis of communism and the development of socialist social relations into communist relations. This is an intricate and multifaceted process. It presupposes a further improvement of socialist productive relations and their gradual conversion into communist relations; the elimination of essential distinctions between town and country, between mental and manual labour and the obliteration of social distinctions between the

working class, the collective-farm peasantry and the intelligentsia, the development of communist forms of work and way of life and, lastly, the all-round development and improvement of socialist democracy. All these processes decisively influence the moulding of the spiritual aspect of people.

During the advance to communism, communist forms of the social system will arise and develop and, under their influence, adherence to communist ideology will grow stronger. "Joint planned labour by the members of society, their daily participation in the management of state and public affairs and the development of communist relations of comradely co-operation and mutual support," it is pointed out in the Programme of the C.P.S.U., "recast the minds of people in a spirit of collectivism, industry and humanism."[1]

A change in the consciousness of the people, determined by changes in their social being, is not, however, a fully spontaneous phenomenon. Society directs this process in a planned way, influencing the consciousness of people by remaking the conditions of their life and by appropriate ideological work. For the process of education to be optimally effective it is necessary organically to combine both sides. To neglect the first side would mean to deprive ideological work of its objective basis, to reduce its effect. To neglect the other side would mean to belittle the ideological development of the people, to confine their horizon to personal interests, to weaken the sources of their enthusiasm and initiative in work.

To hope that the consciousness of people will be renewed of itself and that anti-socialist phenomena will wither away without vigorous struggle against them would mean to slip from the positions of dialectical materialism to the positions of vulgar materialism. While banking on spontaneity is intolerable in economic development, it is even more so in education, for communist education has its objective basis in the development of the socialist economy and socialist relations and, in turn, influences their development. The growth and consolidation of moral stimuli to work accelerates the building of communism's material and technical basis, helps

[1] *The Road to Communism*, p. 564.

strengthen socialist social relations and their gradual growing over into communist relations.

While recognising the great role played by the planned, purposeful influence exerted on the consciousness of people, it would be wrong to deny the importance of the spontaneous element in moulding moral views, habits and customs. The idea is expressed at times that the new, communist mores are introduced in socialist society by the Party and other mass organisations, by the system of education and the ideological media. If this were the case it would hardly be possible radically to change the consciousness of people, and doubts in the possibility of transforming human nature would be justified.

But the point is that in socialist society life itself educates people in a spirit corresponding to the requirements of its morality. The moulding of the new man is a result of a twofold process: on the one hand, the influence of objective conditions—education by life itself and, on the other, the effect of the subjective factor—education by means of ideological influence.

The first of these processes is largely spontaneous. In any society people under the influence of the social relations they enter into become accustomed to definite forms of behaviour that are consolidated in their minds as indisputable standards. The point is what these relations are and what influence they exert on moral consciousness. In socialist society, as we shall subsequently show, this influence proceeds in a diametrically opposite direction from that under capitalism. The power exerted by the spontaneous impact of living conditions on the minds of people must be utilised most effectively. The means of communist education could not be so effective if life itself would not facilitate the development of moral habits in people. That is why the moulding of the new man proceeds most successfully not when attempts are made to eliminate the spontaneous effect of the objective conditions (this is unfeasible), but when the objective conditions are so changed that they influence the minds of people in the direction society needs. The latter is attainable only when the real interests of the people are considered in educational work.

2. Combination of the Social and Personal Interests and the Moulding of the New Man

It was established long before Marxism that combining social and personal interests is a prime requisite for the moral regeneration of society. This idea was expressed by the French materialists of the 18th century, particularly Helvétius, in their struggle against feudalism. Their initial premise is that people are not bad by nature but only pursue their own interest. If they act wrongly this is a consequence of the bad social system. In a despotic state personal interest is never linked with the social interest because baseness is respected and mediocrity is rewarded. It is necessary to change the social system, to abolish feudalism and then personal interest will no longer run counter to social interest. The task of a wise law-giver is to link private interest with social interest. Such, according to Helvétius, is the "true spirit of the laws". "I maintain," Helvétius wrote, that "all people strive solely for happiness, that it is impossible to divert them from this aspiration, that it would be useless to do so and would be dangerous to achieve it and that, consequently, they could be made virtuous only by combining personal interest with common interest."[1]

This idea of the importance of combining personal and social interest for educating people was basically correct. But the notion of attaining such a combination under capitalism proved to be illusory, as was soon demonstrated by life itself.

Moral preaching under capitalism has little effect. Bourgeois society has no lack of high-sounding moral maxims but they invariably collapse on coming into contact with life. The reason is that capitalism could not, and did not, bring the harmony between personal and social interest promised by the enlighteners.

Mutual assistance, sympathy for other people, a humane attitude toward them are diligently preached in moral maxims, but life teaches people different things—greed, selfishness, indifference to social duty.

The contradiction between moral preaching and life and the consequent hypocrisy of bourgeois ethics was noted by

[1] Helvétius, *De l'Esprit*, Paris, 1843, p. 103.

some penetrating minds when capitalism was still in its youth. *The Fable of the Bees: or, Private Vices, Publick Benefits* was published in Britain at the beginning of the 18th century. Once upon a time, its author relates, there was a rich and large beehive. The bees inhabiting it possessed all the intrinsic traits of men. They cheated each other at every step. Each bee strove for its own welfare, and nevertheless the beehive thrived. But an honest bee appeared. It succeeded in persuading its sisters to give up their vices and become virtuous. Mutual robbery stopped, the judges and the police had nothing to do. Together with the vices the striving for enrichment disappeared from the hive. The bees turned into paupers, social life decayed and the hive was plunged into slumber.

From his fable B. Mandeville drew the conclusion that in bourgeois society vices are necessary and useful. ". . . Not the Good and the Amiable but the Bad and Hateful Qualities of Man, his Imperfections and the want of Excellencies which other Creatures are endued with, are the first Causes that made Man sociable beyond other Animals. . . ."[1] Man is selfish and it is his shortcomings that promote the development of society.

Mandeville, an honest man with a clear head, as Marx described him, only expressed frankly what others preferred to keep silent about; capital destroys the truly human ties between people, leaving hard cash and greed as the sole binding force in the world of property owners.

Profit, the supreme deity of the capitalist system, distorts all human relations, debases human morality and holds up the crudest and lowest egoism as a decisive stimulus of the behaviour of private owners in their economic relations. That is why almost from their very inception economics and ethics have been regarded as hostile spheres. Adam Smith, one of the fathers of political economy, was active in both of them. He wrote not only *An Inquiry into the Nature and Causes of the Wealth of Nations* but also the *Theory of Moral Sentiments*.

But the points of departure in the two works are opposed. In the moral sphere Smith takes as the prime source sym-

[1] B. Mandeville, *The Fable of the Bees: or, Private Vices, Publick Benefits*, Vol. I, London, 1728, p. 395.

pathy and concern about what happens to others; in the economy, egoism, indifference to others, a striving to satisfy only one's own interests. But the "altruism in ethics" is pale as compared with the picture of "egoism in economics" painted by Smith.

In contrast to ethics, in economics Smith is fully realistic. "It is not from the benevolence of the butcher, the brewer, or the baker, that we expect our dinner, but from their regard to their own interest. We address ourselves, not to their humanity but to their self-love, and never talk to them of our own necessities but of their advantages."[1] In those days bourgeois ideologists could afford to be frank. They had no need to hide the fact that in the economy of capitalism there was no room for humanity: every person pursued his own interests, while care for others was alien to him. Competition, the struggle of all against all, was considered at that time a requisite for progress.

Today, the times are different. Arguments about the beneficial role of competition are increasingly losing ground among the masses in face of capitalist reality which resembles a pond in which the big fish swallow the small fry with impunity. The domination of the capitalist monopolies in the economy and in all social life has exploded the myth that success in life depends solely on the personal enterprise of the individual. But the more capitalism's contradictions are laid bare, the more hypocritical become the speeches of its apologists. They vainly overexert themselves to prove that capitalism has become "democratic" or turned into "people's capitalism". Some of them even suggest giving up the name "capitalism" and calling it henceforward "economic humanism". "Human relations" at capitalist enterprises are advocated as if capitalism with its drive to squeeze everything out of man is compatible with truly human relations.

Only a radical change of the economic system and not miserable handouts to the workers, suggested by the proponents of the "humanisation of labour" to preserve the capitalist system, can put an end to the crippling of man. Only socialism links together the concepts of "economy" and "humanism". The very aim of socialist production—ever

[1] Adam Smith, *An Inquiry into the Nature and Causes of the Wealth of Nations*, Vol. I, London, 1887, p. 15.

fuller satisfaction of the people's growing material and cultural needs—is profoundly humane. It signifies that the development of production is no longer subordinated to the extraction of profit by private owners but serves the interests of society, the interests of man. Awareness by the people that they work not for exploiters but for themselves, for their own society, ennobles their labour and invests it with a profound meaning. They know that every step forward in socialist production also spells a rise in their welfare, brings with it an improvement in their condition and eases their work. It is natural that the economic plans of the U.S.S.R. have, alongside a section on tasks in economic development, a section on the advance of the people's living standard. These are inseparably interconnected tasks: it is on the continuous development and improvement of socialist production that the people's living standard depends.

The socialist economy which solidly rests on social ownership of the means of production underlies the comradely relations between people conforming to the lofty principles of socialist humanism. These principles are rooted in the economy which does not know exploitation of man by man, competition or implacable hostility between people. For the first time after thousands of years of antagonistic class societies, a social system has been created in which the economy and genuinely humane morality are not hostile. This ensures a firm basis for educating the new man.

The actions of a man in any society are greatly influenced by his life's aim, which is shaped under the direct impact of his daily experience, i.e., by definite notions of what his thoughts and aspirations should be concentrated on, what can bring him success in life. Classic and modern literature amply shows how conditions in capitalist society teach man.

The French writer Emile Zola in his preparatory materials for the novel *La curée* noted: "It is necessary that the scoundrels should win. This is in the nature of things."

Social interests are widely extolled in bourgeois moral sermons, but life teaches people differently: to be successful one must consider only one's own interests. "In our days," James Aldridge, an English writer, states, "morality of the Western world has become hopelessly entangled in contradictions between the greedy nature of our social existence and the Christian basis of our education which asserts that man must

not be greedy, selfish and brutal. This is a contradiction between social morality and real life which capitalism is unable to resolve."[1]

The socialist system removes the grounds for such a gap between moral preachings and life. And this first of all is a result of the fact that the objective basis of socialist society organically combines social and personal interests.

The position of man in socialist society is determined above all by his personal abilities and work. It is not the making of money but experience and knowledge, honest work for society that opens up to millions of people the high road to success in life. Of course, under socialism, too, there are people who look for, and unfortunately at times find, devious ways to success, utilising for this purpose dishonest gain, flattery, connections, and other unsavoury means. They inflict harm on society both because they take up an undeserved place in life and create a delusive impression of "easy" ways to success.

Under socialism, possibilities still remain in economic life of enabling individuals to advance their private interests at the expense of the interests of society. Violation or insufficiently consistent application of the principle of distribution according to work done gives idlers and money-grubbers a chance to live at the expense of others, at the expense of society. The same result is produced by violations of socialist democracy and of the practical selection of personnel according to their efficiency. That is why consistent struggle against violations of the principles of socialism is a prerequisite for effective moral education. This implies the closing of all loopholes utilised by some cunning people to lead an idle life, consistent and steady safeguarding of social property, strict control over the measure of labour and measure of consumption of each worker, struggle against violations of socialist law and order and protection of society from the bearers of alien morality.

* * *

Socialist society condemns the attempts of individuals to counterpose their personal interest to social interest. This, however, does not mean that it generally condemns man's

[1] *Izvestia*, Moscow, November 11, 1966.

striving to satisfy his personal interest. Both economic and moral relations in society are based on a rational combination of personal and social interests.

The Marxist conception of a combination of personal and social interests fundamentally differs from the concepts of Helvétius and other ideologists of the progressive bourgeoisie. For Helvétius personal interest is primary and from it he deduces the social good. On the contrary, scientific socialism gives primacy to social interests. "Only in community with others has each individual the means of cultivating his gifts in all directions; only in the community, therefore, is personal freedom possible."[1] That is why for the Marxist, for the Communist, personal interest is *subordinate* to the social good.

Thus, a new, *communist* content is vested in the formula about combining personal and social interests.

Recognition of the prime significance of social interests does not at all imply suppression of personal interests. The position of the individual and his interests are always determined by the social conditions. One person cannot change or improve these conditions. This task can be accomplished only by an advanced class, by the mass of the people who are making history. That is why Marxists, in contrast to anarchists who advocate uncurbed individualism, have always fostered the spirit of collectivism, awareness of the need for solidarity and conscious common struggle. One of the prime requisites for success of the proletariat's revolutionary struggle is the ability of its participants to subordinate their personal interests to the interests of the class, to the requirements of firm discipline and conscious struggle against the exploiters. The morality of revolutionary fighters is incompatible with the morality of anarchistically minded petty-bourgeois individualists who do not wish to reckon with social discipline, with the collective and put to the foreground their "own personality". Such people are the bearers of the philistine individualism which Maxim Gorky so ruthlessly exposed. Their aspirations were expressed by one of the characters in Gorky's play *The Philistines*, Pyotr Bessemyonov, a philistine whose "civic spirit lasted only for half an hour". Under the influence of his fellow-students he participated in

[1] Marx and Engels, *The German Ideology*, p. 93.

a demonstration against the reactionary tsarist regime and then recanted. "The devil egged me on to take part in these stupid riots," he fumed. "I entered the university to study and study I did.... I felt no regime preventing me from studying Roman law... not at all... I felt the regime of comradeship... and yielded to it. And so two years of my life have gone to the dogs ... yes! This is coercion, coercion against me. Isn't that so?... 'A man must be a citizen first and foremost!', society as represented by my comrades shouted. I was a citizen... the devil take them.... I... do not want, I am not obliged to submit to the demands of society. I am an individual. The individual is free...."[1] Gorky's play lays bare the utter insignificance of such an individual, his spiritual poverty and the illusory nature of his "freedom" which conceals fawning upon the money-bag.

Recognition of the prime significance of social interests is of no less importance in building the new society than in the revolutionary struggle against the old society. The building of socialism and communism demands the pooling of effort by millions of working people. The Communist Party fosters in the people understanding that the personal welfare of everyone depends on the success of this construction. For centuries capitalism taught people to care only for their own welfare and to act according to the saying "each for himself...". Communist morality is formed in the struggle against such habits and traditions.

Social ownership of the means of production erodes the soil which nurtures greed and selfishness, and invariably raises the importance of social motives in the activity of people. The thriving of the socialist system in the final count also determines the personal opportunities of every member. Only by multiplying the collective wealth is it possible to achieve a stable and steady improvement in the living standard of every member of the socialist society. That is why personal interests must be subordinated to social. Their combination constitutes the powerful driving force of socialism.

Rational combination of personal and social interests does not mean that they are identical and fully merge. It is because contradictions between them are possible that the question of subordinating personal interests to social is raised.

[1] M. Gorky, *Complete Works*, Russ. ed., Vol. 6, Moscow, 1950, p. 25.

True, the opinion is at times voiced in Marxist literature that the very presentation of the question of subordinating personal interests to social is wrong. The article of Dietrich Noske, a German Marxist, "Concerning the Interrelation Between Individual and Social Interests" expounds some correct ideas about the materialist understanding of the nature of interest. "In reality," Noske writes, "social interests are simultaneously the determining essential interests of the individual." From this correct proposition he, however, draws an incorrect conclusion: "If we proceed from the fact that the essential personal interests are identical with the interests of society, it is impossible to speak simply of subordinating the former to the latter. On the contrary, the individual subordinates to his essential personal interests all the other personal interests. Consequently, alongside the relationship between personal and social interests we have here subordination *within* the personal interests."[1]

Noske is right when he emphasises that the interests of society come within the range of the interests of the individual. It could not be otherwise because the people who make up a society or a class are the bearers of all these types of social interests. But the relation between social and personal interests is a relationship of interpenetration and not of identity. Social interests, as pointed out earlier, are not dissolved in personal ones. By entering the range of interests of an individual, they do not lose their independence. On the other hand, among man's interests it is apparently necessary to differentiate those that are connected with his needs as an individual and those linked with his being a member of socialist society as a whole.

Noske fears that by recognising the need to subordinate personal interests to social it is easy to arrive at the false conclusion that they can be realised only through struggle *against* social interests. But such a conclusion does not follow from the given premise. Is it not more logical, on the contrary, to arrive at another conclusion: personal interests must be subordinated to social because it is impossible to attain happiness and personal welfare by individual effort.

[1] Dietrich Noske, "Zum Verhältniss von persönlichen und gesellschaftlichen Interessen", *Deutsche Zeitschrift für Philosophie*, No. 11, Berlin, 1963, S. 1369.

They can be achieved only through collective struggle for the interests of the entire society.

The latter determines the *unity* of social and personal interests. But struggle for the interests of society, opening the path to happiness for all its members, may in certain circumstances demand of an individual or a group of people self-sacrifice and privation, the ability to forego their individual interests. It would be wrong to think, however, that this is a contradiction only for unintelligent people who wrongly understand their personal interests. Of course, a false, to be more exact, too narrow; limited understanding of personal interests is possible. But contradictions between the personal and the social occur not only in such cases. The high consciousness of a man is displayed not in the fact that he is rid of such contradictions, but in the way in which he resolves them: in favour of society, sacrificing, if necessary, not only his personal interests, but even life itself (for example, in defending his native land).

Contradictions between social and personal interests may be of a different kind. There are, for example, contradictions which arise from the fact that difficulties of the struggle for communism make it necessary to limit or postpone the satisfaction of personal needs, to make certain sacrifices. Such contradictions are temporary; they are obviated as the new society is built and will finally vanish under communism. In this respect distinctions between socialism and communism are quite considerable: at the first phase of communism, owing to the insufficient development of the productive forces, society is still unable to satisfy all the vital requirements of people, which inevitably gives rise to some contradictions between personal and social interests; these contradictions will vanish at the second phase of communism when harmonious relations between the individual and society will be established on the basis of the highest development of the productive forces.

There are, however, contradictions of another kind which arise from the fact that man has to consider not only personal aspirations but also the needs of society. For example, society will always need people capable of performing definite jobs or assignments at a given time. There may be cases when the performance of jobs or assignments will make it necessary for some people to forego their personal interests

for a time. Such contradictions will also remain under communism. They will not disappear, just as room for heroism will never disappear. And apparently the collective will always foster in people a sense of social duty, the ability, when necessary, to subordinate their personal interests to the interests of society.

It is necessary to differentiate between these contradictions which are inevitable and those caused by shortcomings in the organisation of society's life, work and distribution. Such contradictions, which give rise to a divergence between social and personal interests, are not always merely a result of mistakes; they can also develop naturally when certain forms of social relations become obsolete. But they are resolved in an entirely different way and stand in different relation to the tasks of education. It is clear that educational work cannot compensate for shortcomings in labour organisation. No appeals to lofty moral stimuli and motives can eliminate, for example, a contradiction between the interests of a worker, an enterprise and the entire national economy. To overcome such contradictions it is necessary first of all to improve the forms of organising the economy. Only this can ensure greater unity of the social, collective and personal interests in *objective* reality and, consequently, ensure conditions enabling all people to become *aware* of this unity.

Proper combination of social and personal interests is a prime means and instrument for educating the people. The point is that such education is effected through their own practical activity and they are prompted by their own interests. That is why it is impossible to enlist people in activity which greatly facilitates their education in the spirit of communism otherwise than by combining their personal interests with social. To ignore either side of this unity—whether personal or social interest—means to foredoom the educational work.

Thus, personal interests must not be ignored, education must not be based on suppressing personal interests and aspirations. Such attempts are at times justified by arguments that the fostering of lofty moral traits presupposes selfless service to society and, consequently, is alien to personal interests. From this the conclusion is drawn that communist society, where labour will become life's prime requirement, can be built only by developing lofty moral stimuli to work

and that the personal material incentive hinders the accomplishment of this task.

To counterpose personal material interest to communist consciousness means to keep repeating the mistake made in the past by "Left Communists" and Trotskyites, the mistake rightly criticised by Lenin. "This is a real theoretical muddle," Lenin stressed. "... What is more, it is a retreat from what has actually been achieved and tested in practice. We can't have that; it will lead to no good."[1] Lenin called for building strong bridges to socialism not only on enthusiasm but, with the help of enthusiasm engendered by the great revolution, on personal interest, on cost accounting.

Denial of the need for the personal material interest of the worker in the results of his labour is a manifestation of subjectivism which ignores the nature and the objective laws of the first phase of communism. This is a characteristic feature of the subjectivist approach: outwardly it seems like an attempt to run ahead, to skip over uncompleted stages of development, but actually it signifies a step back from scientific communism to the antediluvian ideas of petty-bourgeois socialism with its characteristic egalitarianism and asceticism.

Attempts to revive petty-bourgeois socialism, naturally, can only do harm. Wherever levelling has been allowed, it has always inflicted serious harm both on socialist production and the education of people. It has undermined labour discipline, speeded up the turnover of labour, hampered the growth of labour productivity and encouraged idlers and drones.

Egalitarian tendencies give rise not to a working man's but to a "grubber's" psychology and orient the people not on creating but on dividing society's wealth.

High moral stimuli originate and spread among the masses not in isolation from the material stimuli. The record of communist construction affords many examples when people who adhere to lofty ideas and understand their social interests make material sacrifices, forego their personal interests for the good of society. But on these grounds it would be wrong to ignore personal material incentives, to consider that they could be replaced by moral stimuli. As long as

[1] V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 32, pp. 28-29.

people live in a society where the satisfaction of their needs depends on their earnings, the personal material incentive does not lose its significance for them. To forget about it would mean to break away from life, from the people who ultimately determine the advance to communism.

When it is a matter of educating millions of people and not individuals, this process, naturally, must not be based on ignoring personal interests; personal interests should be placed at the service of social interests and a proper measure of combining the two must be found. Only in this way can the millions be educated.

This, however, does not mean that it is permissible to go to the other extreme and organise education on the basis of personal interests alone. Educational work cannot be successful where personal interests are infringed, are ignored. Nor is it possible to succeed where personal interests are accentuated to the detriment of social. To forget the moral stimuli and the need to foster them would mean to educate people who possibly would work conscientiously but would measure every step in money terms. They would refuse to do "unprofitable" work, however much society might need it. Of course, there is nothing communist in the minds of such "businessmen".

Consistent application of the principle of the personal material incentive must be combined with fostering moral, ideological stimuli to work which express the social interest of people in the results of their collective labour. These stimuli also have their economic basis; under socialism, the well-being of an individual depends not only on the results of his personal labour but to a decisive degree on the results of the collective labour, on the advance of the entire economy.

That is why material stimuli are developed not at the expense of moral stimuli. A contradiction between them arises only when the link between personal, collective and national economic interests is upset in life. It will be recalled, for example, that under the former system of planning when gross output was the main indicator for assessing the operation of an enterprise, the latter at times often was interested in concentrating on the production of more expensive goods to the detriment of other varieties more needed by consumers.

Such contradictions harmed both the development of production and also technological progress. They have adversely

affected the education of people, which perhaps is even more dangerous and harmful for the building of communism. If the criteria for assessing the operation of an enterprise run counter to state interests, this encourages a narrow local attitude among the personnel of enterprises, prevents them from assessing their work from the viewpoint of the general interests of communist construction. The personal material incentive comes into conflict with the high moral stimuli which the social system develops among people. In the case of insufficiently staunch people this gives rise to a conflict between their conscience and daily behaviour, between their words and actions. "What can be accomplished by educational work conducted at meetings and lectures, by literature, the cinema and the visual arts, if in his daily work the Soviet citizen at times is forced by cumbersome 'indices' to actions which run counter to his conscience, to his understanding of the social good?" Oleg Antonov, renowned aircraft designer, wrote.[1]

Man is educated not only by means of ideological influence but also by his daily life, including the organisation of production, distribution and the social services. It is exceedingly important that the economic, social, political and legal instruments should act in one direction, reinforcing the collectivist psychology and uprooting the individualistic psychology. This is promoted by organisation of work which combines the interests of production and education of people into a single whole. Any economic measure, therefore, must be evaluated not only from the angle of its direct production effect but also of its influence on society's moral progress.

For example, the saving of fuel, raw and other materials in industry is important not only in terms of economic effect, but also of training people to manage things in a socialist way, to safeguard social property and to consider their factory as their own possession.

Improvement of production and education are interconnected at a socialist enterprise, they must not be divided, much less counterposed. When personal and social interests are properly combined, both the socialist economy and its creators, the people, develop more successfully. Rational com-

[1] O. K. Antonov, *Dlya vsekh i dlya sebya* (For All and for Oneself), Ekonomika Publishers, Moscow, 1965, p. 124.

bination of the interests of an individual, an enterprise and the state accelerates the development of production and at the same time promotes the education of men, the fostering in them of a lofty sense of social duty, diligence and discipline and devotion to the people's interests.

The fundamental significance of the economic reforms now under way in the U.S.S.R. and other socialist countries consists in that they ensure a better combination of the interests of the national economy, the enterprise and the individual worker. And this is a requisite not only for the efficient development of socialist production but also for the successful education of people.

The granting of broader independence to enterprises and their greater economic interest awaken in people a thrifty attitude to production, help to develop their initiative and spirit of collectivism. The new economic system changes the very psychology of people and makes them look at many ordinary things in a different way.

The influence of the new economic system on education, is undoubtedly manifested not only through the forms of organising labour and distribution but also through the organisation of the way of life which, to a greater extent than before, depends on the performance of enterprises, the volume of the profit and the way it is used. Moreover, the personnel of an enterprise itself decide how to use these funds, which needs to satisfy first—to build houses or nurseries, to beautify the grounds with greenery, and so on.

It will be wrong, however, to assume that the new economic system will automatically develop in people all the traits society needs. Greater economic interest does not reduce the importance of educational work but only creates more favourable conditions for it. Ideological work remains vitally necessary for people to be able to understand more deeply their true social interests.

Account should also be taken of the distinctions in the reflection of different interests in the minds of people. Personal interests represent for men something direct; people become aware of them usually in the course of the daily round. This, naturally, does not eliminate the need for developing in people a proper understanding of their personal interests, too, because they are at times understood too narrowly. Nevertheless, personal interests can be understood on

the level of ordinary consciousness, of social psychology

The situation is different in the case of social interests; people become aware of them only as a result of ideological activity. This awareness demands certain generalisation of the phenomena of reality, knowledge of their essence, which frequently is hidden behind the appearance. If this essence is not revealed, man's consciousness may be confined to the narrow world of personal interests and aspirations. That is why the purpose of ideological work is to extend the horizon of people from awareness of the interests of their family, production team and enterprise to understanding of the interests of society as a whole.

Only as a result of such ideological work can social interests take a primary place in the minds of men. For people educated by socialist society the social becomes the personal.

The rich spiritual world of men who live the life of their people, who do not separate their interests from those of the entire society, is revealed in diverse production work, in socio-political activity, in the tireless striving to gain knowledge. For such men fulfilment of their social duty becomes not only a conscious striving but also an inner requirement and habit. And this, as we shall subsequently see, is one of the requisites for the transition to communism.

3. Conversion of the Rules of Communist Behaviour into a Habit

Communist education exerts a purposeful social influence on the convictions, sentiments, tastes and habits of people. It is a matter of remaking in the communist spirit the ideology and the psychology of people, of cleansing their morals, customs, and habits from the old features engendered by the exploiting society, and of developing new, communist traits of behaviour. All this educational work should convert the principles of the communist world outlook and communist morality into man's deep personal convictions and his convictions into the rules of daily, customary behaviour.

This is also linked with the shaping of the mechanism of the functioning of communist society, which in many respects will differ from the mechanism of regulating the behaviour of people under socialism.

So long as labour productivity has not reached the level adequate for the full satisfaction of the needs of people and people have not rid themselves of the survivals of the old morals, society is compelled to exercise the strictest control over the measure of labour and measure of consumption of each worker. Comparing the first stage of communism with a factory at which "factory" discipline was established and the workers were paid strictly in accordance with their labour, Lenin stressed in his *The State and Revolution* that such an order was neither our ideal nor our ultimate aim but only a step necessary for the radical cleansing of society from the abominations of capitalist exploitation and for ensuring further advance.

Lenin associated the prospects of socialism's development into communism with people gradually becoming accustomed to observing, without compulsion, the simplest rules of the community. Lenin foresaw that with the establishment of a new social discipline "the *necessity* of observing the simple, fundamental rules of the community will very soon become a *habit*".[1]

Lenin repeatedly returned to the idea that communism presupposed the conversion of the basic rules of the community into a habit. Developing further the propositions of Engels regarding the future of democracy, Lenin noted that socialism "will develop into communism and therefore ... the need for violence against people in general, for the *subordination* of one man to another, and of one section of the population to another, will vanish altogether, since people will *become accustomed* to observing the elementary conditions of social life *without violence* and *without subordination.*

"In order to emphasise this element of habit, Engels speaks of a new *generation,* 'reared in new, free social conditions'."[2]

Lenin associated the withering away of the state with the fact that "people will gradually *become accustomed* to observing the elementary rules of social intercourse that have been known for centuries and repeated for thousands of years in all copy-book maxims. They will become accustomed to observing them without force, without coercion, without

[1] V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 25, p. 474.
[2] Ibid., p. 456.

subordination, *without the special apparatus* for coercion called the state.... Only habit can, and undoubtedly will, have such an effect; for we see around us on millions of occasions how readily people become accustomed to observing the necessary rules of social intercourse when there is no exploitation, when there is nothing that arouses indignation, evokes protest and revolt, and creates the need for *suppression.*"[1]

We have quoted at length Lenin's statements on this question because they graphically demonstrate the need for turning the simplest rules of the community into a habit and also disclose the link between the communist education of the people and the change in the mechanism of regulating their behaviour. Let us discuss in somewhat greater detail each of these aspects of the matter.

First of all, communism, as seen from Lenin's statements, far from rejecting, on the contrary, lays down the elementary rules of morality and justice. These rules were elaborated by the people over thousands of years in struggle against social oppression and moral vices. But under the domination of the exploiters they were warped or brazenly trampled underfoot. They frequently were proclaimed in moral maxims but were not followed in life. People who accepted the morals of the exploiting world usually did not renounce them openly but on every convenient occasion violated them if it was to their advantage and could be done with impunity.

On the contrary, as pointed out in the Programme of the C.P.S.U., communist society makes these rules of morality and justice the "inviolable rules for relations both between individuals and between peoples".[2] Under communism, the elementary rules of the community will be observed by all members of society without compulsion, through the force of habit. Socialism is a necessary stage for transition to such a social order. Under it, observance of the requirements of social discipline is ensured, on the one hand, by the constantly growing consciousness of the overwhelming majority of the working people, by the power of persuasion and, on the other, by the application of state coercion with regard to the minority, to those who do not yield to persuasion and stubbornly continue to adhere to bourgeois customs.

[1] Ibid., Vol. 25, p. 462.
[2] *The Road to Communism*, p. 566.

At the time when socialist construction was only beginning in our country, when it was necessary to combat the economic chaos caused by the war, Lenin put into the foreground the "most elementary tasks of preserving society", of ensuring "elementary order".

"Keep regular and honest accounts of money, manage economically, do not be lazy, do not steal, observe the strictest labour discipline—it is these slogans, justly scorned by the revolutionary proletariat when the bourgeoisie used them to conceal its rule as an exploiting class, that are now, since the overthrow of the bourgeoisie, becoming the immediate and the principal slogans of the moment," Lenin wrote.[1] He regarded the practical application of these slogans by the working people, by the Soviet state with its own methods and on the basis of its laws, not only as a condition for overcoming the economic chaos but also as a necessary and adequate prerequisite for the victory of socialism.[2]

The slogans enumerated by Lenin are also among the most elementary rules of the community which will be undeviatingly observed under communism. True, in communist society the need for money will ultimately be obviated, but there will remain a need for accounting and the economical use of society's wealth. As dishonesty disappears and respect for social and personal property becomes a habit there will be no need for the moral commandment "thou shalt not steal". On the other hand, the elementary rules of the community will include new demands unheard of before, for example, to work not only conscientiously but also to the full measure of one's energy and ability. Work for society according to ability will also become a habit for all its members. The elementary rules of the community, undoubtedly, will also be enriched by many other features, for example, the rules of collectivism and mutual assistance among people, the habit of not holding aloof from social affairs but of taking close to heart everything that affects the interests of society.

Thus, the behaviour of people will be regulated not only by the rules of the community known for centuries, which communist morality may take over from preceding societies

[1] V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 27, pp. 243-44.
[2] Ibid., p. 244.

filling them with new content, but also by many rules crystallised in the process of construction and development of communism. Let us imagine, to use the expression of Engels, people "after several generations of social development under the communist system".[1] Very many of what we now consider lofty rules of morality, observed consciously, will become a habit; they will become elementary rules of the community which people will follow instinctively. The sphere of elementary rules of behaviour which have become habitual will be greatly extended. These will include not only rules of observing social order, social discipline, not only manifestations of ordinary honesty and conscientiousness, but also rules of behaviour peculiar to communism and the habit of taking part in social affairs, caring for the common interest, working according to ability, to the full measure of one's strength, and so forth.

This, however, does not mean that in communist society the entire behaviour of people will be determined by elementary rules of the community, that all rules of morality will be replaced by habits. This would greatly impoverish the spiritual world of the members of communist society. People determine their behaviour not only by habits. Under communism, too, they will be faced with intricate moral problems pertaining to their relationship with each other and perhaps also with society, problems whose solution will demand serious thought and the proper application of the lofty principles of communist morality. But this is not in question when we consider the conditions of existence of communist society. Among these conditions is the observance by people of the elementary rules of behaviour which can and should become customary for them.

Let us take, for example, the conditions for applying the main principle of communism—"From each according to his ability, to each according to his needs". First of all it presupposes the development in people of the habit to work for society to the full measure of one's energy and ability. The need to work in this way should not even exist for people, so that they should not be able to picture their life without work for society. Such an attitude to labour will arise when people are not only aware of the need but also develop the

[1] Marx/Engels, *Werke*, Bd. 20, Berlin, 1968, S. 580-81.

habit of working for the general good, when a conscious attitude to labour becomes habitual. The development of communist habits is no less important for the application of the second side of the principle of communism. Leaving aside the material conditions needed for implementing this principle (that is, the creation of an abundance of consumer goods) its application will depend on the fostering in all members of society of habits and rational needs inherent in the new man. It is necessary to *wean* people *away* from senseless greed, from the desire to grab everything that can be received from society gratis. A member of communist society will fully satisfy his rational needs, he will not want to take from society more than he actually needs. It is necessary to *accustom* people to give society everything they can, to work without sparing effort, to the full of their ability. Without fostering such habits, communist society will not be able to function normally.

Why do we discuss the habits of people? Is it not enough to say that a conscious attitude of people to their work and to the reasonable satisfaction of their needs should be developed?

By stressing the importance of habits we in no way belittle the role of the conscious element in the behaviour of people. Moreover, without developing a high consciousness it also would be impossible to foster lofty moral habits.

There are, of course, habits which are developed in people under the influence of their daily living conditions without any special contemplation. If these are good habits, we have nothing against them. But they might not have a morally motivated content. Moreover, habits differ. There are also habits developed in man under the influence of definite convictions. The first step to the fostering of such habits is to develop moral convictions. The psychology of man is changed above all by affecting his ideology. Man should become deeply *aware* of the need and rationality of a definite form of behaviour. This awareness must be turned into an inner conviction, and the latter must be embodied in daily behaviour. In general, habits are developed as a result of systematic *repetition* of definite actions. That is why the habit of strictly moral behaviour *consolidates* moral principles.

The development of such habits is the next, higher stage in the spiritual development of a man after he became aware

of the moral meaning of definite actions. For example, we can convince a man that he must care for the safekeeping of society's wealth no less and even more than for his personal welfare and such a man will have a conscious regard for the expenditure of social resources, the thrifty use of raw material and power in industry, and so on. But it is also necessary that a thrifty attitude to society's wealth should become his "second nature", should become a habit so that in no case should he regard waste with indifference.

The same can also be said about habits associated with the application of the rules of collectivism. Many years ago M. I. Kalinin, eminent Soviet statesman, said that an important aspect of communist construction is "the development of the spirit of collectivism as a normal habit of people", "the introduction of social habits in production, in daily life, the creation of conditions under which collectivity would be an inalienable part of our habits and rules of behaviour so that our actions should be performed not only in a thoughtful, conscious way, but should follow instinctively, organically".[1] When this is achieved it will be possible to say that man has really become collectivist by nature.

There is hardly any need to prove that the development of such habits by no means belittles the role of the conscious element in the behaviour of man. On the contrary, relieving the mind of thinking about elementary actions will open up greater possibilities for applying the creative forces of man's intellect for the solution of great problems which life always raises.

Anton Makarenko wrote that in each case and at every step it is necessary to verify one's behaviour by the criterion of communist morality to find out whether one acts in a communist way. "But even this is not enough. It is also necessary to get accustomed to the new demands of the new morality in order to observe these demands without burdening our mind with quests. . . .

"Our task is not only to develop in ourselves a correct, reasonable attitude to questions of behaviour, but also to foster correct habits, i.e., habits when we would act correctly not only because we paused and thought about them,

[1] M. I. Kalinin, *O kommunisticheskom vospitanii* (On Communist Education), Moscow, 1946, p. 86.

but because we could not act otherwise, because we have become accustomed to act that way. The development of these habits is a much more difficult task than the education of the mind."[1]

Makarenko, of course, is right when he considers the development of habits a more intricate task than the remaking of the views of people. But this is not only a difficulty which has to be surmounted in accomplishing the tasks of communist education but also a guarantee of success. It is a matter of educating the member of communist society as a harmonious individual to whom a split personality is alien; this presupposes not only a harmonious world outlook, unity of all his traits, but also the unity of moral convictions and views, so to say, the ideological side of consciousness, with the psychology of man, i.e., with his feelings and habits.

While the development of rational habits enables man to act correctly without special contemplation, without hesitation and doubt, for society the development of such habits ensures stability in the observance of definite rules of the community. There will no longer be the need each time to persuade people to act in a definite way and not otherwise or to compel them to act with the help of a special apparatus of power—all this will be ensured by the force of habit.

The habit of the people to act in a definite way is a tremendous social force, which in a number of cases is more effective than the force of law. This social force can, depending on the circumstances, promote or, on the contrary, retard society's development. Lenin described in the following terms the force of old habits engendered by thousands of years of private production: "The force of habit in millions and tens of millions is a most formidable force."[2] The overcoming of such habits is an extremely difficult but fully feasible task, as clearly demonstrated by the socialist remaking of agriculture and the mentality of millions of peasants. But, alongside habits which reflect conservatism and prejudices that are eliminated in the course of building socialism and communism, there are also habits which are developed in the course of this construction, consolidate the rules of

[1] A. S. Makarenko, *Pedagogicheskiye sochineniya* (Pedagogical Writings), Moscow, 1948, p. 69.

[2] V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 31, p. 45.

the socialist community and accelerate society's development.

Survivals of capitalism exist not only as remnants of the old ideology but also in the form of the old psychology. At times harmful habits also make themselves felt among people who are not confirmed supporters of obsolete views. This is frequently explained by the fact that they have not changed their convictions and habits in the spirit of communist morality. Mere verbal recognition of the rules of communist morality is far from sufficient. If these rules have not become the inner conviction of man and their application his own necessity, divergence between words and deeds becomes possible. To eliminate the very possibility of such divergence it is necessary to remake in the communist spirit not only the views and convictions of man but also his daily habits.

If the work of remaking the mind of man has not affected his habits, he may commit anti-social actions owing to weakened control of his mind, which subsequently arouses his own amazement and regret. It is not accidental that most young people convicted for rowdyism commit their offences in a drunken state.

Although moral habits, as a rule, are developed on the basis of moral consciousness and convictions, some of the simplest habits can also be developed unconsciously, under the influence of daily life and only then do people become aware of their moral significance. For example, if in a community or collective firm social discipline is established and consciously maintained by the majority, new people who join this community or collective are accustomed by conditions to observe the existing order, although at first they are not aware of its rationality and social necessity. Under the influence of this collective they accept its traditions and gradually begin to maintain them consciously.

In socialist society both the rules of law and the rules instituted in a given collective are instrumental in accustoming people to moral behaviour. Let us consider, for example, the education of a rational attitude to satisfying one's needs. We are advancing to a social order in which there will be no need for controlling the measure of labour and the measure of consumption of each person. Under communism, no one will think of painstakingly calculating and comparing the quantity of products a man receives

with what he gives society. But prerequisites for such a social order and for developing in people a rational attitude to satisfying their needs, a situation when no one will demand the impossible to satisfy his whims, will not be achieved by abolishing all regulation of consumption. On the contrary, the social regulation of consumption in conformity with the labour contribution of citizen, instituted under socialism, is of great importance for developing rational needs. The rules of law established by the socialist state also act as a powerful educational instrument. The force of law must be organically blended with the force of public influence. Vigorous public condemnation of breaches of order affects not only the guilty parties, but also helps to educate others in the spirit of respect for social discipline.

In a society which has no class antagonisms, and which is not threatened by attack from without, the development of habits of social behaviour is a necessary and adequate prerequisite for the withering away of the state. Definite material prerequisites, too, are needed: society must attain such a level of development of the productive forces as would enable it to apply the main principle of communism. But if we approach this prospect from the angle of the requisite development of the people themselves it may be said that it resolves itself into developing in them the habits of administering their own social affairs, of collectivism and observing the rules of the socialist community without compulsion. This will enable society to get along without a special apparatus for enforcing the observance of the community rules by all members, without state power. It goes without saying that communist society, too, will not be guaranteed freedom from undesirable actions by some individuals. But, as Lenin foresaw, to eliminate them no special machinery, no special apparatus of suppression will be needed; this will be done by people themselves, with the same simplicity and ease as any group of people separates brawling men.

Observance of the communist rules of the community will increasingly become an inner requirement and habit. For example, the duty to work for society will merge with man's inner requirement. In these conditions, any ground for counterposing rights and duties will disappear because

all members of society will be educated in the spirit of performing their duties voluntarily and conscientiously. This will bring about, as pointed out in the Programme of the C.P.S.U., "a natural fusion of rights and duties to form single standards of communist behaviour".[1]

To understand the meaning of this proposition it is necessary to recall the dialectical development of rights and duties in history. At the earliest stage of society, under the primitive communal system, there was no difference whatsoever between rights and duties. Engels pointed out that to an American Indian the question of whether participation in community affairs, blood revenge, and so on was a right or a duty would have appeared as absurd as the question of whether eating, sleeping or hunting was a right or duty. The situation is different in an antagonistic class society where the daily round itself makes plain the basic difference between rights and duties, by assigning to one class almost all the rights and to the other almost all the duties.[2] Socialist society eliminates class conflicts and establishes the equality and universality of rights and duties: all citizens enjoy equal rights and bear the same duties. But at the first phase of communism the possibility is preserved of counterposing rights to duties. There are, for example, people who readily enjoy all the rights and benefits afforded them by society, but in every way evade the discharge of their duties. Communism puts an end to this by making the organic unity of rights and duties the law of life for all members of society.

It goes without saying that rights and duties in communist society will be merged on an entirely different basis than under the primitive-communal system where the observance of the simplest rules of the community rested on the power of unconscious traditions imposed on people by fear of spontaneous forces, authority of ancestors, and so on. Communist society with its intricate and multifaceted life will rely on the high consciousness of people, their deep understanding of their social duty, the observance of which will merge with their inner requirement and become a habit of all. With the withering away of the

---

[1] *The Road to Communism*, p. 533.
[2] See K. Marx, F. Engels, *Selected Works*, Vol. II, pp. 308, 326.

state the behaviour of people will be regulated not by legal but moral rules, consolidated by the force of public opinion and the organisation of social life.

The Programme of the C.P.S.U. states: "The Party will encourage all forms of conscious civic self-discipline leading to the assertion and promotion of the basic rules of the communist way of life."[1] The forms of conscious self-discipline, naturally, do not remain immutable, they are changing, and will change, in the course of advance toward communism. At present it is necessary to strengthen and develop in every way the public agencies which help to maintain public order, and properly combine their work with the activities of state agencies. In time, when all people learn to maintain public order, probably not only the state but also some social organisations set up for this purpose (for example, people's voluntary squads) will become unnecessary. The maintenance of public order will become a common cause in the full sense of the word and its breaches will be extremely rare. With the disappearance of the sources of anti-social phenomena and actions there will be less and less need for applying state coercion. "Universally recognised rules of the communist way of life will be established whose observance will become an organic need and habit with everyone."[2]

Communist society will be a highly organised and smoothly functioning community of people. Such an organisation, naturally, is impossible without definite social rules, which even after the withering away of the state, and after losing legal force, will be preserved by society. But it should be considered that many things in general will no longer require special social standards because, as Lenin put it, they will become "part and parcel of our culture, of our social life, our habits".[3]

A child is taught to wash daily, but an adult no longer needs such orders or rules; for him it is a habit which coincides with his own needs. Similarly, many rules which in the course of transition to communism have to be persistently implanted in the minds of people by various means, including legal state influence, will under communism become so customary as not to require social regulation.

From all this a conclusion may be drawn about what degree of maturity of socialist society is necessary for transition to the higher phase of communism.

In the material sphere the gauge evidently will be the creation of the material and technical basis of communism which ensures an abundance of material wealth and all conditions for the all-round development of people.

In the social sphere, the conversion of the rules of communist behaviour into a habit of the people should be considered such a criterion, when it becomes a habit with all members to work for society to the full extent of their ability and energies, not to hold aloof from social affairs but to participate in them, to observe public discipline and order, then, according to Lenin's expression, the door will be opened wide for the transition from the first phase of communist society to its higher phase.

---

[1] *The Road to Communism*, p. 566.
[2] Ibid., p. 556.
[3] V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 33, pp. 487-88.

Chapter VI

SOCIALISM AND CHANGES IN THE NATURE OF HISTORICAL PROGRESS

Socio-economic formations differ not only in their structure but also in their intrinsic nature and growth rates, the rhythm of the historical process. The transition from capitalism to communism implies such a profound change in the nature of social development that it can be characterised as a new, higher type of historical progress. Progress in a society based on social ownership of the means of production and free from class antagonisms proceeds differently and brings about different social consequences compared with those in class societies. The new type of social progress inherent in socialism and communism epitomises all the features of the mode of production, the basis and superstructure of this society.

1. General Criterion of Historical Progress and Its Application to an Analysis of Socialist Society's Development

The path of historical progress leads mankind from class oppression to the summits of communism. The law-governed development of mankind passes from the first stages of man's history, which had no division into classes, to antagonistic class socio-economic formations, of which capitalism is the last one, and from them to socialism and communism.

Peoples have passed, and are passing, the stages of this road in different periods. Some of them, because of certain historical conditions, manage to skip definite stages. But just as numerous rivers flow into the sea, so does the history of all peoples ultimately lead them to communism. Our

age is one of the greatest turning points in the history of mankind when the transition from capitalism to socialism is effected, when more and more peoples take to the socialist road until socialism and communism triumph on a world-wide scale.

Today it is clear, more than ever before, that the history of mankind is not a sum total of accidents, that it cannot be reduced to a mass of diverse "social changes", as is now claimed by many bourgeois sociologists who would like to banish the very concept of progress from social science. The history of society as a whole is a process of forward, ascending development. And although history knows the succession of revolution by reaction and even retrogression, the replacement of rapid progress by stagnation, the general line of society's forward movement is beyond doubt.

The line of progress stands out most clearly in science and technology. This is the movement from primitive stone implements to modern intricate automatic machines, from the simple fisherman's boat to the gigantic ocean liner, from the hut of the savage to the skyscraper. But opinions diverge regarding the relation of scientific and technological progress to social progress. Some sociologists look upon scientific and technological progress as a force menacing not only social development, but also the very existence of mankind. They compare science and technology to the ominous genie from oriental tales whom someone imprudently released from a sealed vessel. Scientific and technological progress which can and should increase man's power over the spontaneous forces of nature is regarded by them as the establishment of control of new spontaneous forces over man, the "demoniacal" forces of technology. Some of these sociologists even raise the prospect of men being ousted by robots.[1] Such an approach to scientific and technological progress makes an absolute out of the hostility of science and technology to man under capitalism. But the reason for this is rooted not in them but in capitalist relations which distort the real object of science and turn many of its achievements into a threat to mankind.

Other sociologists, on the contrary, identify technolog-

[1] Characteristic in this respect is the book by the British sociologist P. E. Cleator, *The Robot Era*, London, 1955.

ical and social progress. This stand is typical, for example, of the French sociologist J. Fourastier who created what he himself calls the optimistic theory of society's progress. At a discussion on problems of progress Fourastier asserted that "the progress of science is ... the cause for the acceleration of progress in general".[1] For Fourastier the progress of science and technology fully coincides with economic and social progress. Such a stand, being quite "optimistic" as regards capitalism and its future, ignores the contradictory and uneven nature of technological and social development. Yet capitalism graphically shows that even relatively swift scientific and technological progress can be combined with the dominance of obsolete relations of production, with tendencies toward stagnation in the economy and culture. Such a "combination" is very contradictory but it does exist in the capitalist system which has outlived its age.

Other sociologists bemoan the lag of moral progress behind technological progress. In their opinion, contemporary man who has created a powerful technology has not risen morally one step above the cave man. They see in this the greatest threat to the future of mankind. In an article contributed to the French *Figaro* (August 5-6, 1961) André François-Poncet, member of the French Academy, stated that he did not share the optimism about the possibility of changing man's moral aspect: "On the contrary, viewing the present I am convinced that civilisation tends to decline, while barbarity is progressing.... Of what value are the finest machines, of what value is the flight to the Moon, if the miracles of technology are accompanied by the moral decline of mankind?"

But our epoch which presents a picture of the greatest heroism displayed by the people fighting for their social and national emancipation certainly does not offer grounds for laments about the moral decline of all mankind.

We know that epochs of decline of the old society have always been periods of the moral degeneration of its supporters. The decline of capitalism is no exception in this respect. Of course, the decay of the old society also affects

[1] *Quel avenir attend l'homme?* Rencontre international de Royaumont, Paris, 1961, p. 102.

part of the working people, but this does not abolish progress in the moral sphere either. The carriers of this progress are the working class, the masses fighting for their liberation who are not reconciled to being slaves and are evolving their own ethical principles in this struggle.

Marxism by no means identifies social progress with technological progress. But in the final count, if we consider long periods, it is the development of production taken in its entirety (and not only from the technological aspect) that forms the foundation of mankind's social and cultural progress. This is expressed above all in the successive change of socio-economic formations motivated by the development of the productive forces. Marx regarded the socio-economic formations which succeeded each other throughout history as stages of historical progress. In the preface to the *Critique of Political Economy* he characterises the Asiatic, ancient, feudal and capitalist modes of production "as progressive epochs in the economic formation of society".[1] In the present epoch another, socialist mode of production has been added, which is higher than all the preceding stages of historical development. This has already been proved not only theoretically but also practically by the entire experience of building the new society in socialist countries inhabited by more than one-third of mankind.

Progress means a succession of one stage of development by another, a qualitative change of society, and, moreover, transition from the lower stages to the higher. Such development occurs only when the new stage not only negates the preceding one, but also preserves everything positive created by it, opening up at the same time broader possibilities for further advance. The question, however, arises, what is the criterion for considering that a certain stage of society's development is higher than another?

A definition of progress undoubtedly includes the element of evaluating social phenomena. This, in the opinion of some sociologists, casts doubt on the possibility of regarding progress as an objective phenomenon. One of the arguments against the idea of progress, cited by Raymond Aron, a

[1] K. Marx, F. Engels, *Selected Works*, Vol. I, p. 363.

well-known French sociologist, is that the concept of progress contains an evaluation: the assertion that the present society is superior to the old one. "But in principle there must be no value assessment in scientific knowledge. Consequently, the concept of progress is automatically excluded."[1] As we see, evaluation is regarded by proponents of such a view as a purely subjective action. But an objective analysis of a social system and the evaluation of its superiority over preceding systems are not mutually exclusive concepts. The point is from *what* positions the evaluation is made. A criterion of progress must not be sought in some kind of moral or other concepts, applied to society from the outside. For example, when attempts are made to evaluate progress only from the viewpoint of the demands of justice or equality, or the achievement of good for the greatest number of people, such an assessment remains unscientific and subjective, however much we sympathise with the ideals of justice, equality and human welfare. It is unscientific first of all because here the criterion of progress is not deduced from the object's own development, but is derived from the subject's notions of historical development. The matter is not changed in principle if we say that the subject from whose positions the evaluation should be made is the majority of society, for example, the masses. The history of antagonistic class formations often proceeded contrary to the aspirations of the masses, following nonetheless the road of progress.

Marxism has a different approach to the criterion of progress. Its point of departure is recognition of the determinateness of a succession in stages of society's development. That is why evaluation of these stages must be based on a study of the real process of society's development. The criterion of progress is based on the factor upon which the forward movement of society depends, which *dictates* it. In the final count, this factor is the development of the productive forces. The advance of the productive forces, as Lenin put it, is the "highest criterion of social progress".[2]

[1] R. Aron. *Dix-huit leçons sur la société industrielle.* Gallimard, 1962, p. 75. With certain reservations Aron recognises progress in the case of a cumulative process or quantitative accumulation, for example, in science and technology, but not in art (pp. 78 et al.).

[2] V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 13, p. 243.

Characterising the importance of large-scale industry for the transition to socialism, Lenin pointed out that it "is the basis of socialist economic organisation".[1]

There is nothing subjective in this criterion. Advance of the productive forces is the criterion of social progress because the degree and possibility of society's development as a whole ultimately depend upon it. It is appropriate to recall here Engels's thought that a rise in the productive forces of labour and the resultant formation and increase of the social production and reserve fund—all this "was and is the basis of all social, political and intellectual progress".[2]

The scientific criterion of progress enables one to judge unerringly society's level of development. The state of the productive forces in the long run is the gauge for measuring the stage of historical progress a society has attained. Of course, in turning points of history societies differing in their social systems—the old and the new—may have an approximately equal level of development of the productive forces. But such cases are possible only when the new socio-economic formation has not yet reached its full bloom and has not developed the corresponding productive forces, while the productive forces in the old formation have already outgrown the bounds of the existing economic relations. Such cases in no way refute the general proposition that each socio-economic formation has a definite material and technical basis and type of workman. Within the limits of long periods of history the social organisation of production and the nature of the social system correspond on the whole to the level of development of the productive forces.

The scientific criterion of progress also enables one to judge the extent to which a social system is progressive by the possibilities it opens up for the further improvement of the productive forces—whether it promotes this improvement or, on the contrary, impedes it. Moreover, history demonstrates that the social system which begins to retard the development of the productive forces, and, consequently, becomes reactionary, is abolished sooner or later. This

[1] Ibid., Vol. 32, p. 235.

[2] F. Engels, *Anti-Dühring*, Moscow, 1969, p. 231.

follows from the simple fact that people never discard the productive forces created by society. But in order to preserve and further develop them they are compelled to abolish the obsolete relations of production, the outdated social system.

The opinion is voiced at times that the mode of production and the social system determined by it should be considered the criterion of progress. The supporters of this view claim that for properly assessing whether a society is progressive at the given moment from the viewpoint of world historical progress, it is necessary to take into account the development of the productive forces and also the nature of the production relations, i.e., the entire mode of production and also the consequent social system. Of course, in appraising the nature of society it is necessary to take it as a whole, its economic system, social structure, political system and spiritual life. If we were to judge, for example, contemporary capitalism only by the level of the productive forces it attained we would get a distorted picture, the kind that is played up by its apologists like Walt Rostow. The progressive or reactionary nature of a social system is characterised by its state as a whole.

But from this, in our opinion, it does not follow that all the enumerated sides of social life should be included in the criterion of progress. We must not confuse the object to be evaluated with the gauge used for this assessment. Such a gauge can be only a social phenomenon which is progressive always and in all circumstances and on which, moreover, the progress of all other aspects of social life ultimately depends. Only such a criterion as the development of the productive forces meets these two conditions. The mode of production determines society's structure, but it cannot be considered the final criterion of progress because its nature has to be evaluated—whether it is progressive or reactionary. One mode of production can be, at different stages of its development, both progressive (when the relations of production in the main correspond to the nature of productive forces and afford sufficient scope for their development) and reactionary (when the relations of production no longer correspond to the level and nature of the productive forces and fetter their advance). But the development of the productive forces is progressive at all stages of history.[1]

It is easy to see that progress can be objectively evaluated only in the light of society's development as a whole. That is why in his *Theories of Surplus-Value* Marx regarded as objective the approach of David Ricardo, who measured the progressiveness of ascending capitalism by the extent to which it facilitated the development of production and the creation of social wealth. Sentimental critics of capitalism, for example, Sismondi, denied such a criterion and opposed to it the good of individuals. With such an approach, Marx pointed out, it remains incomprehensible why the development of mankind, although at first it "takes place at the cost of the majority of human individuals and even classes, in the end breaks through this contradiction and coincides with the development of the individual".[2] For Marx the criterion of historical progress is the interests not of an individual or even a class, but of all mankind. And although in antagonistic class societies these interests broke their way through at the expense of the interests of individuals, he foresaw that ultimately social progress would also lead to the higher development of the personality. Therefore, Marx considers that production stimulates the "development of human productive forces, in other words, the *development of the richness of human nature as an end in itself*".[3]

For Marxism there is no conflict between the evaluation of social phenomena in the light of historical progress as a whole and from the position of a definite class. Such a conflict was inevitable for the ideologists of the exploiting classes—the landed aristocracy and the bourgeoisie. This compelled them to sacrifice either scientific integrity or their class sympathies. An honest scientist like David Ricardo fearlessly evaluated social phenomena in the light of the development of the productive forces regardless of what

[1] It is a different matter that the productive forces, as all the other achievements of progress (including science), can be utilised for different purposes—progressive or reactionary. Thus, imperialism seeks to utilise the productive forces of capitalism to the detriment of society.

[2] K. Marx, *Theories of Surplus-Value*, Part II, Moscow, 1968, p. 118.

[3] Ibid., pp. 117-18.

class benefited or was harmed by this development. If, Marx wrote, Ricardo's point of view corresponded to the interests of the industrial bourgeoisie, it was only because and to the extent to which its interests coincided with those of "production or the productive development of human labour".[1] In cases where the bourgeoisie came into contradiction with this development, Ricardo ruthlessly attacked it, just as in other cases he attacked the proletariat and the aristocracy. Malthus approached this conflict in an entirely different way. From the knowledge obtained by science he drew only the conclusions that were useful to the aristocracy vis-à-vis the bourgeoisie and to both of them in the struggle against the proletariat. Marx branded such an adaptation of science to the class interests of the exploiters as shamelessness and base thinking.

The ideologists of the proletariat are not faced with such a conflict, because for them a scientific and class, partisan, approaches to phenomena fully coincide. Evaluation of social phenomena from the positions of the proletariat, the most revolutionary class in history, is at the same time also the most objective evaluation.

That is why, in analysing social phenomena, Marxists always ascertain both their relationship to social progress as a whole and their influence on the condition of the working people. It is this that radically sets apart the Marxist approach to social phenomena from bourgeois objectivism. For the latter recognition of the necessity for certain phenomena, for example, that at one time capitalism in Russia was progressive because it developed the productive forces, was tantamount to a justification of capitalist exploitation. Lenin explained that historical materialism, while indicating the need for a given process, ascertains what socio-economic formation furnishes its content and what class determines its necessity. Moreover, historical materialism includes partisanship, which makes it necessary in evaluating events openly and directly to assume the viewpoint of a definite social group. For example, in comparing the progressiveness of one or another form of the economy Marxists appraise their influence not only according to the development of the productive forces, but also according

[1] K. Marx, *Theories of Surplus-Value*, p. 118.

to the nature of their use, the condition of the working class and the other working people. In comparing, say, two ways of developing capitalism in agriculture, Lenin preferred the farmer's way over the bourgeois evolution of the landed estates, because the former "implies the most rapid development of the productive forces and the best possible (under commodity production) conditions of existence for the mass of the peasantry".[1] Both the rapid development of the productive forces and the improvement in the living conditions of the working people are progressive. They prepare the ground for achieving the aims of the proletariat's class struggle—the maturing of the socialist revolution and the subsequent transition to socialist society, which opens up full scope for the development of the productive forces and liberates the working people from every exploitation.

In exploiting class societies, the development of the productive forces is contradictory and, frequently, far from easing the condition of the working people, brings them fresh suffering. But such contradictions cannot be resolved either by stopping historical progress, which in effect is advocated by petty-bourgeois critics of capitalism, who denounce it from the viewpoint of subjective sociology, or by glossing over class antagonisms, which is practised by reformists who slip into the positions of bourgeois objectivism and apologetics for capitalism.

Marxism regards the development of the productive forces as the main, but not the only, criterion of social progress. In different spheres of social life Marxists apply specific criteria which follow from their nature and distinguishing features. For example, scientific progress is measured by the degree of cognition of the laws of the objective world and their practical mastery; progress in the health services can be measured by the increase in average longevity, successes in combating diseases, the wiping out of some of them, and so on. It would be absurd to deny the existence of such criteria because it is obvious that not all spheres of social life are directly determined by the improvement of the productive forces. Moreover, changes in different sides of social life are uneven and, therefore, prog-

[1] V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 13, pp. 243-44.

ress in the development of the productive forces may at some stages in history be accompanied by regression in some or other spheres of social life.

Unevenness of historical development is frequently utilised by bourgeois sociologists to deny in general the possibility of progress and its objective evaluation. Typical in this respect is the stand of American sociologists Robert M. Maciver and Charles H. Page. Comparing primitive and modern society, they admit that the latter is more differentiated, but say it is impossible to assert that one is better than the other. They write: "The 'simpler peoples' achieved higher social organisation with the aid of slavery—was this progress?... Our own civilisation has multiplied commodities and services through mechanised, standardised routine. The facilities and stimulations of urbanisation go with congestion and the loss of the free contacts with nature". In their opinion, "to balance the gain and loss in each total emerging situation is a hazardous personal judgement...".[1] Progress is thus deprived of an objective content, it is made dependent on "losses" and "gains" which are subjectively assessed.

What makes a scientific solution of the problem difficult is that progress in society's material life does not always directly coincide with progress in spiritual life and that changes in different sides of social life proceed unevenly. Nevertheless, inasmuch as the history of society is an integral process of development and succession of socio-economic formations, there is an objective criterion of progress that does not depend on subjective evaluations and views. Such a criterion is the development of the productive forces which gives rise to a corresponding type of relations of production. Superiority of the new social system over the old is displayed in the economy, in socio-political relations and in culture. But ultimately it is determined by the decisive sphere of society's life, production, upon which the change of all other spheres depends directly or through a number of mediating links. That is why Marxism-Leninism regards the development of the productive forces as the *highest* criterion of social progress.

[1] R. M. Maciver and C. H. Page, *Society, An Introductory Analysis*, London, 1961, p. 613.

In the final count a new progressive social system scores victory over the old one because it ensures more rapid development of the productive forces and their more efficient use. There is Lenin's well-known statement that the growth of labour productivity in the final analysis is the most important, the chief prerequisite for the victory of a new social system. Capitalism defeated feudalism because it was able to ensure a higher labour productivity. Similarly, socialism will score final victory over capitalism because it is capable of providing a higher labour productivity. And so, the progressiveness of given production relations, of a given formation as a whole is measured above all by their ability to ensure conditions for the most effective development of production and culture.

It goes without saying that this criterion of progress must be applied dialectically. What is meant here is not simply a comparison of the production *levels* attained at a given moment by countries with different social systems. Assessment of the *level* and *possibilities* of development of the productive forces by no means always coincide as regards their relation to social progress. There can be societies which have reached a high *level* in the progress of the productive forces and nevertheless already restrict the *possibilities* of their further improvement, impede it. Such, for example, is the situation in highly developed capitalist countries today. A high level of development of the productive forces with an obsolete economic system and reactionary socio-political order is one of the crying contradictions of contemporary capitalism.

On the other hand, many socialist countries have had to eliminate or are eliminating the technical and economic backwardness inherited from the past, and also difficulties caused by the resistance of reactionary forces and consequences of wars imposed on them. That is why a certain time is needed for them to attain the level of the productive forces in countries which were industrialised earlier.

But if we compare the *possibilities* opened up by a social system for the development of production we will obtain an unerring gauge of progress. The advantage will be on the side of the social system which is capable of ensuring the full use of productive capacities and has neither chronic

under-employment of enterprises nor chronic unemployment of labour. The establishment of social ownership of the means of production delivers society from all these ills and the huge losses caused by competition and planless production, periodic recessions and crises.

Incipient socialism does not assert its superiority over capitalism at once. At first, directly after the victory of the socialist revolution, a progressive socio-political system is established. This is the sphere of social life, where the advantages of socialism are displayed most promptly of all. Although in the initial period the conditions of the class struggle may dictate certain restrictions of democracy as regards the remnants of the overthrown exploiting classes, the establishment of a socialist state from the very beginning signifies a tremendous extension of democracy for the working people. In this sphere, let us note, the real gauge of progress is not the formal proclamation of democratic standards, but the degree of actual participation of the masses in administering state affairs.

Since socialism scored victory first not in the most industrially developed countries, a contradiction arose between the most advanced socio-political system it established and the economic backwardness inherited from the old system. This contradiction is resolved through the accelerated development of the productive forces. The emergent socialist economic system represents a new type of society's economic organisation, higher than that of capitalism, and it creates the possibility for the rapid improvement of the productive forces and the cultural advance of the people.

Most socialist countries had to eliminate backwardness not only in production, but also in culture. They have created, and are creating, a new socialist culture, which for its *type* is a whole stage higher than bourgeois culture, although for some *elements* of culture (for example, the number of TV sets, and the like) some socialist countries might temporarily lag behind certain capitalist countries. But the possibilities for the cultural advance of the population are boundless under socialism, and in no other society can the lofty spiritual treasures become the possession of the *entire* people. Therefore, socialism demonstrates its superiority over capitalism in culture, too.

Existing differences in various sides of social life in the two world systems are associated with the specific historical conditions of socialist development. The world socialist system represents a more advanced social order, a new, incipient socio-economic formation. Consequently, in so far as their social system is concerned, the socialist countries are far ahead of the most developed capitalist states. But for the degree of improvement of the productive forces, they have not yet surpassed them and in this respect they have to catch up with the principal capitalist countries. The world capitalist system represents an obsolete, reactionary social system, but at the same time a high level of the productive forces has been attained in the principal capitalist countries.

Arnold Toynbee, the well-known British historian, has formulated his impressions of a visit to the United States in the following words: "Every economy has two sides to it; it has its technological means of production and its social system for distributing the product. In its technology, the United States is at least as radical today as it has ever been. On the other hand, in its social system it is highly conservative nowadays." The contradictions between these two sides of the economic system have grown so sharp that one of them must gain the upper hand. In this context Toynbee asks the question: "Is it U.S. technology or the U.S. social system that is more likely to yield?"[1] The limitations of his world outlook prevented Toynbee from revealing the full depth of the contradiction between capitalism's productive forces and relations of production. But his article is highly symptomatic: it shows, regardless of the author's intention, in what irreconcilable contradictions capitalism has become enmeshed, how urgent for society's progress is the abolition of the obsolete economic and social system of capitalism.

A solution of this problem, initiated by the October Revolution in Russia in 1917, opens up a new era in history, the era of transition to the higher, communist society, in which social progress acquires qualitatively new features, distinct from preceding times.

---

[1] A. Toynbee, "A July 4 Question for U.S.: Where Will the Coming Social Revolution Stop?", *The Globe and Mail*, Toronto, July 4, 1961.

2. New Type of Social Progress

Under socialism, social progress has both common and distinct features as compared with capitalism.

Among the common features, characteristic of progress in our age, is, for example, the leading role of industry in society's economic development, in the creation of the material foundations of culture. This sets apart progress under capitalism from the development, for example, of the feudal and other pre-capitalist socio-economic formations. This feature also remains characteristic of progress in socialist and communist societies, inasmuch as they are based on large-scale machine industry. Furthermore, socialisation of labour and the consequent growing internationalisation of production are characteristic of both capitalism and socialism. The conversion of science into a direct productive force is a tendency which originates under capitalism and is fully realised in communist society. The progress of science and technology has brought about the scientific and technological revolution which is under way in the most developed countries—both capitalist and socialist.

These and other features which distinguish scientific and technological progress in the present era from such progress in the pre-capitalist eras do not, however, furnish grounds for identifying different social types of progress. Such an identification is characteristic of the "single industrial society" theory.

Advocates of this theory assert that contemporary scientific and technological progress leads to the creation of a single type of "industrial society". Fourastier expressed this idea in the following way: "Eastern and Western countries are building one and the same house."[1] For many proponents of this idea capitalism and socialism are not successive stages of historical development, but only varieties of the "single technicised society". Although the socialist countries follow their own path, which radically differs from that traversed in the past by the capitalist countries, these sociologists allege that the stages and laws of development are essentially identical in both systems.

The theory of "growth by stages" propounded by

[1] *Quel avenir attend l'homme?*, p. 110.

W. Rostow, an American economist and sociologist, is typical in this respect. In the introduction to his book *The Stages of Economic Growth,* Rostow says that his theory is called upon to provide an answer to the questions, how and under what impulses have traditional agricultural societies been modernised? Whither this process: to communism, to affluent suburbs, to destruction, to the Moon?[1] Rostow claims that his theory is an alternative to the Marxist interpretation of modern history, in view of which he supplied his book with a pretentious subtitle: "A Non-Communist Manifesto".

But what could Rostow put up in opposition to the Marxist theory of the development and succession of socio-economic formations? A theory which is devoid of a precise scientific criterion of progress and accepts as a gauge of progress now the growth of mass consumption, now the degree of development and application of science in production; a theory which unites all pre-capitalist formations into one nebulous and indefinite concept "traditional society", characterised solely by negative features: low level of production, subordinate nature of industry, absence of scientific activity, and so on. Rostow assigns all the positive features to the "industrial society" which passes through the stages of "maturity" and "high mass-consumption". In Rostow's opinion, only the United States has reached the latter stage. As for the socialist countries, the Soviet Union in the first place, Rostow places them in earlier stages, alleging that they merely repeat belatedly the stages already passed by capitalist countries.

By divorcing changes in technology from socio-economic relations and ignoring the significance of the nature of a socio-economic system for determining the stages of progress Rostow, as if at the wave of a magic wand, transforms the countries of decaying capitalism with their reactionary economic and political system into the vanguard of progress, while the socialist countries which have opened up a new age in mankind's development are relegated to the backyard of history.

Ignoring the social essence of progress is the main fallacy

[1] W. W. Rostow, *The Stages of Economic Growth*, Cambridge, 1960, p. 2.

of Rostow's theory and of all other varieties of the "single industrial society" theory. They elevate into an absolute some common features of the capitalist and the socialist societies, determined by the more or less equal level of development of the contemporary *productive forces,* and they ignore the fundamental differences in the types of social progress which follow from the nature of their intrinsic *relations of production.* The general concept "industrial society" glosses over all the basic social differences.

True, some bourgeois sociologists (for example, T. Parsons) speak of two types of industrialisation and, correspondingly, of two types of industrial societies. But these types, too, are determined by them without regard for the socio-economic system. Societies which base their activity on private enterprise relatively independent of governments are regarded by them as one type. The other type are societies in which the development of the industrial system proceeds, as they think, with the government playing the primary role.

The theory of "modernisation" of society was sedulously advocated at the 6th International Congress of Sociology, held in September 1966. In a special paper dealing with a definition of modernisation, R. Bendix, an American sociologist, tried to single out salient features of the transition from the pre-industrial to the industrial society. Bendix saw no essential differences between the industrial revolution of the 18th and 19th centuries, made in a period when capitalism was maturing, and the industrialisation of backward countries along the lines of socialism in the 20th century. He saw in both the division of the world into societies which have advanced and those lagging behind them; he noted the bigger part played by governments in modernising relatively backward countries as compared with relatively advanced states, and so on.

It goes without saying that, depending on the concrete historical conditions, the state may play a bigger or smaller part in converting agrarian into industrial countries. But the social meaning and consequences of industrialisation are not determined by the degree of state intervention. They depend above all on what social system strikes root as a result of industrialisation—capitalist or socialist.

The essence of progress cannot be reduced to changes in the technology of production. At definite stages of historical development it also presupposes revolutionary changes in the forms of property, in the entire system of socio-economic relations. The rate of technological progress, its social consequences and laws depend on these changes. It is for this reason that types of industrialisation should be differentiated above all according to the road a country's development follows—the capitalist or the socialist.

A "single industrial society" does not actually exist, it is a figment of the imagination. There are two systems, two societies, representing different socio-economic formations. And the difference between them lays its imprint on all sides of social life, including scientific and technological progress. That is why even the common features which follow from the unity of the material culture of our age, which we mentioned earlier, are modified in the development of each society.

What are the distinctions of social progress under socialism? What are the decisive features which furnish grounds for regarding its development as a new type of social progress?

Elimination of the antagonistic nature of social progress is the first and decisive distinction of socialist society.

This antagonistic nature is a common feature of social progress in all pre-socialist formations, beginning with the disintegration of the primitive community. Moreover, the very origin of social antagonism was a prerequisite for progress. The productive forces could not rapidly develop without the intensive division of labour, which led to the antithesis between town and country, between mental and manual labour.

The division of society into antagonistic classes greatly accelerated historical progress, but this was bought at a high price. Intensified exploitation of the oppressed classes and peoples by the ruling classes and nations served as the basis for the expansion of material production and the advance of science and the arts. Under capitalism, where higher development of the productive forces as compared with preceding formations has been attained, this antagonistic nature of social progress stands out in bold relief. There is good reason why Marx compared progress in this

society with that hideous pagan idol who would not drink the nectar but from the skulls of the slain.

When capitalism was in its youth it was still possible to believe that its advent ushered in an era of boundless progress. The ideologists of ascending capitalism (Jean de Condorcet) looked upon progress as the continuous perfection of man and his reason. To them progress appeared to be the straight and endless forward movement of mankind. But capitalist reality very soon demonstrated the untenability of such views, and this came as a disappointment to many upright and intelligent people.

Capitalism distorted all genuinely human relations subordinating them to its only god—the rapacious craving for profit, wealth and power. In such a world everything, as it were, turns into its opposite. "Machinery, gifted with the wonderful power of shortening and fructifying human labour, we behold starving and overworking it," Marx wrote. "The new-fangled sources of wealth, by some strange weird spell, are turned into sources of want. The victories of art seem bought by the loss of character. At the same pace that mankind masters nature, man seems to become enslaved to other men or to his own infamy. Even the pure light of science seems unable to shine but on the dark background of ignorance."[1]

Contemporary capitalism provides more and more evidence that Marx was right. Mankind has now entered the era of another scientific and technological revolution linked with the automation of production, the harnessing of nuclear energy, space exploration and so on. But capitalism seeks to turn all of these greatest attainments of the human mind against mankind itself. Harnessed nuclear energy, which promises people unlimited sources of cheap industrial power, has been converted by imperialism into the threat of a lethal, devastating war. While socialism, which is the pioneer in space exploration, is placing it at the service of mankind and regards it as an important means of scientific and technological progress, capitalism is ready to utilise this signal accomplishment of science and technology for aggressive ends.

The social consequences of automation also reveal the

[1] K. Marx, F. Engels, *Selected Works*, Vol. I, p. 359.

antagonistic nature of social progress under capitalism. Automation is capable of multiplying labour productivity scores of times; it can bring people a tremendous easing of work and usher in a genuine era of abundance. But in capitalist society abundance is created primarily for the monopoly upper crust. Automation spells unemployment for the worker and ruin for the small producer. According to the *Mine-Mill Union,* an American trade union magazine, automation and capitalist rationalisation in the United States will rob the people of 8-10 million jobs in the next few years. The employers themselves frequently admit with brazen frankness that the only purpose of automation is to reduce employment and raise profits. Robert E. Pflaumer, president of American-Marietta, a leading American corporation, admitted that he considered it profitable to spend $17,000-20,000 if this made it possible to lay off one production worker. He added: "I have no emotional problem about replacing those nice guys who've been working for 20 years."[1] It is easy to guess that the "nice guys" thrown onto the street after having worked for 20 years at the corporation's factories and enriched the Pflaumers, think differently about the "justice" of such a social order.

The progress of medicine, the health services and social security won by the workers through struggle have considerably extended average longevity in the developed capitalist countries. But social contrasts make themselves felt in this sphere, too. Characteristic in this respect is that in Britain, one of the richest capitalist countries, the proportion of children who die in their first year is twice as high in poor families as the average for the country. In rate of decline in child mortality the poor lag some 30 years behind the rich.

Life in the capitalist world is full of such contrasts. High development of science and technology and great social injustice—this is what progress in capitalist society spells for the working people.

Bourgeois ideologists can no longer conceal this deep conflict between economic progress and the ideals of justice. But if at the dawn of capitalism its philosophers, failing to see the antagonistic nature of bourgeois relations, ad-

[1] *Business Week*, December 13, 1958, p. 51.

vocated the idea of boundless progress, now when social antagonisms have become so glaring, many of them are trying to undermine the faith of the people in the possibility of any progress in general. Bourgeois sociologists frequently assert that the idea of progress is unscientific and must be discarded. As far back as the beginning of the 20th century Vilfredo Pareto, a Swiss sociologist, called for a renunciation of the worship of reason, truth and progress, which, like all cults comes among illogical actions. The *Philosophisches Wörterbuch*, explaining the concept "progress", remarks: "Belief in progress has been greatly shaken by two world wars and now a pessimistic world outlook is beginning to spread."[1] For a more detailed explanation of this thought the dictionary refers the reader to the following items: "Abendland" (West), "Apokalyptisch" (Apocalyptic) and "Untergangserwartungs" (Expectation of Doom). In the latter item we find a statement made at the beginning of the 16th century by Ulrich von Hutten: "Our century! Science, what a pleasure it is to live!" He thus voiced his belief in progress. But today everything is different. "The keynote of the present history of philosophy is the idea of an apocalyptic end. Crash, catastrophe, sunset, twilight, the end—all these words are found in any study of the history of culture."[2] Renunciation of progress is the final word of wisdom uttered by the ideologists of the obsolete class which has become the greatest stumbling block to the advance of society and would like to carry along all mankind with it to its grave.

Marxism-Leninism is the only doctrine which has provided a scientific analysis of the laws governing social progress and indicated the real way for resolving social antagonisms. This way is not a reversion from the contradictions of capitalism to pre-capitalist relations, as was advocated by petty-bourgeois socialists and anarchists such as Proudhon and Sismondi in France or by the Narodniks in Russia. To call for a halt to historical progress in order to avoid antagonisms means to be both reactionary and utopian. We must go forward and not back, resolve social antagonisms in a revolutionary way, and not conceal them.

[1] *Philosophisches Wörterbuch*, Stuttgart, 1955, S. 167.
[2] Ibid., S. 613.

Only in this way can a path be blazed to the new, higher social system in which historical progress will forever lose its antagonistic nature.

"No antagonism, no progress," Marx wrote. "This is the law that civilisation has followed up to our days."[1] This law ceases to operate with the transition to socialism. In conditions of the socio-political and ideological unity of society, which arose on the basis of the socialist mode of production after the abolition of the exploiting classes, social progress becomes subject to other laws.

The antagonism within the socialist mode of production is eliminated: relations of production do not become fetters on the development of the productive forces. Under socialism, there are contradictions in the mode of production, but the sides of the production relations which become obsolete are eliminated here without social revolution because obsolete classes no longer stand behind them. When relations of production change under socialism, social property remains and is further developed. This determines the *boundless nature* of progress. While preceding formations experienced, alongside the ascending period of their development, a descending period, communism is free from such a restriction, it will be boundlessly improved and renewed.

Under socialism and communism, progress meets the interests of the entire society and all its members. Society is no longer divided into reactionary and progressive classes; all social groups are interested in building communism.

Their common interest in social progress is explained above all by the fact that it benefits all members of society. While in antagonistic class formations material and spiritual wealth is concentrated at one pole and poverty at the other, under socialism an increase in society's wealth spells an increase for all. Social production is subordinated to the ever fuller satisfaction of the growing material and cultural needs of the people. To ensure the continuous progress of society, to give each member of society material and cultural goods and benefits according to his rising needs, individual requirements and tastes—such is the aim of communist production.

[1] K. Marx, *The Poverty of Philosophy*, Moscow, 1966, p. 53.

Under socialism, all the achievements of science, technology and production are placed for the first time in history at the service of the entire society and not of a minority of its members. That is why scientific and technological progress is no longer a double-faced Janus for the working people, as is the case under capitalism, where, on the one hand, it promotes society's advance and, on the other, brings new calamities to the people. "Automation, boon or bane?" This question does not exist for the people in the socialist countries. They know that automation does not threaten them with unemployment, the obsolescence of their trade and loss of livelihood, that it eases their labour, raises their living standard and facilitates their cultural and technical advance. Under socialism, too, automation raises specific problems and engenders contradictions which have to be resolved (for example, the need to retrain part of the workers, to redistribute manpower, and so on). But the very nature of these problems and contradictions is entirely different from what happens under capitalism: they never express and never cause class conflicts.

In evaluating social progress it is necessary to consider not only the development of production but also the aim it serves and what it gives the people. Under socialism, economic and cultural progress fully coincides with an improvement in the living standard and the spiritual advance of the whole people. Before the advent of socialism culture even in periods of its efflorescence remained accessible chiefly to the minority, the upper crust of society. This was the case in all periods when culture flowered to the full—whether the classical culture in Athens or the Renaissance in Western Europe. Only the new system could undertake to elevate gradually the entire mass of manual workers to the level of mental workers. This task is being accomplished during the building of communism. The Soviet Union has now 187 students per 10,000 of population, about 2 times as many as France, 2.6 times as many as Britain and almost four times as West Germany. Together with an advance in the material and cultural standards, socialism creates more favourable conditions for the development of the individual, extends the opportunities he has for developing his capabilities and fully applying them. This is progress for each and at the same time progress for all.

The relationship between social progress and the ideals of equality, justice, and humanity radically changes as compared with preceding formations. Socialism and communism remove the ground for conflict: society's progress directly promotes the realisation of these lofty ideals. The historic mission of communism is to deliver all people from social inequality, from all forms of oppression and exploitation and the horrors of war. Communism brings *peace, labour, freedom, equality, fraternity, and happiness* to all the peoples on earth. This is a society in which the greatest abundance of material and cultural wealth is inextricably combined with supreme social justice.

Elimination of the uneven nature of historical progress is an important result of abolishing class antagonisms. In determining the type of social progress, account must be taken of the extent to which different peoples are drawn into the general advance of mankind. So far historical progress has been extremely uneven. This unevenness contains a tragic contradiction displayed in the fact that the progress of some countries is effected at the expense of others.

Some countries and peoples marched forward, while others lagged behind in their development and remained for a long time in the backyard of history. Numerous apologetic theorists have tried to demonstrate that such an order is natural and unavoidable: some of them have divided the peoples into "historic" and "non-historic"; others have ascribed racial "inferiority" to the backward peoples; still others have perceived in this a manifestation of the natural and ineradicable law of the "struggle for existence". No proponent of these theories wants to see the real causes which have doomed peoples who fell behind in their development to ever greater backwardness: class and national oppression, colonial exploitation and predatory wars.

Under imperialism, the unevenness of economic and political development, inherent in capitalism generally, has become extremely pronounced. Historical progress has assumed a particularly one-sided, and it may be said, warped nature. This is particularly noticeable when comparing the position of a small group of imperialist powers and the peoples in the remaining colonies. According to official data of the United Nations, at the time the former colonies

won their political independence, the per capita annual national income amounted altogether to $25 in Indonesia, while in the Netherlands it was 20 times greater. In Burma it was $36, in India $57 and in Britain more than 10 times higher. In the imperialist countries average longevity reached 65 years, while in the countries oppressed by them it did not exceed 30-35 years. This means that on the average every citizen of an imperialist state was assured a life span twice as long as a man who had the misfortune of being born in a colony.

Josué de Castro, a well-known Brazilian scholar, points out that even at the present level of technology it is possible to feed a population 10 times as great as the present; nevertheless, starvation remains the most dreaded and widespread disease in the world and claims a huge toll of life. In poor countries "people live in different conditions from those obtaining in the rich world: in the highly developed countries people are born to populate the earth whereas in the poor world, which is so little thought of, people are born not to populate the earth but to fly in the heaven like angels. Six or seven newborn children out of 10, that is, more than half have never a chance to live on. This high rate of mortality is a striking illustration of the fact that in these countries it is not the earth that feeds the man but the man who feeds the earth."[1]

This is a kingdom not only of starvation and poverty but also of darkness. According to UNESCO, in 1962 illiterates comprised more than half of the adult population in 97 of 158 states and territories and more than four-fifths in 23. Wealth and poverty, culture and darkness not merely exist side by side; there is also a definite causal connection here; some are poor because (this is one of the main reasons) others are rich. The backwardness of the so-called less developed countries cannot be explained merely by their own development; the backwardness they inherited has been supplemented by the one imposed from the outside, as a result of their exploitation by highly developed imperialist states.

Socialism precludes the development of some countries at the expense of others. Here social progress meets the

[1] *Quel avenir attend l'homme?*, p. 68.

interests not only of all groups of society but also of all peoples who are jointly advancing to a common goal. Differences in the level of some peoples, inherited from preceding formations, are not an insurmountable obstacle to uniting their efforts. On the contrary, such unification creates the conditions for eliminating the backwardness of peoples and countries. The development of the peoples who fell behind is accelerated by mutual assistance and by the efforts of each people with the fraternal support of others. In the community of socialist countries it is absolutely inconceivable that the assistance received by lagging countries should be made conditional, as is the case under capitalism, on terms which compel them to remain for decades at the same low level of industrial development and do not allow them to get rid of the deformed colonial pattern of the economy.

Accelerated development of the formerly backward countries which have taken the socialist road is no longer a scientific prediction but a historical fact. Thanks to the high economic growth rates in the world socialist system as a whole and particularly in the formerly backward countries, the economic levels of the socialist countries are being evened out. As regards the output of electric power per head of population, the gap between the most and the least developed European socialist countries was 50 per cent towards the end of the 1960s, whereas before the Second World War the gap between the more developed countries of Eastern Europe and the less developed ones was 500 to 600 per cent.

In the course of building socialism and communism the socialist countries will gradually draw together in size of per capita national income and industrial output, efficiency of agricultural production, level of labour productivity and major indices of the living standard. This presupposes more rapid development of countries with a lower economic level as compared with other socialist countries.

The uneven nature of historical development will thus gradually be eliminated. Under socialism, progress assumes the character of general development of all peoples and countries.

It goes without saying that the elimination of uneven development of different countries, the evening out of their

levels, is a very intricate and prolonged process. It is also linked with overcoming certain contradictions between countries within the world socialist system, determined by differences in geographical location, development levels, and so on. Such contradictions can be sharpened by nationalist tendencies, which are especially dangerous in cases where they gain the upper hand in the leadership of certain countries. But given the correct policy, the proper combining of the efforts of each country designed to develop its national economy with international co-operation, these contradictions can be successfully overcome.

Whereas in the capitalist world the domination of some and the subjugation of others, rivalry and conflict between states is the law of relations between countries which accentuates the unevenness of their development, in the socialist world, on the contrary, comradely mutual assistance and co-operation among the peoples which helps to even out their development levels is the law of their advance.

Mutual assistance and co-operation of the socialist countries find their material embodiment in ever-closer economic ties between them. Reciprocal deliveries account for some 63 per cent of the foreign trade of CMEA socialist countries. They co-ordinate their national economic plans, deepen the socialist international division of labour and extend production ties between them. This is indicated, for example, by the combining of the electric power systems of Hungary, the German Democratic Republic, Poland, Rumania, Bulgaria, the Western Ukraine (the U.S.S.R.) and Czechoslovakia. A single power system of the socialist countries is taking shape, which will encompass the European part of the Soviet Union and the other socialist countries of Europe. Deeply symbolic is the name given to the gigantic oil pipeline, more than 4,500 km long, which links Soviet oil fields with refineries in Poland, the German Democratic Republic, Czechoslovakia and Hungary. Born of the people's comradeship, it is named Druzhba (Friendship).

The system of economic ties between socialist countries has been established and is developing in a planned way. Whereas the capitalist international division of labour operates spontaneously, which accentuates its distorted and one-sided character, the socialist international division of

labour is effected consciously and in a planned way, in conformity with the vital interests of all the socialist countries, the interests of their harmonious and all-round development. The uneven nature of historical development is closely connected with its spontaneity. On the contrary, the *conscious, planned nature of changes*, which is an important feature of historical progress under socialism and communism, is one of the prerequisites for eliminating this unevenness.

The planned nature of progress in socialist society is one of the great advantages of socialism over capitalism. Today it is generally known that no government in the capitalist world, no party in office, is capable of offering a real programme for the long-term development of the entire society. True, at the present level of production, planning becomes such a pressing necessity that even some capitalist countries elaborate various economic programmes. But bourgeois ideologists are compelled to admit, like the West German professor Fritz Baade, that this "planning" is more in the nature of "forecasts how, given definite prerequisites, development will proceed in the next few decades".[1] Many bourgeois sociologists sceptically regard the possibility of guiding or even forecasting society's life. Characteristic in this respect are the opening words of the book *Modern Sociological Theory in Continuity and Change*: " 'We don't know where we're going but we're on our way' is a sentiment that, spoken or unspoken, describes many of our day-to-day activities, not only in these United States, but throughout the world. It is by no means a sentiment to be despised.... Even when we extrapolate 'trends', we may go sadly astray...."[2]

If we use the expression of this book it may be said that the socialist world fosters an entirely different sentiment in people. They know they are going and, moreover, where they are going. Understanding of the aim of social development, the unity of this aim for the entire society and the consequent purposeful nature of practical activity—all this greatly accelerates society's advance. Thus, the planned

[1] Fritz Baade, *Der Wettlauf zum Jahre 2000*, Berlin, 1966, S. 17.
[2] *Modern Sociological Theory in Continuity and Change*, edited by Howard Becker and Alvin Boskoff, New York, 1957, p. V.

nature of historical progress is a tangible factor making for its acceleration.

High growth rates of society are also a specific distinction of historical progress under socialism and communism.

This distinction, of course, is also linked with the general law of society, namely, as history advances its pace is increasingly accelerated.

To give an idea of the general rhythm of history we use the picturesque comparison given by J. Lewis Powell, a British scholar. He "compressed 50,000 years of mankind's recorded history into fifty years, and developed the following chronology: 1) ten years ago, man left his cave for other kinds of dwellings; 2) five years ago, an unknown genius invented the first writing; 3) two years ago, Christianity appeared; 4) six months ago, Gutenberg developed movable type; 5) ten days ago, electricity was discovered; 6) yesterday morning, the airplane was invented; 7) last night, radio; 8) this morning, television; 9) the commercial, jet airplane was invented less than a minute ago".[1]

This comparison graphically illustrates the acceleration of the rate of scientific and technological progress, but like every comparison, naturally, it is relative. It does not include such an important element which determines the rhythm of social progress as the succession of socio-economic formations. Yet, acceleration of the rate of social development during transition from one society to another, a higher one, is an important indicator of the general forward movement of mankind. Each new socio-economic formation extends the possibilities and creates new driving forces for the development of production.

In particular, capitalism brought with it a tremendous speeding up of social progress as compared with earlier formations. But its antagonistic contradictions and intrinsic spontaneity and unevenness restrict the employment of the possibilities created by society for further advance. Socialism removes the obstacles to the development of the productive forces determined by private capitalist ownership of the means of production.

High and stable growth rates of production and all other

[1] *Speaking of Space*, edited by Richard M. Skinner and William Leavitt, Boston, Toronto, 1962, pp. 116-17.

sides of social life are a law of the socialist system. The experience of a number of countries shows that under socialism the economy grows much more rapidly than under capitalism. Moreover, the growth rates of the socialist economy, after the backwardness inherited from the past is eliminated, are not slowed down. This is one of the indices of socialism's progressive nature.

Planned organisation of production and all social life plays an essential part in speeding up the advance of society under socialism and communism. Thanks to this, society is able, first, to find the most expedient way for its development; second, to concentrate its efforts on the main tasks, not to diffuse or waste them; third—and this is of decisive significance—to plan, and consciously guide society's development by drawing ever wider masses into active participation in building the new life, and thus to speed up the forward movement of society.

Acceleration of the rate of historical development is inseparably linked with liberating the people from class and national oppression, with their awakening to independent life.

Socialism raises the people from the "lower depths" to the conscious and active making of history, it awakens the energy and initiative of all members of society—herein lies a truly inexhaustible reserve of forces for solving the most intricate and difficult historical problems.

The experience of socialist industrialisation in the U.S.S.R. and other socialist countries is indicative in this respect. Socialism transforms backward, agricultural lands into advanced, industrial states in the life-time of one generation, and not in the course of centuries. The "secret" of this transformation lies above all in that socialist industrialisation, in contrast to capitalist, becomes the cause of the entire people, meets their interests, brings them material well-being. Under socialism the working masses feel not only the influence of *objective* consequences of industrialisation but also become the *subject* of industrialisation, that is, consciously carry it out. And this vastly accelerates progress.

At the 5th International Congress of Sociology (September 1962) some Western sociologists asserted that it was wrong to compare the rates of capitalist and socialist industrialisation and give preference to the latter because the former took place in a different historical epoch, when the general

course of history was much slower. It is true, of course, that in the present historical epoch the general rate of historical development has risen. But why is it that even today many less developed countries, remaining within the bounds of the capitalist economic system, do not get onto the road of swift advance? This incontrovertibly proves that the possibilities and the rate of historical development are connected with the nature of the social system.

The faster pace of social progress enhances the attractiveness of socialism for the working people of other countries, especially economically less developed. They see how the socialist countries successfully solve their fundamental national and social problems, problems that are so acute in their own countries. In his book *Democracy's Manifesto* William O. Douglas, Justice of the U.S. Supreme Court, wrote: "Soviet communism makes a powerful psychological impact in underdeveloped areas because of the way it has exploited the industrial revolution. In about forty years, Russia has risen from feudalism to an industrial society; her scientific advances have been widely heralded by Sputnik and by her astronauts. Her propaganda—'Why take 165 years, like the United States did? Why not do it our way in your lifetime?'—has had a great impact on people in a hurry to escape the misery of mud huts."[1]

But what can capitalism offer to people in "mud huts"? So-called economic "aid" as a result of which the poor people become even poorer? Imperialism is able to disguise its aims, but it is incapable of disinterested help for its victims. Only the existence of the socialist system and its help to developing countries, only the vain hope of extinguishing the flames of the national liberation movement compels the imperialist powers to make some concessions to the backward countries. The enslavement of the less developed countries is as inextricably bound up with imperialism, with its rise and development, as their liberation is inseparable from the birth and consolidation of socialism.

Ability to exist without wars should also be regarded as a criterion of the progressiveness of a social system in our age. It is generally known that the arms race creates the

[1] William O. Douglas, *Democracy's Manifesto*, New York, 1962, p. 31.

gravest menace to the future of mankind and also seriously retards economic, social and cultural progress. In 1967, the annual expenditure for military purposes throughout the world reached $182,000 million.[1] People in all countries of the world could be provided with homes on the money spent for military purposes in the last ten years. It is easy to imagine how social progress will be accelerated when these huge resources are released and put to use.

The progressiveness of socialism as a new social system is also demonstrated by the fact that it contains no driving forces impelling man toward war. On the contrary, it makes all sections of society vitally interested in peace. The possibility of preventing world wars which appeared in our days is inseparably linked with the birth and development of socialism. As it grows in size and strength, the world socialist system is increasingly influencing the destinies of mankind. This is added proof that socialism acts today as a powerful catalyst both of the development of the countries where it has triumphed and also of world progress as a whole.

"Even progress is moving faster owing to the stimulating presence of the Soviet Union with its scientific and technological accomplishments," A. Pancaldi, a well-known Italian publicist, declares.[2] He notes that the exploration of outer space by man would have been much slower had not this new experiment in the history of mankind been initiated by the land of the October Revolution. The capitalist West has been compelled to join in the race for progress not only because the conditions for the competition were created by the new technology and scientific discoveries but above all because this was dictated by the achievements of the Soviet Union, the country where the October Revolution had released tremendous reserves of energy.

Just as the discoveries of modern science have demonstrated to mankind what titanic stores of energy are hidden within the atom, the social revolution, made on one-fourth of the earth, has disclosed and released the inexhaustible reserves of social energy inherent in the people, the principal driving force of social progress.

[1] *UNESCO Courier*, January 1970, p. 15.
[2] See *Za rubezhom*, Moscow, No. 45, 1966, p. 5.

3. Dialectics of the Transition from Socialism to Communism

For Marxists communism is neither an abstract ideal nor society in a stagnant condition. From the very outset the founders of Marxism regarded communism not only as a result of all preceding history, but also as the beginning of the immeasurably richer future history of mankind.

Naturally, with such an approach communist society itself is considered a developing society which passes through different stages of maturity. The measure of this maturity is first of all the development of the productive forces which is the supreme criterion not only of social progress as a whole but also of the progress of the communist formation itself. It underlies the development of socialism, as the lower phase, into the higher phase of communism. It is this that imparts to the transition from socialism to communism the character of a natural historical process which cannot be achieved at will but becomes possible and necessary only as the productive forces attain the necessary degree of development.

Lenin foresaw that politically the difference between the first, or lower, and the higher phase of communism, will probably be tremendous in time.[1] This difference did not appear in the foreground under capitalism. But today when socialism has already been built we behold this difference in its entire tremendous scope and determine the scale of the great tasks which must be accomplished for the transition to communism. In all spheres of social life—in material production, in socio-economic and political relations, in the realm of culture—communism will signify a higher stage of social progress as compared with socialism.

But for all the immensity of the problems of building communism it is on the basis of socialism that they are being solved. The natural development of socialist society will steadily lead to its conversion into communism. This is a gradual process requiring no social revolution. The gradual nature of this process means that

it is effected not by a single action but through the simultaneous transformation of all sides of social life, the development of communism out of socialism;

[1] See V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 25, p. 470.

it does not require a break-up of the foundations of socialism but, on the contrary, is possible only through their further development and consolidation;

it is bound to be a relatively long process.

These features of the transition from socialism to communism follow from the fact that both phases of communism have common foundations (for instance, dominance of social property in the means of production, the conversion of society into a community of working people, the planned nature of economic and social development), and at the same time essentially differ. The community of the foundations of socialism and communism creates the possibility of and simultaneously the necessity for the development of socialism into communism.

At the same time the important distinctions between socialism and communism dictate the relatively long duration of the development of the former into the latter. From this logically follows the prolonged existence of the socialist stage. It would be a grave error to imagine socialism as some kind of a swiftly-passing stage between different historical periods. Of course, the victory of socialism consummates the period of transition from capitalism to socialism and ushers in the period of socialism's development into communism. But this correct proposition should not make us think that socialism can be converted into communism at once, as if at the wave of a magic wand. Society should pass through a whole historical stage of development along socialist lines to prepare for communism. This is needed both for creating the productive forces of the higher phase of communism and for the thorough re-education of people in socialist conditions. That is why the beginning of socialism's development into communism does not mean that society stops being socialist. Such development can take place within the bounds of socialist relations, which will prevail for a long time to come.

At the same time the shoots of communist relations, maturing within socialism, in one way or another will become intertwined with socialist relations. Whereas the general development of society presents a picture in which past and present features and shoots of the future intermingle, this is especially characteristic of socialism which is an inevitable stage in the transition from a class society to a classless

society. The shoots of the new, of communism will increasingly multiply, while the survivals of the past will be eliminated as communism grows out of socialism.

The advent of the higher phase of communism will signify, first, the preservation and further development of the features common to both phases; second, negation of the features which are inherent only in socialism and distinguishing the lower phase from the higher; third, the birth of new features inherent only in communism. It would be wrong to think that to speed up the transition to communism the historically transient features of socialist relations must be discarded as swiftly as possible. This, far from accelerating the development of communist relations, would retard them.

Communism cannot grow otherwise than out of socialism. Transition from socialism to communism is a gradual process which is effected not through the break-up of the existing system but through its consolidation and further development. It presupposes not the abolition of the principles of socialism, but its utmost use for creating communism's material and spiritual prerequisites. That is why the principles of socialism and forms of socialist management will be replaced by communist principles and forms only when the former are fully exhausted. For example, the transition from the socialist to the communist principle of distribution will be completed only after the principle of distribution according to work is fully exhausted, that is, when society attains an abundance of material and cultural wealth and benefits, and labour becomes life's prime requirement for all. Only by strengthening and developing the principles of socialism is it possible to negate them. Such is the dialectics of the transition from socialism to communism.

It goes without saying that communist features must not be implanted artificially. Over-hasty attempts to introduce communist forms of relations when this is not prepared yet by the development of the productive forces and the cultural advance of the people can only cause harm.

At the present stage in the development of socialist society main emphasis should be laid on the consistent application and improvement of the principles and organisational forms of socialism. This is the aim of all the practical tasks set by the 23rd Congress of the C.P.S.U. if they are taken

in a generalised way. Society improves the forms and methods of managing the national economy, creating more favourable conditions for the rational use of the country's gigantic productive forces, the rapid advance of the living standard and the full use of the advantages of the socialist system. The new system of planning and economic stimulation is an important means of improving the economic mechanism of socialist society. This mechanism is used to accomplish the historic task of laying the material and technical foundation of communism.

Further improvement of social relations is in the focus of attention of Soviet society. Among these tasks involved here are the further strengthening of the Soviet state and the utmost development of socialist democracy. Particular attention attaches to raising the role of the Soviets so that they should fully utilise their prerogatives in economic and cultural development and to enhancing the role of the trade unions and other mass organisations.

Lastly, the further development of education and culture and the upbringing of the new man are of major significance in cultural progress.

All-round development and consolidation of socialism advances society toward communism. It is impossible to speed up this process artificially just as it is impossible to stop it. If socialist society develops, builds up its productive forces, raises the efficiency of production and satisfies more fully the requirements of the working people, it naturally advances toward communism.

Although this process is law-governed, it is not automatic. We should not underestimate the difficulties of the transition to communism and picture it as an easy undertaking.

Under socialism, as in any society, progress takes place dialectically, through the overcoming of difficulties and contradictions. The absence of reactionary classes in socialist society does not mean that obstacles to progress and forces resisting it have in general disappeared. On the contrary, in the new society, too, the new has to overpower the old. The new is born and develops in struggle against the old. The old is no longer represented by any classes, but it is upheld by conservative people, the carriers of survivals of capitalism, who for the sake of their personal selfish

interests or because of their intrinsic nature obstinately resist the new and harm the interests of society.

Similarly, the absence of antagonistic class contradictions under socialism does not signify that here progress is free from contradictions in general. Certain sides of economic and social relations become obsolete, come into contradiction with the requirements of further advance. The contradictions should be disclosed in good time and resolved to ensure continuous progress. Moreover, the resolving of any contradiction offers no ground for complacency, because new contradictions arise in the course of further development. Contradictions will always arise and be resolved, but they differ at various stages of development and their change and succession reflect society's progressive movement.

Under socialism, too, progress is impossible without eliminating contradictions engendered by life. From this point of view, the transition from socialism to communism which signifies movement to a higher stage of historical progress, can be examined as a result of overcoming the contradictions distinguishing the first phase of communism.

These contradictions, in our opinion, cannot be reduced to one basic contradiction or deduced from it by analogy with the basic contradiction of capitalism. They are diverse but in the long run arise from one source, namely, that socialism is merely the first phase of communist society which has grown up not on its own basis and therefore has not fully realised the intrinsic potentialities of the communist formation. Socialism creates the conditions for the rapid development of the productive forces, but despite the considerable acceleration of their growth rates, the production level achieved at this stage is not yet sufficient for fully satisfying the vital needs of society. This contradiction, inevitable at the first phase of communism, makes itself particularly felt in countries which have to eliminate the historically inherited backwardness of the productive forces.

As long as the material and technical basis of communism is not created and the all-round development of the people themselves is not achieved, remnants of the old forms of the division of labour remain. They are expressed above all in the essential distinctions between industrial and agricultural work, mental and manual work and skilled and unskilled work, and these distinctions also give rise to a number of contradictions.

Distinctions in the content of labour, in turn, determine a certain inequality in distribution. Associated with this, as pointed out in Chapter III, are the intrinsic contradictions of the socialist principle of distribution. But this is not a contradiction between the mode of distribution and the mode of production. At times it is claimed that distribution according to work done, which presupposes individual appropriation, runs counter to the socialist mode of production based on social ownership of the means of production. Such a formulation of the question, in our opinion, is wrong because it creates the impression that individual payment for work runs counter in its nature to social property. Actually (and this was explained by Marx and Engels) there is no discrepancy in that part of the product created by socialist society, which is utilised as means of production, remains at the disposal of society, while the other part, utilised for consumption, is distributed among society's members.[1]

The possibility of a contradiction arising between the method of distribution and the mode of production is not precluded. It will even inevitably come to the surface when the productive forces develop further, the wealth of society multiplies greatly and labour increasingly turns into life's prime requirement for all. As time goes on, the socialist method of distribution, having exhausted its mission, will be gradually replaced by the communist method.

But at present the socialist method of distribution fully conforms to the achieved level in the mode of production and plays a highly progressive part. Nevertheless it is not free of contradictions, demonstrating its historically inevitable limitations. These contradictions consist above all in that socialist society by introducing the equality of people in the main, decisive thing, in their relation to the means of production, is compelled to preserve certain inequality between them in conditions of distribution and way of life.

In view of the preservation of social distinctions and the impossibility of fully satisfying the needs of all members of society, grounds still remain for the rise of contradictions

[1] See F. Engels, *Anti-Dühring*, p. 157, and K. Marx, *Capital*, Vol. I, pp. 78-79.

in the relationships of state, class, national, collective and personal interests. The development of socialist consciousness is also contradictory; it inevitably reflects the contradictions existing in social relations.

The disclosure of these and similar contradictions, naturally, is not the same thing as resolving them. The prerequisites for resolving them are created in the course of socialist society's progress as it grows and matures economically and culturally. For example, the contradictions following from the existence of social distinctions between town and country, between mental and manual labour can be resolved only by gradually advancing society's economy and culture. A long period may pass from the disclosure of such contradictions up to their complete elimination because time is required for creating the needed material and cultural prerequisites.

Social unity plays a special part in resolving contradictions under socialism. This unity has arisen as a result of eliminating class conflicts within soicety and creates favourable conditions for resolving the arising contradictions by the joint effort of the majority of society's members. That is why under socialism, in contrast to capitalism, the resolving of contradictions does not entail social crises and conflicts which shake society to its foundations. The transition from socialism to communism is gradual and requires no social revolutions. It signifies the gradual obliteration of social distinctions, the drawing together of all social groups and the establishment of complete social homogeneity.

From this indisputable fact, however, it does not follow that the tendencies of development of different sides of the contradiction under socialism always coincide, that the "divergence angle" between them steadily shrinks, that the dialectics of socialism is, therefore, the dialectics of harmony, and so on.

Wherever a contradiction is disclosed there are always diverging tendencies. This does not necessarily presuppose a split of basic interests, the rise of conflict between the interests of people, as is the case under capitalism. But the divergence of tendencies remains under socialism, too. When, for example, certain sides of socialist production relations, forms of organising the economy and management grow obsolete, a divergence of their tendencies is undoubtedly displayed here. This divergence between the developing productive forces, the new content of labour and the obsolete forms which restrain and hamper this development, tends to become ossified. The "divergence angle" between the two sides, i.e., the degree of their non-conformity might grow, and is even bound to grow, as long as the contradiction ripens and remains unresolved. Without a growth of this non-conformity society would not even detect it and feel the need for resolving it.

Progress in socialist conditions, too, is impossible without negating the obsolete which hinders the forward movement. To leave the old intact would mean to stop development. Therefore, the question is not whether negation takes place under socialism, but *how* it takes place. There is the old which hampers the movement of socialist society, which has to be destroyed as soon as possible. There are definite sides of socialist relations which in time will also age and become obsolete but only when they stop promoting social progress.

The general laws of materialist dialectics, just as the laws of historical materialism, are specifically displayed in the development of the communist socio-economic formation. It is necessary, however, properly to assess the measure of specific differences. The scholar faces here two dangers: the danger of not noticing, not considering this specific difference, of reducing it merely to the outward forms of the manifestation of laws, and the danger of exaggerating it, of actually denying general laws.

The laws of dialectics are deduced on the basis of generalising development not only in society but also in nature. These are universal laws governing the development of nature, society and human thought. If we were to assume that with the birth of communist society the basic content of the laws of dialectics change, that some of its principles will be replaced by others, dialectics would lose its importance as the science of the general laws of every movement and development.

Socialism signifies a new type of social progress, but from this, in our opinion, it does not follow that a new type of dialectics appears here (for example, dialectics of harmony). There are general laws of dialectics which are modified and completely manifested at different stages of society's development. Under socialism contradictions differ from those

of antagonistic class societies, they are resolved in new forms, the obsolete and the ageing are negated by different means. But the propositions of dialectics remain in full force, the propositions that development proceeds through contradictions, that the contradictions reveal the opposite sides, tendencies and features, that their unity is always relative and temporary, that struggle between them leads to their resolution. Such struggle is eternal, and will also go on under communism.

Communist society is a higher stage of historical progress. But this signifies neither a halt to social progress nor the disappearance of its contradictions. The opponents of scientific communism at times allege that the Communists, striving to attain their ultimate goal, are subverting dialectics as such. Dialectics proclaim boundless development realised through contradictions, while communism, they say, spells the disappearance of any contradictions, spells the "end of history". Hence the conclusion solemnly proclaimed by Father Chambre, a French catholic, in his book *Marxism in the Soviet Union*: "It is the death of dialectics which looms on the horizon of the Soviet Union's historical development."[1]

It is easy to discern the meaning of Chambre's sophistry. To secure the "triumph of dialectics" he proposes perpetuating contradictions unherent in class society and, consequently, also the existence of antagonistic classes. But the absolutisation of any concrete forms of contradictions is incompatible with dialectics which Chambre supposedly champions but actually replaces by his trivial sophistry.

Marxist dialectics, in contrast to sophistry, does not perpetuate, does not deify contradiction. It underlines that contradictions arise and are resolved in the process of development; moreover, it is by resolving contradictions inherent in a definite historical stage that society advances, undergoing the transition to a new, higher stage in its development.

With the abolition of classes the class struggle retires from the scene as the driving force of history. But this does not mean that all contradictions and struggle disappear. Under communism, too, people will encounter the old and the new, the moribund and the incipient. And this means

[1] H. Chambre, *Le Marxism en Union Soviétique*, Paris, 1955, p. 470.

that there will be a need to resolve contradictions which life always engenders.

It is clear that the expression "ultimate aim" does not spell an end to development. This expression has always been used by Marxists in contrast to the concept "immediate aim". In contrast to immediate aims, which express the tasks of one or another stage of the revolution, communism is the ultimate aim of the class struggle of the working class, because only with the complete victory of communism on a world scale will all classes, the working class included, disappear, and an end will come to the class struggle which has pervaded the entire history of mankind for millenia.

Does this mean that the development of society will cease? Not at all. Together with class society, only the pre-history of mankind comes to an end, and truly human history begins when people free from any social oppression and the enslaving influence of the old division of labour, fully develop their capabilities and talents. Clearly, the development of mankind, far from slowing down, on the contrary, will be tremendously accelerated.

The possibilities for speeding up social development will be further extended because the features inherited by socialism from preceding societies will be eliminated, the remnants of the old forms of the division of labour will disappear and, together with the appearance of new, improved means of production, people themselves, as the most important productive force of society, will be developed in a comprehensive way. The elimination of social distinctions and survivals of the past, the establishment of harmonious relations between society and the individual will also accelerate historical progress. Increasingly subjugating the spontaneous forces of nature, society will also fully master the laws of its own development.

Lenin branded as boundlessly false the bourgeois notion that socialism is something dead, ossified, given once and for all, and this is all the more applicable to communism. Communism can be likened not to a congealed crystal, but to the ever green tree of life which is constantly regenerated and never grows old. Communism finally liberates society from the bounds of the historical limitations inherent in preceding societies and opens up infinite vistas for mankind's progress.

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 21, Zubovsky Boulevard, Moscow, U.S.S.R.

Progress Publishers recently published:

KOSOLAPOV R. *Communism and Freedom*

The author discusses communist labour as a major condition for genuine human freedom. He analyses the following problems: the epistemological principles of the Marxist conception of freedom; alienation of labour in antagonistic societies; elimination of the alienation of labour as a condition for social freedom; the objective prerequisites for transforming labour into free self-activity; reduction of working hours, etc.