

supplement

ISSN 0201-4297

1985

6

STP

The struggle of the ideas in the
contemporary world

Washington's "Star Wars" plans •

**From "consensus politics" to
"social deterrence" •**

**October 1917 Revolution: chance or
historical inevitability? •**

The Novosti Press Agency

supplement

6

stip

1985

SOCIALISM:
THEORY
AND PRACTICE

The struggle of ideas in the contemporary world

Published bimonthly in English,
French, German and Spanish

CONTENTS

PROBLEMS OF WAR AND PEACE

S. MENSHIKOV

What is behind the "star wars" debate 3

MARXIST-LENINIST THEORY AND ITS CRITICS

M. AVSENEV

Can socialism be attained bypassing capitalism? (Article Three) 13

REAL SOCIALISM AND ITS CRITICS

I. SHISHKOVA

Socialism: motives and aims of education 21

G. KOPYAKOV

The "miracle" that was not 26

MODERN CAPITALISM

M. KOLCHUGINA

Confrontation of classes in the sphere of education 29

S. PEREGUDOV

Searching for a new policy 34

BOOK REVIEWS

G. GRIGORYEV

Democracy and socialism are indivisible 43



I have known some history teachers to completely forget about the USSR when talking about the victory over nazi Germany. Your publications serve to give a welcome fresh angle on the events.

Thomas Kenneth,
teacher,
Great Britain

My wife and I consider your country to be our second Motherland. We'll never forget the sacrifices made by the Soviet people in the struggle against nazism. In the year marking the 40th anniversary of the victory of the USSR over nazi Germany we wish you every success.

P. Seulemans,
worker,
Belgium

I deeply respect your country. The glorious Red Army saved the lives of many Americans and British (I am one of them) who landed in Normandy in 1944. This was due to the fact that the main Wehrmacht forces were fighting on the Eastern front.

Thomas Shola,
employee,
USA

Your publications counteract Western propaganda which slanders the Soviet Union and casts slurs on its prewar and postwar foreign and domestic policy. This propaganda distorts the truth about the Soviet people's contribution to the rout of nazism.

John Olsen,
pensioner,
Norway

Address: STP Editorial Office,
APN Publishing House,
7 Bolshaya Pochtovaya Street,
Moscow 107082, USSR

PROBLEMS OF WAR AND PEACE

WHAT IS BEHIND THE "STAR WARS" DEBATE

by Stanislav MENSHIKOV

"Star wars" has been debated on a growing scale in the United States over the past few months. Hardly a day passes without a statement or an interview by a well-known politician or an article on the origin and meaning of President Reagan's "strategic defence initiative". Major reports and propaganda pamphlets, written on instructions from the White House, describe the "beneficent mission" of space weapons allegedly designed to rid mankind of the horrors of nuclear war. Thorough research papers, however, have also been published by eminent scientists and leading public figures who competently expose the "star wars" programme for what it really is, disproving the arguments of its advocates.

To be able to follow the debate on "star wars" one has, above all, to see clearly the meaning and purpose of the "strategic defence initiative" (SDI).

WHAT THE US PRESIDENT PASSED OVER IN SILENCE

The US President and a small group of his "conservative advisers" have cherished the idea of "star wars" for several years. It was going to be launched in the 1980 presidential election campaign but, on second thoughts, it was put off, for it was feared at the time that any mention of such an idea would mean political suicide for Reagan, whom his political adversaries often called a "war-monger".

Even a few years later, on March 23, 1983, when the US President first publicly proposed the SDI, fearing a negative

● S. MENSHIKOV, D. Sc. (Econ.), specializes in problems of developed capitalism.

● Abridged articles are marked with an asterisk*.

Editing completed September 19, 1985.

© The Novosti Press Agency, 1985

response, he tried to make it look attractive, promising it would protect the US population from strategic missiles and that it would "render nuclear weapons useless and obsolete", thus paving the way for their abolition.

The President also failed to mention the main thing in this and numerous subsequent speeches, namely, that the development and deployment of a basically new type of weapons, space weapons, was planned.

An official statement made by US Under Secretary of Defense Richard DeLauer in March 1984, proves the point. At the Committee on Armed Services of the House of Representatives he listed in a strictly business-like manner the main thrust and components of the SDI. What then are these components?

The "star wars" programme provides for creating means of intercepting intercontinental ballistic missiles (ICBMs) at any section of their flight trajectory: at the launching phase when the rocket engine is started; at the second, postlaunch phase, when the multiple independently targetable re-entry vehicles (MIRVs) begin to separate; at the third, or middle phase in which the re-entry vehicles fly freely in outer space; and at the fourth and last phase, when the vehicles re-enter the atmosphere close to the target. This SDI concept corresponds to the set goal: to build an almost total anti-ballistic missile defense system (ABM). Its inventors expect the system to be more effective due to its many layers. In addition, means of intercepting medium-range ballistic missiles and tactical missiles having a shorter flight trajectory will be created.

This programme will require new types of weapons and new means of observation, homing, tracking and battle control. These are weapons, which, for the most part, will use the energy of directed beams—infra-red chemical lasers, ultra-violet lasers, X-ray lasers activated by small nuclear detonations, neutral particle-beam generators, and others. It is planned to deploy some of these on Earth and others in space, while still others will be fired into the interception area. In some instances bulky optical equipment will have to be placed both in space and on the Earth for reflecting and focussing directed beams. Another category of space weapons includes new types of self-homing interceptor missiles, some of them to be space-based, that is, launched from satellites, and electro-magnetic guns.

The large-scale development of space weapons is being planned. For instance, placing chemical lasers in low space orbits would require 300 to 500 permanent orbital battle stations. It would take at least 250 shuttle flights to deliver fuel

to these stations. Such an ABM system is estimated to cost no less than 500,000 million dollars.

Thus, a closer look at the SDI leads one to conclude that it is a plan for the mass-scale development and deployment in outer space of a new type of highly destructive weapons.

FIRST-STRIKE WEAPON

Announcing the "star wars" programme President Reagan claimed that the militarization of outer space was necessary primarily for defending the United States and ridding the US population of the threat of mass destruction. On that basis SDI advocates hail the "noble moral principles" by which the US Administration is allegedly guided. Let us assume for a moment that this is the actual purpose of the SDI and that it is attainable in the foreseeable future. There would seem to be nothing wrong with it. The realities of the world today, however, are such that, as regards relations between nuclear powers, one must not think in terms of security for only one side. Due consideration must be taken of equal security for all. This is the only possible approach. Why is this so?

In the first place, any nuclear state has offensive nuclear weapons. Approximate strategic parity between the sides is a guarantee that none of them would risk being the first to use nuclear arms, for this would mean risking a catastrophic retaliatory strike. If any of the sides having offensive weapons were to begin to protect itself from retaliation with an anti-missile shield, there would be a real danger of it being tempted to be the first to use nuclear weapons with impunity. The 1972 ABM Treaty between the USSR and the USA was concluded precisely to exclude such a situation. The Treaty banned the development of total ABM systems. Thereby a favourable atmosphere was created for the limitation and subsequent reduction of offensive strategic arms.

The situation is most dangerous when either side is building up a strategic offensive potential simultaneously with a large-scale ABM defense. This is recognized even by the US President himself. Defensive systems have limitations and raise certain problems and ambiguities, Reagan said. If paired with offensive systems they can be viewed as fostering an aggressive policy. But this is precisely the situation which is arising as a result of the activities of the US Administration, which tends to combine the SDI with efforts to achieve superiority in strategic nuclear weapons. All the more so, since the Soviet Union has unilaterally announced that it will not be the first to use nuclear weapons, while the USA stub-

bornly refuses to follow this example and continues to advocate the first nuclear strike doctrine.

Recent research by American scientists has convincingly shown that in the foreseeable future the SDI is unable to ensure the effective defence of the US population in the event of a nuclear conflict. Even those in charge of the SDI programme have to admit this. For instance, General James Abrahamson, who is in charge of this programme in the Pentagon, had to state publicly that a perfect ballistic missile defence was a theory which could not be put into practice.

This in no way means the US Administration has given up its space militarization plans. All the programmes for developing and deploying the new types of weapons mentioned above remain in force. Only the immediate official goal of implementing these programmes has changed. This goal now is to protect only the ground-based launchers of strategic missiles on US territory. Does it change anything in the assessment of the SDI as an aggressive programme which is extremely dangerous for mankind? The only answer to this question is "No".

The US scientists themselves who criticize the idea of the total defence of the population recognize the feasibility of plans to defend strategic missiles, and other important military objectives, such as command posts. But it seems that the interceptor missiles, which are allowed within certain limits under the 1972 ABM Treaty, are quite enough for this and the overwhelming number of space weapons envisaged in the SDI is totally unnecessary.

If this is so, why the need for a whole set of space weapons designed for all layers of a total ABM system? Sober-minded scientists from the USA write that there is a well-grounded suspicion that we are faced with the American effort to acquire a first-strike capability—the ability to launch a devastating attack against Soviet strategic forces and to defend effectively against an attenuated retaliatory strike. When ABM is coupled with the ongoing American buildup of counterforce weapons, such as the MX and Trident 2, and America's adoption of a nuclear war doctrine, the Soviet Union's conviction of US first-strike planning will grow all the firmer.

A PROPAGANDA SMOKE-SCREEN

Influenced by the opposition in the United States and in other NATO countries, the US Administration has made yet another move to hide the true aims and scope of the SDI.

Of late, it has been more and more often described as a programme limited only to research and therefore threatening no one and even not contradicting the ABM Treaty.

All these assurances, however, are clearly meant for naive or poorly informed people. During the debate on space weapons a great deal of data emerge proving that "star wars" involve much more than "pure research".

To begin with, the SDI appropriations (26,000-30,000 million dollars for the next few years) by far exceed what is required for research. To compare: the manufacture and deployment of MX missiles cost less than the so-called SDI research. As the scientists of the Stanford University have demonstrated, "star wars" appropriations include not only spending on research as such but also the costly designing of new weapons and the testing of their components and subsystems, actions which contradict the ABM Treaty. This spending accounts for nearly two-thirds of all the appropriations.

Explaining the SDI in Congress, a Pentagon spokesman said that one of its merits was that by the end of the decade, i.e. by 1990, a number of ground, airborne, and space experiments will have been conducted. The knowledge gained from these tests will help to identify the most promising technologies.

STRANGE LOGIC

The US upper echelons of power unanimously say that the implementation of the "star wars" programme will not harm but will even have a positive influence on the Soviet-American talks on space and nuclear arms. True, the assertions made to this effect differ somewhat. Some declare categorically that the SDI cannot be a subject of discussion at the talks and even less an object of concessions as far as the USA is concerned. The presidential "initiative" in the area of space arms, coupled with MX and Trident 2 missiles and other elements of strategic nuclear weapons, they say, puts the USA in a "position of strength" which is allegedly essential to force the Soviet Union into making concessions. Others hint that a "limited" ABM system does not threaten the Soviet Union's security and serves as a basis for reaching an understanding on allowing an arms race in outer space.

These arguments completely contradict the Soviet-American understanding reached in Geneva in January 1985, according to which the aim of the talks should be to prevent the arms race from spilling over into outer space, to halt it

on the Earth and to limit and reduce nuclear weapons. There are two aspects here, each of which is of exceptional importance. In the first place, the subject of the talks is the prevention of the militarization of space and not the allowing of one or other variant of such militarization. It is obvious that there are no two ways of interpreting it. The other major aspect is that the only correct positive interrelationship between space and nuclear arms is stressed: the prevention of an arms race in space is conducive to agreement on nuclear arms reduction, and vice versa.

The Soviet-American understanding, one must admit, is a consistent development of the logic registered in the 1972 ABM Treaty which said, in part: "... effective measures to limit anti-ballistic missile systems would be a substantial factor in curbing the race in strategic offensive arms and would lead to a decrease in the risk of outbreak of war involving nuclear weapons." And further: "the limitation of anti-ballistic missile systems, as well as certain agreed measures with respect to the limitation of strategic offensive arms, would contribute to the creation of more favourable conditions for further negotiations on limiting strategic arms."

But what was correct in the early 1970s is still more urgent now that mankind is threatened with the prospect of the arms race spilling over into outer space. The Soviet Union has stated clearly that the militarization of outer space will set off new rounds of the nuclear arms race on Earth and call into question the very possibility of limiting space and nuclear arms.

Meanwhile "star wars" advocates are trying to impose quite a contrary logic. They assert that if both sides possessed a defensive nuclear shield, 90 to 95 per cent effective, then 90 to 95 per cent of offensive strategic arms would be rendered useless—and could be dismantled. In other words no arms limitation agreements are needed: a fairly "free" militarization of space would put everything right. The fallacy of these arguments is quite obvious.

IN MILITARISTS' INTERESTS

The advocates of the militarization of outer space are turning everything upside down. They speak of defence while preparing to attack; they advertize a space-shield while forging a cosmic sword, and they promise to eliminate nuclear weapons while in fact increasing and improving their stock-piles. They promise the world stability, yet upset the mili-

tary balance. They speak of harmless scientific research, yet create a new type of attack weapons. They assert that nuclear weapons can be eliminated by creating space weapons, yet they open the gates for an even more intensive race in both space and nuclear weapons.

Why, then, is the US Administration pushing ahead with the SDI, ignoring the convincing arguments against it, risking undermining the existing system of international accords and losing the opportunity of concluding new and still more important agreements and why is it endangering the security of the United States? The following seem to be the main reasons behind all this.

First, the more reactionary imperialist circles in the United States are annoyed at not being able to make the most of the immense military might in their hands to secure a dominant position for themselves in the world.

Their plans are summed up in the US doctrine of nuclear "deterrence". This doctrine appeared in the late 1940s, when the United States had a monopoly on atomic weapons. As it lost that monopoly, the US Administration could hardly expect to deliver a pre-emptive strike without suffering a retaliatory strike. Yet, the wish to make wide use of atomic weapons for blackmail and diktat on the international scene was still there. The "deterrence" doctrine also envisaged the first use of nuclear weapons and US superiority in delivery vehicles—bombers and strategic missiles—and also the relative invulnerability of American offensive forces. Hence the huge buildup of US military muscle in the 1960s and 1970s: first in the form of the notorious triad of heavy bombers, ground-based ICBMs, and submarine-launched ballistic missiles (SLBMs); and then through the massive introduction of MIRVed missiles.

But in the 1970s, thanks to the efforts of the Soviet Union, nuclear parity—approximate strategic balance in both delivery vehicles and the number of warheads—was reached. On the one hand, this provided a basis for concluding Soviet-American agreements limiting offensive and defensive strategic arms and, on the other, it sapped the very foundations of the "deterrence" doctrine. Although the initiative in the nuclear arms race has invariably belonged to the United States it has resulted not in US military superiority but in a strategic balance; it has not made the USA's allies more confident in the American nuclear "umbrella". It has rather made them more suspicious of Washington's military plans. There has been increasing talk in the USA about a "limi-

ted" nuclear war which would not affect US territory but be fought on the territory of its allies; there has also been talk about a "selective" use of American nuclear weapons against various targets in the Eastern Hemisphere.

In the early 1980s, especially with the advent of the Reagan Administration, the US military doctrine has been evolving increasingly towards building up US capability for a total war, including a prolonged one, with the use of nuclear arms, a war in which the USA could prevail. This was said in no uncertain terms in the relevant presidential directives and in the Pentagon's long-term plans. True, for some time the stress was on new sophisticated non-nuclear means of warfare, on raising the nuclear threshold, and so on. These ideas were incorporated into the plans of the Pentagon and NATO. But gradually the wish to build up the US strategic nuclear force was becoming ever more prevalent. The first step along this path was the modernization of this force with a view to building a counterforce potential. The second step, according to militaristic logic, is the creation of a full-scale ballistic missile defence and the use of space weapons to increase nuclear first strike capability.

So, the SDI is allotted a firm place in the plans of the US warmongers. This is the logical conclusion, as it were, of their intention to restore US military superiority, to shield the United States from nuclear retaliation, and to make nuclear arms a widely used instrument of blackmail and domination in the world.

Second, it is of considerable importance here that the US military-industrial complex has a stake in the huge profits which the implementation of the SDI can bring. It has been mentioned repeatedly in the business press over the past few years that the military concerns expect new major initiatives from the US Administration and express a growing concern over the coming expiry of the terms of the contracts for the manufacture of MX missiles, B-1B bombers, Trident 2 and Pershing 2 missiles, cruise missiles and other components of strategic force modernization. The concerns pin definite hopes on future contracts for the manufacture of new Stealth bombers and the brand-new Midgetman strategic missiles. But all this does not clearly satisfy the insatiable appetite of the military-industrial complex. A basically new programme of building space arms is a quite different matter with its term extending over a decade and with the prospect of contracts worth not merely 26,000-30,000 million dollars (which is only the beginning) but, according to experts' estimates, nearly one

trillion dollars. The military concerns have not known such staggering contracts since the Second World War.

It is asserted in official US circles that the realization of the SDI promises great benefits for the entire American economy and makes for the forcing of technological progress on a broad front. Washington is trying to convince its allies that they, too, will be able to enjoy the benefits supposedly offered by the SDI, and threatens that if they do not join in, they will condemn themselves to technological backwardness. There are those in Western Europe that support these arguments.

This, however, is just another propaganda trick, especially where the economy of the USA itself is concerned. It is quite clear that an arms race in space will not help but, on the contrary, will slow down current technological progress, for it diverts colossal resources away from being used for peaceful purposes. The proposed expenditure on the militarization of outer space is already far too high for there to be anything left to spend on putting outer space for peaceful ends and on making full use of the latest achievements of science and technology. To this must be added the unfavourable financial consequences which are inevitable, given the already colossal budget deficit. To those who advocate the benefits of using the "by-products" of militarization for civilian purposes we can raise the following justifiable objection: it would be considerably more effective to use the resources made available by avoiding a potential arms race in outer space and curbing that on Earth in the interests of the broad development of the scientific and technological revolution and peaceful economic progress. The security of the USA itself would gain from this.

Now let us turn to the economies of US allies. There, too, the technological bait is a deception. It is well known that Washington is far from noted for its generosity in handing over the latest technology, both military and civilian, to its partners. On the contrary, there are countless examples of the Americans borrowing technological achievements from the Japanese and the West Europeans, and of "brain drains" from these countries to the USA. If the USA does hand over technology to its partners, it does so on conditions that subjugate these countries to its control, infringe their sovereignty, and undermine their competitiveness.

Thus, the economic benefits which both the USA and its allies might gain from joint participation in the SDI are extremely doubtful, while their losses both in the economic field and in the sphere of military security, are indisputable.

The "star wars" debate reflects the alignments of forces in American society on the main issue of today, the issue of war and peace. On the one side are the forces of imperialist reaction, the military-industrial complex and all those who, ignoring the growing threat of war, are accelerating the arms race in order to achieve the illusory goal of military superiority and the long desired opportunity of "detering" each and everyone. On the other side are all those who clearly realize that there is no reasonable alternative to peaceful coexistence and that the only way of safeguarding peace is to end the arms race on Earth and prevent it in outer space, to ease world tensions and establish all-round cooperation among the peoples.

This discussion reflects, more than any other event in the past, the growing concern of ordinary Americans, who see that the expansion of the arms race undermines the security of the United States, and who are aware that there is only one effective means of protection against nuclear weapons—their total elimination. The sooner these ideas are accepted by those in Washington on whom domestic and foreign policy decision-making depends in the United States, the sooner international agreements ensuring a peaceful future for mankind will be reached.

It is from these positions that the Soviet Union approaches the task of finding a solution to the problem of space and nuclear weapons, and to negotiations of these questions. In order to prevent a further buildup of weapons the Soviet Union has proposed that both sides introduce a moratorium for the entire period of the negotiations in Geneva on the development (including research work), testing and deployment of offensive space weapons, and that they freeze their strategic offensive arms and medium-range missiles at their present levels. Such a moratorium would be an important and constructive first step towards an arms reduction agreement.

Indeed, what could be more sensible than immediately refusing to create offensive space weapons? After all, it is easier to reach agreement on this now, while such weapons have not yet been developed or deployed. Control over the implementation of such an agreement would be extremely simple, and very easy to carry out. By putting forward this proposal the Soviet Union has clearly demonstrated the possibility and need for constructive, practical solutions in the sphere of international security, and once again showed its good will.

International Affairs, No. 6, 1985 *

CAN SOCIALISM BE ATTAINED BYPASSING CAPITALISM?

(Article Three)

Socialist Orientation and the "Soviet Model"

by Mikhail AVSENEV

Western propaganda-makers, putting their own interpretation on what Lenin and contemporary Marxists said on the general laws of socialist construction, try to prove that for the newly free countries the socialist choice means the blind copying of the Soviet model. Since the conditions in the USSR and the majority of these countries differ, socialist orientation, they argue, is out of the question and moves in this direction are doomed to failure.

GENERAL LAWS AND SPECIFIC FEATURES

But these "proofs" fall to the ground. The tenor of the statements made by bourgeois ideologists leads us to conclude that they refer to the concrete methods the CPSU and the Soviet people used in building the socialist economy. But Marxism-Leninism is far removed from dogmatism. Marxists

Concluded from issues 4 and 5, 1985.

● Prof. M. AVSENEV, D.Sc. (Econ.), specializes in problems of the developing countries and anti-communist theories.

do not impose on all countries a definite stereotype of transition to socialism but, on the contrary, warn against it.

Before the October revolution, when analyzing possible directions in the development of the world revolution, Lenin wrote: "All nations will arrive at socialism—this is inevitable, but all will do so in not exactly the same way, each will contribute something of its own to some form of democracy, to some variety of the dictatorship of the proletariat, to the varying rate of socialist transformations in the different aspects of social life."¹ Subsequent development has fully confirmed Lenin's prevision.

It is only natural that the ways of transition to socialism in different countries were and will be substantially different from those in the Soviet Union. Along with the general laws of socialist construction effective for all countries, each of them has its own specific conditions and problems shaped by circumstances. The way these general laws operate in practice depends on the particular conditions prevailing in a country, the relationship of class forces, the level of development of the productive forces, the influence of traditional social relations, and so on. In the framework of the Soviet Union, too, the specific features of separate regions and republics substantially affected the implementation of socialist reforms during the transitional period. Lenin stressed the need to take into account the conditions existing, say, in Central Asia, Kazakhstan and the Far North of Russia. In the mid-1920s there were still survivals of feudal and clan-tribal relations in these regions, complicating and retarding social changes.

Thus, in the central regions of the Soviet Republic the decree on land nationalization adopted immediately after the October revolution was carried into effect either at once or after the defeat of internal counter-revolution and the interventionist armies. By contrast, in Kazakhstan and Central Asian republics landed estates were not fully liquidated as late as the second half of the 1920s and the church still had big land possessions. The peasants of Central Asia and Kazakhstan were still being exploited by the local feudal-patriarchal elite. Thus, the preparation of socialist reforms and their implementation developed in their own way and did not coincide in time and methods with those accomplished in the centre of the country.

It would be appropriate to remind the bourgeois ideologists speaking of a "blind copying of the Soviet model" of the statement Lenin made in one of his works: "... the subse-

¹ V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, vol. 23, pp. 69-70.

quent revolutions in Oriental countries, which possess much vaster populations and a much vaster diversity of social conditions, will undoubtedly display even greater distinctions than the Russian revolution."²

However, this does not mean that the newly free countries advancing along the socialist road should ignore the Soviet experience. As it is, some problems tackled today by Angola, Afghanistan, Kampuchea, Nicaragua, the People's Democratic Republic of Yemen, Ethiopia and some other countries have much in common with the problems which the CPSU had to deal with during the transition to socialism. For instance, already at the stage of socialist orientation the working people can win in the main areas the open economic and political struggle between the forces of socialism and reaction. At this stage the new society begins to create the material and technical base through industrialization and the first steps are taken in involving into cooperative societies peasants and artisans, etc.

In this connection Lenin's appraisal of the international significance of the Soviet experience dating back to the early 1920s is relevant: "We now possess quite considerable international experience, which shows very definitely that certain fundamental features of our revolution have a significance that is not local, or peculiarly national, or Russian alone, but international."³

Lenin explained further that the international significance of Soviet experience lay not only in its impact on the revolutionary activity of other peoples, but also in the inevitable recurrence in other countries of many processes which took place in Soviet Russia at the socialist construction stage.

USING PRIVATE CAPITAL

Instructive is also the Soviet Union's experience regarding the relations established by the working people's state with private, including foreign, capital. Having nationalized the main means of production and exchange, the Soviet state allowed certain participation of private capital, including some foreign firms, in the economy, after the end of the Civil War. The Party set out to use private capital to ensure rapid economic uplift, but took care not to permit its excessive growth, as that might endanger the working people's revolutionary gains.

² V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, vol. 33, p. 480.

³ V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, vol. 31, p. 21.

As the state and cooperative sectors grew stronger, private capital was gradually dislodged from the economy. While doing this, the Soviet Communist Party did not resort to any bans, as the imperialist ideologists claim, but used economic levers—prices, taxes, credit, etc. As a result, by 1927 the share of the private sector in industrial production fell to 2.2 per cent compared with about 24 per cent in 1924. From 1924 to 1927 the share of private capital in retail trade dropped from 53 to 40 per cent. The CPSU did not press for the early liquidation of the private sector in the sphere of trade, because state and cooperative trade could not ensure normal supplies for the population at the time.

Soviet experience in this field is used to varying degrees in the majority of socialist oriented countries in conformity with the local conditions. Lately, these countries are more considerate in nationalizing foreign enterprises and more frequently use transitional forms of nationalization whereby the state takes the controlling stock, leaving a part of the shares in the hands of their former holders. Management and technical supervision are also temporarily left in the hands of foreigners and are gradually taken over by national personnel. Whenever foreign companies continue their operations, the state keeps them under strict control. Lenin provided for such a circumstance in his works on foreign concessions.

ORGANIZATION OF THE STATE SECTOR

Of great importance for the successful functioning of the economy in socialist-oriented countries is the management of state-controlled enterprises. The state sector has significant positions in the economy of most of these countries. Workers and office employees in this sector come to see work in a new light gradually acquiring the feeling of responsibility for the future of their own enterprise and then of the national economy as a whole. This, too, shows how these countries use the Soviet experience, in particular workers' control, socialist emulation, etc.

Socialist-oriented countries have to make the state sector profitable so that it does not need "shots in the arm" from the budget, is not dependent on the state, but itself contributes to economic growth.

The profitability problem also confronted Soviet Russia during the initial stage of its transition to socialism. The experience of those years showed that the main causes of the state enterprises' operation at a loss were mistakes at the design stage when enterprises were built far from the sources

of raw materials and transport lines. Other causes were: incompetent management, overmanning above the normal production needs and low labour productivity due to low qualifications and poor labour discipline. People had not yet come to realize that working at state enterprises, they worked not for the exploiters but for themselves.

The Soviet Communist Party gave much attention to profitability. As its 12th Congress pointed out in 1923, "Only an industry which produces more than it absorbs can be successful." That is why when organizing state enterprises the attention of workers and management was focussed on such indicators as growth of labour productivity, reduction of production costs and better quality, expansion of the range of produced items, etc.

THE DEVELOPMENT OF PLANNING

Proper planning is a most important component in the economic policy of the socialist-oriented countries. It is a challenging task, for their national economy is fragmented and embraces different economic structures (traditional, small-commodity, private-capitalist) defying state regulation. In this respect too there is the instructive experience of the Soviet Union at the initial stage of the transition to socialism. The foundations of Soviet planning were laid in approximately the same conditions which exist today in the majority of the socialist-oriented countries.

The Soviet state took its first steps in planning in a multi-structural economy in which the socialist and capitalist structures coexisted and contended with each other and which embraced also small-commodity economies of millions of private peasant owners. For this reason the first Soviet plans drawn up in 1921/22 covered only three branches of industry. In 1924/25, the plan covered 22 branches which contributed up to 70 per cent of the total output of state industry. For 1925/26, the country had its first composite plan which contained mutually related targets for industry, agriculture, construction, internal and external trade and the budget. In May 1929, when public ownership was established throughout the economy, the country adopted its first five-year plan.

Soviet specialists came up against considerable difficulties in planning the development of the private sector. Economic regulation through the policy of prices, taxation and credit played an important part here. Using these levers, the Soviet

government succeeded in compelling private capitalists to expand production and trade in keeping with state plans.

Perhaps, the most challenging task was to extend planning methods to small peasant farms. Direct compulsory planning could not be applied. So, beginning with the early 1920s, the state used methods of indirect planning, especially the system of concluding contracts with peasants for delivering agricultural produce to the state. The peasants who fulfilled these contracts were given a number of advantages in the supply of seeds, credit, agricultural machinery. They were sold manufactured goods at favourable prices, etc.

Along with the contract system, widely used were such methods of indirect planning as taxation and, especially, the price control. A system of purchase prices was introduced for various types of agricultural produce, stimulating their more or less balanced production. Thus, raising cotton prices and, at the same time, supplying the cotton-growing areas with cheap grain, the state secured expansion of areas sown to cotton, etc.

COOPERATION OF THE PEASANTRY

Lastly, the Soviet experience of socialist construction during the transition to socialism provides answers to many questions connected with the cooperation of small and middle peasants. This experience is particularly valuable for young socialist-oriented states where peasants constitute the majority of the population. Important here is the correct application of Lenin's principles of cooperation and, first of all, the principle of voluntary association in cooperatives. Experience has shown that when the leadership follows this principle, as, for example, in Ethiopia, the People's Democratic Republic of Yemen and other countries, cooperation proceeds more or less smoothly. Moreover, many cooperatives in these countries quickly demonstrate their advantages over small private farms. When this principle is not observed, cooperation runs into difficulties.

It is important to introduce cooperation gradually, proceeding from the simplest to more advanced forms. In Soviet Russia, in the early 1920s, for example, priority was given to creating supply, sales and credit cooperatives, most accessible to the peasants. The growth of these cooperatives benefitted both the peasants and the state. The state found it easier to plan the population's food supply and provide industry with agricultural raw materials. The peasants thus got a stable market and were able to obtain manufactured goods. Besides,

credit cooperatives reduced the peasants' dependence on rural capitalists and money-lenders.

Production cooperatives also developed from the simple forms, chiefly associations for collective cultivation of the land in which the means of production were not socialized. Members of such cooperatives worked the land with their own implements. Parallel to them the first collective farms appeared.

From the beginning the CPSU and the Soviet state encouraged the development of the cooperative movement, giving it material and technical aid. Cooperatives, especially collective farms, enjoyed considerable tax allowances and advantages in obtaining credits and loans for buying machinery. Thus, collective farms which in 1925-1926 embraced about 7.3 per cent of villages and contributed only 3 per cent of commercial agricultural output, received about one-third of all tractors delivered to rural areas.

These are some aspects of the Soviet experience which can be applied by newly free socialist-oriented countries.

* * *

The Marxist-Leninist theory proving the possibility for socially and economically backward peoples to go over to socialism bypassing capitalism was confirmed by the building of socialism in the USSR and Mongolia. In a brief historical period the republics of the Soviet East and Mongolia made great headway in their development as compared, in particular, with such countries as Turkey, Iran and some others, which in their time were similarly (if not better) placed as regards the level of the productive forces and the prevailing social relations, including relations of production.

It should be stressed that Marxists speak of the possibility of backward countries' transition to socialism skipping capitalism, but they do not insist that this possibility will inevitably and immediately become a reality. Apart from the external factor—the existence of the world socialist economy with the help of which backward countries can go over to socialism avoiding capitalism, this requires definite internal conditions: the political activity of the masses, their resolve to advance along the road leading to socialism, the existence of an organized social force such as the vanguard party of working people pursuing a policy aimed at building a socialist society in the future.

In most of the liberated countries in Asia, Africa and the Middle East such conditions are non-existent so far. It

is quite likely that in many of them capitalism will reach a level of development when not the socialist orientation but the overthrow of the bourgeois system will be on the order of the day. But the very possibility for underdeveloped countries to bypass the capitalist development stage is indisputable, however much the ideologists of imperialism would try to refute it.

Socialist orientation is becoming an objective law of mankind's development in the epoch noted for the deepening of the general crisis of capitalism, when world socialism has become the decisive factor of social development.

From M. M. Avsenev's book
*The Choice of the Road of
Development and Modern
Anti-Communism*, Mysl Publishers,
Moscow, 1984 (in Russian) *



Since I started reading your articles my outlook has changed a great deal. I become more convinced with every passing day that capitalist society is unjust and that the forms of its existence are ridiculous. Now I understand why the Western press publishes slanderous information about the socialist countries.

Joseph Samba,
engineer,
France

I don't believe Western propaganda which paints a dark picture of your life. By sowing distrust in and fear of your country Sovietologists want to brainwash the supporters of socialism in the developing countries, especially in Africa, and make them give up their socialist ideas. But their efforts are in vain! I personally believe the socialist path to be the only correct one. Capitalism is a form of modern slavery.

G. Mbewe,
Zambia

SOCIALISM: MOTIVES AND AIMS OF EDUCATION

by Irina SHISHKOVA

Seeking to prove that capitalism is viable and has advantages over socialism, Western ideologists spare no effort in criticizing various aspects of the development of Soviet society. Nor do they pass education unnoticed, falsifying its aims and motives, as well as the whole system of personnel training in conditions of planned socialist economy.

CAPITAL INVESTMENT OR VITAL NECESSITY?

When discussing the educational system in socialist society Sovietologists apply the bourgeois theory of "human capital," according to which the acquisition of knowledge, a trade, a profession, skills is viewed as a form of profit-oriented capital investment. So it is a personal interest that inspires one to get an education. They claim that in place of the class of petty proprietors (peasants, artisans, etc.) the socialist countries, using their educational systems, have created a class of independently thinking petty "capitalists", i.e. educated specialists seeking to make the most of their individual capital, education.

What is true about what they say is that the continuous ever more rapid development of the educational system is the aim and means of economic and social policies under socialism. In the Soviet Union, the task of placing the achievements of science and culture within the reach of working masses and training a competent, highly skilled workers set by Lenin

● I. SHISHKOVA, Cand. Sc. (Econ.), a reviewer of bourgeois theories of socialism.

in the first years of Soviet government, has been implemented unflinchingly ever since. At present, over 60 per cent of the gainfully employed population in the USSR have a higher or a secondary education. The development of the educational system to meet the interests of society, the working people themselves, and to keep step with the scientific and technological revolution is an indisputable achievement of real socialism.

The Sovietologists' explanation of the motives prompting the Soviet people to raise their educational standards and skills does not hold water. The desire to prove oneself in creative labour is born of the socialist mode of production when labour becomes man's prime and vital necessity. This desire must be backed by advanced knowledge. That is why continuous education and cultural advancement are inalienable features of the socialist way of life. Polling evening department students of the Leningrad Mining Institute has shown that 75 per cent of them want to do interesting, creative work, 33 per cent believe that education is the best way of developing one's intellect. Students giving priority to the improvement of their material welfare accounted for just 5-6 per cent of those polled.

EDUCATION FOR ALL

In their criticism of the socialist educational system bourgeois authors accentuate the idea that the economic situation in the socialist countries encourages monopolization of education by certain social groups.

There is no denying that in modern socialist society such factors as different cultural levels of families, or distinctions between urban and rural schools influence the people's cultural standards, the range of interests and the quality of general education.

But the social and economic policies of the socialist states pursue the aim of creating equal educational opportunities for members of different classes and social strata. This is achieved through college preparatory departments for workers and collective farmers, and their children; separate competitive examinations for school leavers and applicants with a work record, and the development of an extensive network of evening and correspondence educational establishments. As a result, the educational standards of all social groups in the USSR are steadily rising, with a tendency towards their evening out for the different groups. Whereas in 1939, 87 out of 1,000 workers had a higher or secondary (senior or junior)

education, in 1983 the figure rose to 813. For collective farmers, the growth was much more spectacular: 18 and 677, respectively.

The way the education system is financed under socialism is further proof of its vast opportunities. In addition to free education at all levels, there is an extensive system of student grants as a component part of the social security system. In the USSR, nearly 75 per cent of the students of higher and specialized secondary educational establishments receive student grants. In 1965-1982, the payment of student grants from social consumption funds increased from 0.9 to 2.5 billion roubles. Almost 27 per cent of the social consumption funds¹ is spent on education and cultural and educational work.

COMPREHENSIVE DEVELOPMENT OF THE INDIVIDUAL

Western ideologists claim that education in socialist society is utilitarian, completely subordinated to production interests and reduced to training specialists capable of performing a narrow range of functions. As a result, they allege, the student's personality, far from developing, is deformed and morally impoverished.

Assertions of this kind are a typical example of ascribing the defects of bourgeois society to socialism. With private ownership dominating capitalist society, the educational system serves as a lever the ruling classes use to force on the working masses a crooked pattern of requirements, certain standards of behaviour, and bourgeois morality and life-style. The aims of education are different under socialism where it serves to attain the topmost objective—the forming of a comprehensively developed individual. In socialist society the social, cultural and production aspects of education complement each other.

Karl Marx never viewed the development of the individual separately from his economic basis—the development level of the productive forces and the character of the relations of production which determine the “form of activity of these individuals, a definite form of expressing their life, a definite mode of life on their part.”² He regarded the individual's development level above all as a requisite for the successful

¹ Social consumption funds—state expenditure on education, public health, social security, the development of culture and sports, etc.

² K. Marx, F. Engels, *Collected Works*, International Publishers, New York, 1976, vol. 5, p. 31.

development of productive forces. "Modern industry, indeed, compels society, under penalty of death, to replace the detail-worker of today, . . . reduced to the mere fragment of a man, by the fully developed individual. . . to whom, the different social functions he performs, are but so many modes of giving free scope to his . . . powers."³

Socialist society affords vast possibilities for making work more meaningful and developing its creative potential as far as possible. Whereas under capitalism the application of new technologies is accompanied by labour intensification and layoffs, in the socialist world technological progress is geared to changing the content of labour, improving working conditions and increasing leisure time which Marx described as "the room of human development". This, in turn, has a beneficial effect on production showings since "the labour of a man who has also disposable time, must be of a much higher quality".⁴ Such a higher quality of labour is intrinsically connected with the content of education.

A special place in Sovietologist publications is occupied by assertions that a pragmatic, functional approach is shown in the socialist countries in determining the content of general and specialized education. Such an approach, they claim, is at odds with the demands of modern production since it reduces the worker's mobility, impedes the development of his creativity, inhibits his inventiveness and quests for new solutions.

These accusations are absolutely groundless.

As to the content of general secondary education in the Soviet Union, it has no equal in world practice. All pupils are taught a native and foreign language, mathematics, physics, chemistry, biology, and a wide range of humanities and social sciences. They also master a trade which affords them a wider choice in life. In the higher and specialized secondary educational establishments in the USSR and in other socialist countries specialized training is always preceded by general theoretical training, which tends to increase in volume.

It is their high general educational and cultural standards that enable many Soviet working people to make inventions and propose all kinds of technical improvements. Some 5 million of such proposals and inventors' copyright applications were submitted in 1982 alone, while the economic effect from

the application of inventions and proposals totalled 6.8 billion roubles, i.e., 1.7 times the average annual figure for 1971-1975.

Finally. Contrary to the assertions of bourgeois theoreticians, socialism by no means rejects but rather insists on an individual approach to every pupil and the development of all his abilities. Individualization in education is becoming a prerequisite for fuller realization of the communist principle, "From each according to his abilities". Under socialism individualized education is based on solid general schooling. It is being carried out in the European socialist countries and the USSR. This is exactly the objective of the current school reform in the Soviet Union. It places more emphasis on vocational guidance and envisages a higher degree of individualization of education in secondary school.

Voprosy ekonomiki, No. 2, 1985 *



Thanks to your publications I've learned of the Soviet Union's honest and unambiguous position on disarmament.

Carlo Catapane,
worker, Italy

It is only under socialism that working people enjoy every privilege and really good living conditions. Yours is very just society. Herein lies the difference between life in your country and that under capitalism—in the USA and other bourgeois countries.

Ronald Pérez Amador,
builder, Nicaragua

After reading your publications I've come to the conclusion that your system is juster than capitalism. Your achievements are greater than those of the USA.

Pedro Escamillo Figueroa,
student,
Mexico

Your publications enrich my theoretical knowledge. They speak about the strength of socialism, the CPSU's creative approach to solving today's problems.

Nguyen Minh Hoa,
teacher,
Vietnam

I admire the Soviet policy aimed at halting the arms race and preventing the militarization of space.

Francisco Vieira,
student,
Mexico

I admire your country. The USSR is a state of great accomplishments, technological progress. It is a country of great people capable of changing the course of history.

Philippe Villette,
employee,
France

³ K. Marx, F. Engels, *Capital*, Moscow, Progress Publishers, 1976, vol. 1, p. 458.

⁴ K. Marx, *Theories of Surplus Value*, Moscow, Progress Publishers, 1978, Part III, p. 257.

THE "MIRACLE" THAT WAS NOT

For 68 years now debates have been going on in the world as to what really happened in Russia in October 1917. It is often asserted in the West that the October Revolution was at best a "Russian miracle": it was an "accident", for it took place in a backward country where the necessary social and economic conditions for it had not yet taken shape and which needed many decades to go through the "school" of capitalism and only then could it begin contemplating a transition to socialism. Can one agree with such assertions? Ghenmady KOBYAKOV, a world news analyst, gives his answer to this question.

WERE THE OBJECTIVE HISTORICAL LAWS VIOLATED?

Let us analyze whether the October Revolution was really an "accident" that did not reflect the basic tendencies of the world socio-political development of the 20th century, or had a profoundly logical character and was brought about by objective economic and political conditions.

First of all, on this point I would like to remind readers the well-known words of Lenin, the founder of the Soviet state, that no revolt would bring about socialism unless the economic conditions for socialism were ripe. History has proved more than once that any political regime unless it has an appropriate economic and social foundation, is doomed to failure. Lenin, to whom political adventurism was totally alien, would not and could not have roused the working class and its allies to revolution unless he was sure that the objective material conditions for building a new social system in Russia existed. What was Russia like in 1917?

At that time Russia was a country where capitalism had reached a medium level of development and it entered the period of imperialism almost simultaneously with other capitalist states. By the end of the 19th century, having outstripped the leading capitalist countries in industrial growth rates, Russia became the world's fifth major industrial power behind the USA, Germany, Britain and France. It held the second place in the length of railways, third in metal making and metal working, fourth in the total output of engineering industries, fifth in coal and steel production, and so forth. Broadly as the 20th century approached, Russia's industries manufacturing means of production accounted for about 40 per cent of total industrial output, i.e., more than in Germany and France where the proportion between the A and B groups was about 1 to 2.

In Russia in 1913 a big industrial base comprising 25,000 factories and plants already existed. Moreover, a ramified network of commercial banks developed in the country with five

giant banks accounting for nearly half of all the resources and credit operations, which exceeded the level of the concentration of bank capital in the West European countries. In the imperialist period at least 200 industrial monopolies of all types, including their highest forms such as trusts and concerns, were formed in Russia. Russia was next only to the United States and Germany in the degree of industrial monopolization. The banks exercised control over and influenced companies whose stock capital amounted to 44 per cent of the finances of all joint-stock companies. The banking and industrial capitals were merging, and financial capital was accumulating and gaining increasingly important positions in the Russian economy. The capitalist evolution of agriculture proceeded more slowly. By the early 1880s feudal relations had been completely destroyed. Capitalist relations began to dominate in Russian agriculture, though they took on fairly specific, transitional forms, interlacing with the vestiges of serfdom.

Thus, on the eve of 1917 Russia was economically mature for the proletarian revolution. However, the level of economic development alone does not determine a country's preparedness for a transition to socialism. Evidence of this is the present-day situation in many advanced Western countries, where the economic conditions have long since become mature, or even "overmature", but the capitalists still hold power despite all the crises and upheavals which have affected the capitalist world in the past decades.

It means that, in determining the maturity of the material prerequisites for the socialist revolution in any country, it is necessary to take something else into account, namely the socio-political, subjective factor.

THE ROLE OF THE PARTY AND THE MASSES IN THE REVOLUTION

In order to carry out a successful revolution, a revolutionary situation is needed. Its basic features are, first, the inability of the ruling classes to

keep their power intact. In other words, a crisis of the policy of the ruling classes is required that would produce a crack through which the discontent and indignation of the oppressed classes can pour. Second, the revolutionary situation is characterized by an extreme worsening of the material situation of the working people. And, third, by virtue of these circumstances the activity of the broad masses of the people increases markedly. Lenin said that revolutions "cannot be made to order or by agreement; they break out when tens of millions of people come to the conclusion that it is impossible to live in the old way any longer".¹

Had the revolutionary situation taken shape in Russia by the autumn of 1917? Yes, indeed.

The ruling classes were unable to rule in the new way, and the masses didn't want to live in the old way. Acute social contradictions were arising between the bourgeoisie and landowners, on the one hand, and the masses composed of the proletariat and peasantry, on the other. In September-October 1917, there were 2.3 million workers on strike. The peasants' movement for land was developing on an increasingly massive scale. By October 1917 more than 4,000 peasants' riots had taken place.

However, those conditions were insufficient for the rise and triumph of the socialist revolution. For its success, an organized, disciplined and politically mature working class, ready for mass revolutionary actions, and its vanguard—a genuinely proletarian party leading the masses and pointing to them the correct way to victory, were needed. Did they exist in Russia? Yes, there was such a class and such a party in Russia.

The total number of hired workers amounted to more than 18 million, industrial proletariat numbering 5 million people.

The concentration of labour was also high, which offered the working class more opportunities for its po-

¹ V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, vol. 27, p. 480.

litical organization and class cohesion. Russia was one of the world's leaders in this indicator. Fifty-four per cent of all workers were employed at factories and plants whose personnel exceeded 500 people. For the sake of comparison, it can be noted that the corresponding figure for such a highly developed country as the United States was only 33 per cent. Besides, the skills of qualified Russian workers were in no way inferior to those of West European proletarians. As regards political awareness, class solidarity and internationalism, the Russian proletariat substantially excelled all other detachments of the international working class. The so-called "working-class aristocracy" was not numerous, and workshop and trade-union sentiments among Russian workers were immeasurably less developed than among West European and US workers.

Drawing attention to the role of the subjective factor in the ripening and carrying out of the revolution, Lenin pointed out that "the old government... never, not even in a period of crisis, 'falls', if it is not toppled over".² This factor is an indispensable condition for a revolutionary situation to develop into a revolution. This, Lenin explained, required "the ability of the revolutionary class to take revolutionary mass action *strong* enough to break (or dislocate) the old government".³ Such an ability is ensured by the political party of the proletariat.

As far back as in 1903 the Russian working class founded a Marxist revolutionary party of a new type, armed with the most advanced theory. Under this party's leadership the working class became politically educated,

it tempered and strengthened in the years of the first Russian revolution of 1905-1907, matured still further in the period of the new revolutionary upsurge of 1910-1914 and resisted the waves of nationalism and chauvinism during the First World War of 1914-1918. Lenin's party brought the Russian working class and peasantry to the overthrow of the tsarist autocracy in February 1917 and to the triumphant socialist revolution in October 1917.

Facts refute the Western propagandists' assertions about the October Revolution as an "accidental" and "spontaneous" outburst, showing that it was not a "Russian miracle" but the result of the country's historical development and an expression of the objective laws operating under imperialism. That the October Revolution took place not in an industrially advanced country but in a country with a medium level of economic development does not in the least contradict the main proposition of Marxism that the basis of the proletarian revolution is a conflict between productive forces and production relations, between the social character of production and the private form of appropriation of national wealth. This conflict supplemented with other social and political contradictions brought Russia to the socialist revolution. The country had to choose between a national catastrophe as a result of the war, dislocation and impotence of the Russian bourgeoisie and the transfer of power into the hands of the proletariat. After carrying out a profound scientific analysis of the state of the Russian economy and its social structure, the party of Communists and its founder Lenin worked out and implemented the plan for the country's transition from capitalism to socialism with the support and active participation of the majority of the working people in the country.

CONFRONTATION OF CLASSES IN THE SPHERE OF EDUCATION

by Margarita KOLCHUGINA

In capitalist society education has been and remains a sphere of acute class confrontation. Compelled to reckon with the demands of the scientific and technological revolution and the working people's struggle for their rights, the capitalist state modernizes and reforms its educational system. Structural changes have taken place in the secondary and higher school. The process of education, i.e., the organizational forms, content and methods of education, is improving. Comprehensive schools which formally reject the practice of the social selection of students have replaced the older schools which differed in social status, terms and aims of education (some gave their graduates the right to enter university, others didn't). The working people have, to a certain extent, gained greater access to secondary and higher education.

The reformers were to suit the class character of the traditional educational systems, that had proved inefficient, to the new conditions of capitalist development and to meet the economy's rapidly growing demands for skilled personnel. The reforms were to promote economic stability and growth and do away with social contradictions. Carried out by social-reformists under the slogans of the "universal right to education" and "equal opportunities", they were to channel the working people's demands to democratize education along lines that best suited capitalism and force the working people to approve the state-monopoly policy in the sphere of education.

● M. KOLCHUGINA, Cand. Sc. (Econ.), specializes in problems of education in capitalist society.

² *Ibid.*, vol. 21, p. 214.

³ *Ibid.*

THE AIM AND RESULTS

The restructuring of education, however, has failed to yield the desired economic and social results. The crisis in this sphere has not yet been overcome. Its economic aspect makes itself felt in that the structure of manpower training does not conform to the real demand for it and the possibilities of using it in various economic fields. Suffice it to say that young people account for 40 to 60 per cent of the total number of unemployed in the OECD member countries, though their share in the gainfully employed population does not exceed 20 per cent. Eighteen to 24 year-olds account for nearly half of the unemployed in a number of professions and trades. Employment of specialists has become a qualitatively new and extremely acute problem. West German experts predict that at least 1.3 million specialists with higher education will fail to find a job in the 1990s. From 1970 to 1980, the level of unemployment among university and college graduates in Britain grew from 6 to 11 per cent. In 1983 there were over three million redundant people in the country, half of them young people. The situation is much the same in other capitalist countries too.

The structural disproportion between the educational system and employment in the West is also shown by such a paradoxical phenomenon as a large number of job vacancies that cannot be filled because of the lack of required specialists, and this at a time of mass unemployment. In 1980 there were 766 job vacancies per every thousand unemployed in the United States, 500 in Japan and 354 in the FRG. According to official statistics, the number of job vacancies reached 600,000 in the EEC countries that year.

The equality proclaimed in the sphere of education has also proved fictitious. Here are a few figures. In US schools giving their graduates the right to enter university, students from a high social status group account for 75 per cent and those from a lower social status group—a mere 15 per cent. A similar tendency has developed in other countries: although the proportion of workers' children among students has increased over the past decades, it is still small (12 per cent in the FRG, 15 per cent in France, 20 per cent in Britain and 21 per cent in Sweden).

The growing cost of education is one of the most substantial barriers in the way of the equality proclaimed in the sphere of education. In the 1982/83 academic year the average cost of study in a private college in the United States amounted to 7,475 dollars a year and in a state college—4,388 dol-

lars. However, the material assistance extended to students in the form of grants and loans does not exceed 300 dollars a year. Because of this more and more Americans, even those with relatively high incomes, have to finance their children's education from their future incomes, i.e., by paying off the education costs for five to six years after graduation. The parents' financial status increasingly determines the quality of their children's secondary education. The acute deterioration in the quality of education in US state-run schools compels the middle classes to send their children to private schools. Generally, having received better schooling, students whose parents have higher incomes can make more rapid progress in their further studies and have better employment opportunities, which also contradicts the principle of equal opportunities.

At present the hypocritical nature of "equality" in the capitalist system of education is becoming particularly evident. Formally comprehensive, the modern bourgeois school declares that there are equal opportunities for climbing the social ladder, but virtually selects students according to their social status.

The idea of individualizing education is being broadly advertised in the West. Of course, it is fruitful in itself. But in capitalist countries this idea is assuming ugly forms. Differentiated curricula and the theory of innate mental abilities¹ are playing an important role in its implementation. According to this theory, everyone is predisposed to a certain type of activity from birth and, hence, to a corresponding type of education, and those who can master the secondary school curriculum are in the minority (25 to 30 per cent). This theory is designed to ideologically justify the system of class selection of students, carried out in the bourgeois school. In practice, the demands placed on most students are understated, and children from poorer families are discriminated against. Thus, the system of capitalist mass education is worsening. Evidence of this is the "functional illiteracy" which is becoming widespread. According to the *US News and World Report*, about 50 million people come within this category in the United States.

¹ Soviet science regards the theory of innate abilities as unscientific, believing that the decisive factor in forming the individual is not heredity but one's environment and collective practical and creative activities. Of course, Soviet scientists admit that there are innate differences and hence different physiological prerequisites for the development of one's abilities. But whether these abilities develop and to what extent, depends on social relations, the character of education, the environment and many other factors.—*Ed.*

The capitalist state comes up against substantial difficulties in the sphere of education, ensuing from the basic contradictions of capitalism. In particular, the difficulties are seen in the fact that although the ruling elite is interested in reforming education to keep up with the demands placed on the training of specialist personnel by the development of science and technology, it is, in an effort to preserve its privileges, seeking in every way possible to restrict the scope of such reforms, as soon as their results overstep the bounds of capitalist society's economic and social requirements.

FOR THE DEMOCRATIC RESTRUCTURING OF EDUCATION

With the development of productive forces and internationalization of capital the democratic solution of the problems of education and manpower training is acquiring increasing importance for the working class as one of the major trends in the anti-monopoly struggle.

Communist parties, trade unions and youth organizations place great emphasis on the impact of scientific and technological progress on the level of the working people's education and job skills. This is quite understandable as the well-being and the degree of class and political awareness, as well as the role and place of working people in society as a whole, largely depend on how this level changes.

In analyzing the matter in hand, bourgeois scientists generally base their arguments on the technological changes occurring in the productive forces, but disregard their social and economic form—i.e., social relations and the existence of hired labour. The real causes of the lower educational standards of the labour force are concealed, and the blame is wholly placed on the new technologies.

However, the objective laws of the development of productive forces under capitalism show that the new technologies are introduced primarily to accumulate capital. The possibilities offered by the scientific and technological revolution and automatization with a view to enhancing labour productivity and promoting the all-round development of the individual are limited by the principle of maximizing profits by reducing manpower training costs and economizing on human resources. Therefore the occupational structure of the labour force is developing most contradictorily.

This is due to the historical demands to develop productive forces on the one hand and to the working people's growing requirements on the other. Under capitalism, the specific demands for qualified manpower and the policy in the sphere

of education are opposed to each other and depend on the correlation of social and class forces and the acuteness of the struggle between labour and capital.

The working class and its organizations in the capitalist countries reject the narrow technico-economic approach to education. They proceed from the fact that the struggle for the democratization of education is possible and expedient only as part of the general struggle for the social and economic transformation of society, against big capital (transnational corporations above all).

Against the background of capitalism's deepening crisis a worker's comprehensive training is becoming a factor determining the conditions of his existence. In most Western countries more than half of redundant workers have no vocational training. Unemployment is higher among women, whose educational level is generally lower than men's. A similar correlation between the level of unemployment and education can be traced among foreign workers—the most oppressed section of the international working class.

Of course, education alone cannot guarantee a job under capitalism. But it extends working people's political horizons, promotes the all-round development of the individual and secures a better social status for those members of society who create material values.

This is precisely what the trade unions take into account in their policy in the education sphere. Its essence lies in the struggle for a democratic reform that would guarantee all workers without exception broad general education and vocational training.

The struggle of the working people in capitalist countries to democratize the educational system is complex and multifaceted. The working class is playing its objective and subjective role in making the trade union movement more active in the sphere of education. However, the experience gained shows that the possibilities of making any noticeable progress in this direction are limited under capitalism and that the workers must unite in their struggle to create a democratic educational system.

Rabochi klass i sovremennyy mir,
No.5, 1984*

SEARCHING FOR A NEW POLICY

On the Tactics of the Bourgeoisie during the Deepening General Crisis of Capitalism

by Sergei PEREGUDOV

Capitalism's entry, in the mid-1970s, into a period of considerable economic difficulties wrought radical changes in various fields of social life in Western countries, including internal policy. Although the situation in those countries is different in many respects, their political development has more or less definite common features one of the salient ones being the modification of the political tactics of the bourgeoisie designed to strengthen its domination and preserve the existing system and relations.

THE CRISIS OF CONSENSUS POLITICS

In the early decades following the Second World War relatively favourable conditions arose for the economic development of capitalism, making it possible for the ruling circles in the West to set the sophisticated social manoeuvring mechanism in motion and widely apply reformist methods of solving the sharpened social and class problems. This policy based on Keynesian doctrines of enhancing the state's regulating role found

expression in increased public spendings on social needs and greater allocations for social insurance, public health and education. Obviously, those were not radical innovations that could lessen social inequality. The reformist course often described by Western politologists as consensus politics served a definite class purpose: through minor concessions to achieve "social peace" and keep the mass discontent within tolerable limits. Higher wages, the reformist versions of participation in management, in the distribution of profits and the like, as well as the increased public spending on social needs were designed to create an illusion of consensus between the rulers and the ruled, thereby securing social and political stability.

The course for class reconciliation was evident in the attempts to establish cooperation between the reformist trade unions, employers' associations and the capitalist state. In the 1960s-1970s, even a specific neocorporative tendency emerged in Western political science. Its advocates regarded neocorporativism as an essential feature of socio-political life in many advanced capitalist countries. According to their concepts, the pluralistic model of the interaction of independent socio-political forces and organizations with the capitalist state was being superseded by the neocorporative model, based on interdependence and limited autonomy, whose central link was the trilateral

cooperation of the business, the state and the trade unions.

In keeping with the course for achieving consensus was the agreement between the ruling bourgeois and social-democratic parties on the principal issues of home and foreign policies, be it within the two-party system as in Britain and the USA or the multi-party system as in France, Italy, Belgium and the Netherlands, etc. It was on such a basis that in the 1960s-1970s the Left Centre government with the participation of Socialists was formed in Italy, the Big Coalition of Social-Democrats and Christian Democrats in the FRG, the coalition governments in Scandinavia, Benelux, and in Central Europe.

Significantly, the social-democratic and bourgeois parties basically shared the same ideological and political concepts of the welfare state, co-participation in management, consumer society, pluralism, and so on and so forth. This led to a lull in the political activity of the bourgeois and reformist camp, giving the well-known US politologist D. Bell grounds to proclaim capitalism's entry into an era of de-ideologized development.

As for the actual impact of the consensus politics on the social, political and ideological situation in the capitalist world, this policy didn't and couldn't bring any class peace or the "end of ideology". Moreover, the

● Sergei PEREGUDOV heads the department of the political problems of the revolutionary process in the advanced capitalist countries at the Institute of World Economy and International Relations, USSR Academy of Sciences.

concessions won by the working people raised their demands and stepped up their opposition to any attempts to create obstacles in the way of satisfying the new demands. It was the clash of the masses' growing demands on the one hand and the ruling circles' striving to rigidly restrict the social manoeuvring tactics on the other that gave rise to exceptionally violent outbursts of class struggle in several capitalist countries throughout the late 1960s-early 1970s.

The illusions about "social peace" based on the consensus politics began to vanish fairly quickly. The crisis of this politics had dual consequences. First, the significance of the trilateral cooperation: the state—business—trade unions and hence their stabilizing impact on the social and political situation in the advanced capitalist countries diminished considerably. Second, the influence of the advocates of consensus politics—right-wing Social-Democrats and bourgeois reformists—decreased markedly.

Thus, the forces which set the tone in political government and secured relative internal political stability for the twenty post-war years virtually lost much of their influence. In other words, the reformist model of political development, which seemed almost ideal to many adepts in capitalism only a short time ago, had crumbled.

Of course, the crisis of the reformist methods of political gov-

ernment doesn't at all mean that they have become unimportant. What is meant is the change of priorities and of the general line based on them, which no longer conforms to the altered conditions.

SOCIAL SEGREGATION POLICY: AIMS AND METHODS

It would be wrong to interpret a change in the political tactics of the bourgeoisie as a complete re-orientation of the guidelines of the entire ruling class. But the striving for tighter social policies and transferring the centre of gravity to the stick policy has prevailed in the capitalist world.

The new tactics resolutely advocated by neoconservatives amount to efforts to achieve social and political stability not through concession, compromise and partnership but, on the contrary, by "tightening the screws", i.e., disuniting and splitting the ranks of the working people, undermining their will for struggle and weakening their ability to act jointly. Bourgeois individualism, personal success, competition and the "natural" striving for enrichment are glorified in every way as the best human values and standards of life.

The present-day tactics of the bourgeoisie are highlighted by social deterrence methods elevated to the rank of state policy.

Mass unemployment is central to such a policy. It aggra-

vates the situation on the labour market to such an extent as to compel people to work more intensively and, moreover, to lower their social demands to employers and the government. Of course, mass unemployment is not a neoconservatives' invention, its growth since the mid-1970s in all developed capitalist countries chiefly resulted from the crisis phenomena in the economy. This, however, does not refute the fact that the employment policy was used as a means of "disciplining" the working people and their organizations, a means of lessening the number of strike action, and undermining proletarian solidarity.

It is important to stress another point. In order to enhance the "disciplinary" role of unemployment, the neoconservatives are reducing unemployment benefits and further widening the gap between these benefits and wages and salaries.

Mass unemployment is far from the only "negative stimulus", intentionally adopted by the monopolistic bourgeoisie and those who express its political will. Another such instrument, regarded by the bourgeoisie as fairly effective, is the consistent and steady reduction of allocations for social insurance, education and public health. This policy leads to a significant decrease in the volume and quality of social services received by the population through the state, making them inadequate to the

level of material and cultural development the working people achieved in the post-war period. As a result, people increasingly have to buy such services from private firms and insurance societies and organizations, virtually enslaving themselves for almost the whole of their life.

Making extensive use of social deterrence methods, the bourgeoisie seeks to split the ranks of the working people and oppose relatively well placed groups to less successful ones. Social barriers are being intentionally erected within the ranks of the working class. This is by no means done by improving the position of a certain section of the working people. On the contrary, more difficult conditions are created for those layers and groups of the population that are less protected and need assistance from society and the state. Along with redundant workers, pensioners and invalids, the pariahs of bourgeois society include blue- and white-collar workers employed in crisis-stricken old industries, school leavers having no adequate vocational training, as well as national minorities. Put in opposition to these fairly numerous categories of the working people is the so-called new working class—workers with a sufficiently high level of general education and vocational training, who are employed in the modern sectors of the economy and less threatened with the loss of their jobs. In an effort to win over this detachment of the working

class and to bind more tightly the middle layers, the neoconservatives now and then agree to some concessions, especially in the taxation sphere. More often than not such measures are only symbolic. Nonetheless their psychological effect lingers on fairly long.

Discrediting the trade unions, which are alleged to create an embarrassing situation in the economy and hamper its modernization by their excessive demands, is among the means of undermining the spirit of collectivism in the working class and mutually antagonizing its groups. Taking advantage of the fact that the levels of organization and militancy of the trade unions differ in different sectors of the economy and geographical regions and playing up some difficulties arising for the population during strike periods, neoconservative propaganda is trying to set a considerable part of the working people against the trade unions—at times with success—and to split the trade union movement and deepen its contradictions.

Although, as has been noted, the course for setting some groups of the working people against others is chiefly pursued with the help of the state, using political means, big capital does not stay away either. The monopolistic corporations have not used up their reserves of social manoeuvring, although the latter have been depleted considerably. This is especially true of

the arms producing monopolies as well as the transnationals having branches in countries where cheap labour is available. Both can, by applying certain measures in keeping with the well-known concept of the social responsibility of business, create better conditions for some of their personnel than at most factories and institutions in their home countries. Incidentally, this is one of the reasons why labour remuneration has become more differentiated in recent years in a number of capitalist states.

Naturally, such concessions made to the individual categories of working people cannot but strain their relationships. Even if some groups of the working people receive no extra privileges but merely preserve what they have gained in the post-war period, they come to regard their position as exclusive. No wonder that many of them take the striving to obtain some or other improvements as almost a threat to their own position.

The splitting tactic of the bourgeoisie is aimed at weakening not only the revolutionary but also the reformist wing of the workers' movement and at strengthening the social base of bourgeois political parties. This tactic results from the general negative attitude of the most influential part of the monopolistic bourgeoisie to reformism. In their opinion, reformism today subverts rather than buttresses the capitalist system and economy.

Neoconservatives assign not the least role in achieving their home policy objectives to methods diverting the masses from the struggle for their vital interests, implanting nationalism and chauvinism and stirring up anti-Soviet and anti-communist sentiment. These methods are not new either. The neoconservatives are trying to rejuvenate imperial ambitions among a certain part of the population and thereby facilitate the solving of some home and foreign policy problems. The military venture undertaken by the Thatcher government on the Falkland (Malvinas) Islands and the US aggression against Grenada were designed to preserve the capitalist system and strengthen imperialism's strategic positions in the Western Hemisphere, and also to rally the nation under arch-reactionary banners.

The "end of ideology" thesis has long been discarded, and today the neoconservatives regard it as their primary duty to "ideologize" home and foreign policies and ideologically justify their actions. They are out to create an atmosphere of fear of the communist threat and intimidate the man in the street. They cannot fail to see that their course for stepping up the arms race, militarization and confrontation with the socialist countries is meeting with the growing resistance of the masses, their increasingly active protest. Therefore, dissatisfied with conventional anti-Soviet and anti-communist propaganda, the neocon-

servative politicians are using underhand methods of psychological warfare against the socialist countries and the liberation movement. Their purpose is quite clear: they are seeking not merely to suppress the working people's doubts and protest but, by launching a massive propaganda and psychological assault to turn, if not all, at least a considerable part of the people into their allies.

IN SEARCH OF AN EMERGENCY VARIANT

The neoconservatives are growing more and more concerned over their increasingly apparent inability to assure stable relations between the rulers and the ruled for any long period of time, to enhance political stability and create a new consensus. This is not accidental. Reflecting the retrograde character of the general policy advertised by the new right-wing forces, social and political negativism in itself contradicts the people's aspirations for a positive solution of the problems facing society. It is not surprising that several years after the crisis of reformism led to a growth of right-wing trends and parties in a number of countries, changing the correlation of political forces in their favour, the masses have grown sceptical of their prescriptions for improving society. Relevant surveys show that at present people in practically all Western states regard

lowering the level of unemployment, especially among the youth, as the primary aim of state policy in the socio-economic sphere. They are anxious not only about the fact that the threat of unemployment is looming over more and more groups of the working people, who until recently seemed insured against it, but also about its truly dramatic consequences for society as a whole.

Notable changes in Western public opinion have occurred regarding the policy of reducing public expenditures on social needs, especially on public health and education. More and more workers are becoming aware of the negative consequences of disunity in their ranks. It is significant that the strike movement which was on the decline throughout the late 1970s has been growing markedly since 1984. It is noteworthy that the working people are prepared for a direct confrontation with the government as was the case with West German metallurgists and British miners and dockers in the spring and summer of 1984. This is the most striking evidence of the change of mood.

Of no less significance is the growth of the mass anti-war movement and the trade unions' increasing involvement in it, showing the government's failure to enlist the people's support in carrying out its aggressive militarist course which causes growing anxiety even in the capitalist world.

Of course, the neoconservative policy as a whole and its underlying principles and methods have not outlived themselves, they continue to influence the social and political climate in a number of Western states. Yet, as time goes by, the weaknesses of the neoconservative model are becoming increasingly apparent. The ideologists and politicians of the ruling class acutely feel that this model is unworkable. They are worried not only about the extremely conflicting character of its principles and ideas but also about the absence of a reliable emergency variant. The crisis of the policy of traditional social-democracy and the radicalization process which has affected many social-democratic and socialist parties have made the ruling circles doubt whether these parties will be able to serve as a safety device as successfully as they have done throughout the greater part of this century.

Of course, social-democracy continues to play a major role in the system of capitalist relations. This is attested to by the adaptation of the policy of the ruling socialist and social-democratic parties in Sweden, France, Italy, Portugal and some other countries to the demands of the bourgeois circles. But today the ruling class has to make greater efforts to "condition" the socialist and social-democratic parties and their leadership, and—more important—it has no confidence that these efforts will produce the desired effect. Therefore, a

considerable part of the ruling class is compelled to more energetically search for a viable alternative to the neoconservatives' strategy which is arousing growing discontent among the masses.

This, in our view, is the hidden motive of the centrist political forces' activation taking place in some advanced capitalist countries, including those where the neoconservatives are in power. In some cases, more or less stable moderate factions are forming within the neoconservatism-oriented parties ready to challenge their leadership. In other cases, the "political centre" is strengthening at the expense of the infusion of "new blood" from right-wing social-democracy. Thirdly, attempts are being made by social-democratic and socialist parties to re-orient their programmes towards "new" social-democracy less tightly bound to the workers' movement and its organizations and bent on preserving the social and political status quo.

For all the variety of centrist parties, trends and groupings, they share some common features: they advocate a greater role of competition and private enterprise in the economy and social relations, more emphasis on the market stimuli of social behaviour, and virtual abandonment of the full employment policy. At the same time, they recognize the need not only for preserving but also for enhancing state interference in the so-

cio-economic sphere, however, laying the stress on its selective character.

The overwhelming majority of the Centrists give primary attention to strengthening and institutionalizing a "partnership" of the business strata, trade unions and the state at various levels, including national.

It is symptomatic that the supporters of the "new social partnership" concept urge the need to substantially strengthen the role of the state as a regulator of social relations and a guarantor of capitalism's stability. That is why some of them propose constitutional reforms which will enhance the power of the upper chambers of parliament and limit the authority of lower chambers elected by general vote as well as strengthening the judicial system, thereby creating a "constitutional barrier" to the adoption of decisions that do not suit the ruling class.

It is planned to use the police apparatus of open coercion more cautiously, and bring to the foreground less odious "restrictions" designed to narrow the field of activity of the social and political forces opposing big capital. What is proposed is neither a return to the previous state of affairs and old methods of socialization nor renunciation of the new methods, but a kind of synthesis of both, aimed at creating reliable guarantees of "social peace".

The foregoing ideas and pro-

posals have not yet anywhere become action programmes of the influential political forces ready to take the reins of government from the neoconservatives. Nevertheless, the elements of the new alternative can be traced in the official documents of British Social-Democrats and Liberals, West German Right-wing Social-Democrats and Italian Socialists. They are being increasingly discussed in the moderate wing of the British Tories, among the US New Democrats and in other parties and trends. This, we believe, is fairly convincing evidence of the direction in which the supporters of the "new policy", designed to supersede the purely neo-conservative orientation, are con-

ducting not only their intellectual but also their political quest.

To sum up. The bourgeoisie and its ideologists and politicians are endeavouring to follow a long-term course aimed at shifting the general axis of the internal political development of advanced capitalist countries to the right and moving the left democratic forces to the political sidelines. However, actual development is not determined by the subjective desires and aspirations of the powers that be, no matter how strong their positions in the economy and politics.

*Mirovaya ekonomika
i mezhdunarodniye
otnosheniya,
No. 10, 1984 **

DEMOCRACY AND SOCIALISM ARE INDIVISIBLE

There are many people in the West who are in the habit of associating the concept of democracy with formal aspects and attributes of the bourgeois democratic state. And since Soviet democracy differs from bourgeois democracy not only in its substance but also in its forms, it does not fit their usual notions of democracy.

Indeed, in the Soviet Union there is no democracy like that in the countries of the so-called "free world". Sixty-eight years ago, as a result of the triumph of the Great October Socialist Revolution, a new democracy of a different, higher kind, Soviet, socialist democracy, was established in the USSR and is developing successfully.

The attractive power of this democracy compels the ruling classes and ideologists of bourgeois society to invent and peddle various theories and concepts which distort its social mission, principles, tasks and functions. They thereby attempt to whitewash the anti-popular practices of the monopoly diktat, to drum false values of bourgeois democracy into people's minds.

These theories and concepts are exposed for what they are in the book by Soviet journalist Valery Telegin "Soviet Democracy: Principles and Practice" brought out by the APN Publishing House in 1984 in English, French, Spanish, German and Portuguese.

Perhaps the most widespread ploy used in criticizing Soviet democracy is the charge that it is limited because there is only one political party in the USSR. But the one-party system, the author says, is not an obligatory feature of socialist democracy. For example, there is a successful multi-party system in the German Democratic Republic, Poland, Czechoslovakia and a number of other socialist countries. And

the first Soviet government also consisted of the representatives of two parties: Communists and Left-wing Socialist-Revolutionaries. But it soon became clear that the Socialist-Revolutionaries did not at all intend to cooperate loyally with the Communists. In March 1918 they withdrew from the coalition government on their own initiative and then in the summer of the same year organized an armed revolt in Moscow against Soviet power, thereby destroying any possibility for the formation of a bloc of Communists with petty-bourgeois political parties.

The author convincingly shows that petty-bourgeois parties, including Socialist-Revolutionaries, were not "disbanded by the Communists", as claimed in the West. They disappeared from the political scene after they had compromised themselves in the eyes of the people. The course of historical events forced the Communists to assume full responsibility for the future of the country.

One of the run-of-the-mill fabrications current in the West is the thesis that the Soviet population is far removed from politics. Western propagandists not only refuse to see the truly mass character of Soviet power (nearly 2.3 million people's deputies and 31 million activists participate in the work of Soviets today), but also the important distinguishing feature of socialist democracy—the fact that it extends also to the sphere of economic management. They disregard the mass social activity of the Soviet people expressed in various organizational forms—in the framework of the Communist party (with a membership of over 18 million), trade unions (with a membership of over 132 million) and the Komsomol (with over 41 million members). The scope of Soviet people's participation in running the affairs of society can be illustrated also by these figures: over 10 million people (two-thirds of them workers and peasants) are members of people's control bodies which supervise all spheres of production, trade and the activities of the administrative apparatus; 6 million members of standing production conferences (65 per cent of them workers) and 14.5 million trade union activists participate in production management. Over 8 million people are members of voluntary people's law and order enforcement teams. Over 700,000 people's assessors work in courts of law. Don't these figures speak of the high social and political activity of the Soviet people?

Broad involvement of working people in running the affairs of state and society, the decisive say of the masses in all spheres of state policy—this is the main meaning and principle, the hallmark of the political system of socialism that

differs fundamentally from any bourgeois political systems. And this principle gives Soviet people the grounds for saying that democracy and socialism are indivisible.

A time-worn stereotype of the Western media is the myth that there is neither freedom of speech nor of the press in the USSR. The author shows this to be quite untrue by citing concrete facts.

Take freedom of speech, for example. It comprises the right of Soviet citizens and public organizations to criticize the actions of officials and state bodies and provides ample opportunities for the uninhibited, free and business-like discussion of any questions of social life.

In speaking of freedom of the press in the USSR, the author gives such figures: 8,088 newspapers are published in the country in a total of 176 million copies and over 5,000 journals and other periodicals in over 3.2 billion copies annually. There are 395 copies of newspapers per 1,000 of the population, which is somewhat less than, say, in Sweden, the world leader in the publication of periodicals, but a quarter more than in the USA and the FRG, one-third more than in France and three times more than in Italy.

Though there are no private publications in the USSR, this does not mean that there is a state monopoly of the mass media. Some journals and newspapers are indeed published by state agencies but others are published by trade unions, youth and other public organizations, including art workers' unions, religious societies. Periodicals are published in 56 languages of the peoples and nationalities of the country.

Religious literature is also published, for in the USSR freedom of conscience is written down in the Constitution and guaranteed by it. Such literature includes "The journal of the Moscow Patriarchate", the journals "Brotherly Herald" and "Muslims of the Soviet East", the Bible and the Gospel, the Koran, prayer books, psalm collections.

A considerable part of the materials published in Soviet periodicals consists of readers' letters, reports and reflections. Practically not a single issue of a newspaper is published without critical contributions. There are also special satirical publications.

Principled, constructive criticism is an effective instrument in eliminating shortcomings, a sign of society's political health. An official of any rank is obliged by law to give a written reply to a newspaper or journal to any criticisms of him published in it. He must, the author emphasizes, also report on the measures taken to eliminate the said shortcomings.

The reader may ask: are there any restrictions placed on the editor in the USSR? Yes, there are. They are established by Soviet law. The editor, for example, has no right to divulge state or military secrets, to insult the feelings of believers, to whip up chauvinism, anti-Semitism, to disseminate pornography and sadism, to use an insulting tone in materials, to propagandize war. All these restrictions meeting the interests of society fully conform to the UN International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights.

The big press in the West recently whipped up a noisy campaign in which it persistently reiterated the false thesis that in the Soviet Union people are persecuted for their convictions, for having "non-conformist ideas". What are the true facts?

In the USSR, as in other socialist countries, it is not forbidden to think differently, to criticize particular aspects of social life. There are some who hold views that contradict communist ideology. There are also overt anti-Sovieters, opponents of socialism. But the Soviet state does not persecute those who think differently. There are no codes nor courts of law for ways of thinking. Soviet legislation establishes criminal responsibility **not for ways of thinking** but for socially dangerous **actions** qualified as criminal by law. However reprehensible certain views may be, they are not punishable by law in themselves. Consequently, ideas that do not take the form of concrete anti-state actions do not constitute a crime. The very posing of the question of possible punitive measures for non-conformist views as such is alien to Soviet legislation and its practices, the author points out. This is clearly stipulated, for example, in Article 3 of the Fundamentals of Criminal Legislation of the USSR and Union Republics: "Criminal responsibility and punishment shall be applied only to a person guilty of committing crimes, i.e., committing by intent or accidentally a socially dangerous act covered by criminal law." Court proceedings are also instituted for actions qualified by the court in accordance with the law as either aimed at undermining or at weakening the existing social and political system in the country or at spreading lies denigrating the Soviet state and social system—actions, we repeat, not views.

Restrictions similar to those effective in the USSR are to be found in the legislation of practically every country. And those guilty of breaking the laws are subject to punishment. Incidentally, these restrictions do not contradict the norms of international law. They are contained, in particular,

in Articles 12 and 19 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights.

Democratic rights and freedoms in the USSR, constituting an essential feature of the socialist system, the author says, do not remain static and unchanged. With the consolidation of the social-economic and political foundations of socialism a new, deeper content is imparted to them.

For the first time socialism restores the true meaning of the concept of "democracy", imparting a real content to democratic principles. Genuine democracy, as confirmed by the entire record of history, is possible only in socialist society. For it alone can translate the ideals of democracy into reality and make it what it should be according to the precise meaning of this word—the power of the people.

For Soviet people, democracy and socialism are indivisible. Valery Telegin's book convincingly shows this.

Ghennady GRIGORYEV

PERIODICALS FEATURED IN THIS ISSUE:

Mezhdunarodnaya zhizn

(International Life)

– a monthly scientific and political journal of the All-Union Znaniye Society, founded 1954, circulation 112 thousand, published in Russian, English and French.

Mirovaya ekonomika i mezhdunarodniye otnosheniya

(World Economy and International Relations)

– a monthly journal of the Institute of World Economy and International Relations of the USSR Academy of Sciences, founded 1957, circulation about 30 thousand.

Rabochy klass i sovremenny mir

(The Working Class and the World Today)

– a bimonthly journal of the Institute of the International Working Class Movement of the Academy of Sciences of the USSR, founded 1971, circulation 10 thousand.

Voprosy ekonomiki

(Economic Affairs)

– a monthly journal of the Institute of Economics of the USSR Academy of Sciences, founded March 1948, circulation 43 thousand.

PUBLISHING HOUSES WHOSE BOOKS ARE FEATURED IN THIS ISSUE:

Mysl

(Thought)

– state publishing house in Moscow, publishes literature on philosophy, economics, history and geography, approximately 300 books in a total printing of 15 million yearly.

**The Soviet monthly digest SOCIALISM:
THEORY AND PRACTICE and
supplements to this journal are digests of
the political and theoretical press
featuring the vital problems of Marxist-
Leninist theory, the practice of socialist
and communist construction, the
peoples' struggle for peace, democracy
and socialism, and worldwide ideological
struggle.**

**All inquiries should be addressed to
SOCIALISM: THEORY AND PRACTICE
7, Bolshaya Pochtovaya Street,
107082, Moscow, USSR,
or to the Information Department of the
Soviet Embassy**

