ISSN 0134—5486

SOCIAL SCIENCES

3

1979

USSR ACADEMY OF SCIENCES

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

The journal is published by agreement:

in Bengali,
Samaj Bijnan (Bingsha Shatabdi Publishers,
Calcutta, India);

in Japanese,
Shakai Kagaku (Shakai Kagaku Co.,
Tokyo, Japan)

in Greek,
Kinonikes epistemes (Planet Publishers, Athens,
Greece);

in Arabic,
Al Ulum al-Ijtima'iya (Dar al-Farabi Publishers,
Beirut, Lebanon);

in Portuguese
("Avante!" Publishers, Lisbon, put out
the edition for circulation in Portugal).

The Spanish edition is reprinted in Colombia
by Centro de Estudios e
Investigaciones Sociales (CEIS) Publishers, Bogota.

*

Since 1976 the Editorial Board has been publishing the journal Obshchestvennie nauki (Social Sciences) in Russian. It appears six times a year.

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

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

USSR ACADEMY OF SCIENCES

Philosophy
History
Economics
Politics
Sociology
Law
Philology
Psychology
Ethnography
Archaeology

SOCIAL SCIENCES

Vol. X, No. 3 1979

CONTENTS

The material on the political sciences in this issue was prepared jointly with the Soviet Political Sciences Association in connection with the 11th World IPSA Congress

EDITORIAL COUNCIL

Fedoseyev P. N., Academician, Chairman

Grigulevich I. R., Corresponding Member, USSR Academy of Sciences, Deputy Chairman

Maslova N. I., Executive Secretary

Members

Afanasyev V. G., Corresponding Member, USSR Academy of Sciences; **Arbatov G. A.**, Academician; **Bogomolov O. T.**, Corresponding Member, USSR Academy of Sciences; **Bromley Yu. V.**, Academician; **Frolov I. T.**, Corresponding Member, USSR Academy of Sciences; **Gapochka M. P.**, Cand.Sc.(Philos.); **Gromyko An. A.**, D.Sc.(Hist.); **Guryev I. E.**, Cand. Sc. (Econ.); **Gvishiani J. M.**, Academician; **Inozemtsev N. N.**, Academician; **Kapustin E. I.**, Corresponding Member, USSR Academy of Sciences; **Khachaturov T. S.**, Academician; **Khrapchenko M. B.**, Academician; **Komkov G. D.**, D.Sc(Hist.); **Kostyushko I. I.**, D.Sc.(Hist.); **Koval B. I.**, D.Sc.(Hist.); **Kovalchenko I. D.**, Corresponding Member, USSR Academy of Sciences; **Krivtsov V. A.**, D.Sc.(Hist.); **Kumanev V. A.**, D.Sc.(Hist.); **Kuznetsov D. V.**, Cand.Sc.(Hist.); **Markov D. F.**, Corresponding Member, USSR Academy of Sciences; **Mchedlov M. P.**, D.Sc. (Philos.); **Momdjan Kh. N.**, D.Sc.(Philos.); **Narochnitsky A. L.**, Academician; **Okladnikov A. P.**, Academician; **Piotrovsky B. B.**, Academician; **Primakov E. M.**, Academician; **Semyonov V. S.**, D.Sc.(Philos.); **Shaposhnikov V. S.**, **Shiryaev Yu. S.**, D.Sc.(Econ.); **Sobolev A. I.**, D.Sc.(Philos.); **Tikhvinsky S. L.**, Corresponding Member, USSR Academy of Sciences; **Timofeyev T. T.**, Corresponding Member, USSR Academy of Sciences; **Trukhanovsky V. G.**, Corresponding Member, USSR Academy of Sciences; **Vinogradov V. A.**, Corresponding Member, USSR Academy of Sciences; **Volsky V. V.**, D.Sc.(Econ.); **Zhilin P. A.**, Corresponding Member, USSR Academy of Sciences; **Zhukov E. M.**, Academician.

To the Reader

A distinctive feature of the world of today is the radical and ever more rapid changes in all spheres of human endeavour.

Social scientists are therefore focusing on interpreting these changes from the standpoint of the political sciences. This was the theme of the 11th World Congress of the International Political Science Association (Moscow, August 1979) which also paid considerable attention to questions of foreign policy.

In this connection we open the current issue with an abridged text of Pravda's *review of L. I. Brezhnev's book* On the Foreign Policy of the CPSU and the Soviet State.

Soviet Political Sciences

One issue of a journal cannot, of course, give a full picture of the research being done by Soviet political scientists. In this issue, however, the reader will find several articles and extensive information on Soviet political sciences. There are also contribution by Vice-President of the USSR Academy of Sciences **P. Fedoseyev** *discussing the interaction between the science of society and the progress of society; President of the Soviet Association of Political Sciences* **G. Shakhnazarov** *analysing various aspects of achieving a lasting peace; Academician* **G. Arbatov** *discussing the problem of conflict in the context of the concept of detente; Academician* **N. Inozemtsev** *emphasising the vitality of the concept of peaceful coexistence of states with different systems, which corresponds to the nature and basic regularities of the present epoch; Academician* **E. Primakov** *studying the peculiarities of the current stage of the national and social liberation of the developing nations.*

The Theory of Culture. The Psychology of Creative Work

Academician **M. Khrapchenko** *notes that, as man and society change and as art itself evolves, their relationships also change and become richer and fuller. The article by* **F. Bassin**, *Academician*

A. Prangishvili *of the Georgian Academy of Sciences and* **A. Sherozia** *deals with the present-day interpretation of the role of unconscious psychic activity in the perception of works of art.*

Economics

Academician **T. Khachaturov** *considers the theory of efficiency of capital investments in terms of planned national economic development and also as an element of the general theory of efficiency of socialist production.*

History. Archaeology

Having stressed that in the study of the history of Slavs more attention has been paid to the historical destinies of Slavs than to their origin, their original homeland, Academician **B. Rybakov** *draws on vast archaeological material to describe the stages in the history of the pra-Slavs.*

Interdisciplinary Research

This section carries a review of a Round Table discussion held by several Soviet academic journals on the economic, social and cultural problems of the Comprehensive Development of Western Siberia. *This year being proclaimed by the UN the International Year of the Child, we publish an article by* **Yu. Ryurikov**, *the well-known Soviet expert on problems of the family and marriage, dealing with the demographic, socio-psychological and socio-pedagogical aspects of the role of children and parents.*

Sociology

I. Antonovich *discusses some Western theories that capitalism has allegedly grown into a kind of new socio-economic pattern free from its traditional vices.* **A. Grachev** *analyses the youth movement's transition from the stormy 1960s to the stage of struggle for the vital interests of the younger generation of the capitalist countries, which although outwardly less impressive is now more organised and mature.*

We thank our readers for their letters and any new suggestions regarding the topics of our articles and information materials will always be welcomed.

The Editors

From the Editors: Recent weeks (already after this issue went to press) have witnessed important international and bilateral "summit meetings"; events such as China's aggression against Vietnam; the Beijing leaders unilateral decision not to prolong the Treaty of Friendship, Alliance and Mutual Assistance between the Soviet Union and the PRC; the separate American-Israili-Egyptian deal, and other events. The USSR's approach to problems of international relations remains unchanged: as always it bases itself on the Leninist principles of foreign policy, and on the decisions of the 24th and 25th Congresses of the CPSU.
In his speech to his constituency on March 2, 1979, Leonid Brezhnev put forward a number of new peace initiatives and emphasised that "the Central Committee of our Party and the Soviet Government are exerting every effort to promote cooperation with the forces of peace, freedom and progress, frustrate the designs of circles that support aggression, uphold and deepen international detente, and to reliably ensure that the Soviet people, our allies and friends can continue to live and work in conditions of peace."

The Foreign Policy of the CPSU and the Soviet State

In 1978, Political Literature Publishers brought out a book by Leonid Brezhnev, General Secretary of the CPSU Central Committee and Chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium, under the title of *On the Foreign Policy of the CPSU and the Soviet State.* The book contains profound scientific analysis of the fundamental problems of present-day international affairs, and deals with the creative development of the cardinal propositions of the CPSU's Leninist foreign policy.

Included in the book, either in full or in part, are speeches and articles by the author in the period between 1964 and 1978: these show the significance of the Great October Socialist Revolution and its impact on the course of world history. They reveal the determining factors in present-day world development and the role played by world socialism, the international communist and working-class movement and the other revolutionary forces of our times. Also indicated are the practical prospects of the future, while the tasks of the struggle for peace and the prevention of a new world war are formulated. The material contained in the book reflects the purposeful struggle for peace and international security, waged by the CPSU and the Soviet state, guided by the Leninist principles of foreign policy.

"As we see it," Leonid Brezhnev says, "the purpose of our foreign policy is to strengthen peace, which we need for building communism, which is required by all socialist countries, by the peoples of all lands. This is why we shall continue to counteract the policy of aggression and help to eliminate throughout the world the conditions that breed aggressive wars.

"As we see it, it is the purpose and mission of our policy to help all the peoples to exercise their inalienable rights and, above all, their right to independent and sovereign development, so that they may benefit from the fruits of modern civilisation.

"As we see it, the purpose and mission of our policy on the international scene is to side unfailingly with those who are fighting imperialism and all forms of exploitation and oppression, for freedom and human dignity, for democracy and socialism."

In 1914, at the beginning of the imperialist war, Lenin wrote regarding the future: "The socialist movement...creates new and superior forms of human society, in which the legitimate needs and progressive aspirations of the working masses of *each* nationality will, for the first time, be met through international unity...".

Grounded in equality, the family of socialist states has implemented what Lenin predicted. The inception and the development of the world system of socialism are the main international consequence of the Great October Revolution which has determined the character of the world of today. This is a factor that is exerting an ever greater influence on world affairs, and accounts for the prime importance the CPSU and the Soviet Government attach to the alliance of and friendship and cooperation between the socialist states, which are united by common aims and interests, a common world-view, and ties of solidarity and mutual aid.

As convincingly shown in the book, the amassing of joint experience in socialist state construction has produced scientifically grounded and time-tested guidelines which, in the conditions of each individual country, serve to provide optimum decisions for the intricate problems of the development of a new society.

The multitude of interlinks between the countries of socialism vividly demonstrate the way the political parties, state bodies and industrial collectives work together to achieve the common aims.

The Leninist foreign policy has, from the very inception of the Soviet land, been imbued with a peaceful purpose. Its concrete content has been dictated by the objective historical conditions and can be summed up as a course towards peaceful coexistence between states with differing social systems.

This book of 759 pages is a vivid chronicle of the struggle

against the aggressive policies of the imperialists, for a healthier international climate and for peace and international collaboration over the years covered, years of purposeful and unflagging activities in the area of foreign policies on the part of the CPSU and the Soviet state. The major and positive changes in the international situation during that period have become possible thanks to the steps taken to implement the Peace Programme adopted by the 24th Congress of the CPSU, and its logical continuation: the programme of the further struggle for peace and international cooperation, and for the freedom and independence of the nations, as adopted by the Party's 25th Congress.

Reflected in the book are the vast activities for the drawing up and implementation of a wide range of measures designed to reduce tension in international relations.

As pointed out by Leonid Brezhnev, "the changes for the better in the world, which have become especially appreciable in the 1970s, we refer to as international detente. These changes are tangible and specific. They consist in the recognition and enactment in international documents of a form of code of rules for honest and fair relations between countries, which erects a legal and moral-political barrier against those given to military gambles. They consist in the achievement of the first agreements—modest though they may be for the moment—for blocking some of the channels of the arms race. They consist of a whole system of agreements covering many areas of peaceful cooperation between states having different social systems."

The striving to establish principles of peaceful coexistence, lasting peace and the slackening and ultimate elimination of the danger of a new world war has always been the main direction in the policies of the CPSU and the Soviet state in relation to the capitalist countries.

The transition from the cold war and the explosive confrontation between the two worlds, towards international detente has been linked first and foremost with the shifts in the alignment of forces on the world arena. Considerable efforts have been needed for it to be realised that it is not brinkmanship but talks on differences, not confrontation but peaceful cooperation that should determine the relations between countries.

The CPSU and the Soviet Government have done much to develop relations of equality and mutual advantage with the capitalist states. This work, as pointed out by Leonid Brezhnev in October 1976, has been marked by specific features at each particular stage. The book shows the consistent way in which the task was accomplished of laying down the foundation of normal relations with France, the FRG, the USA, Canada, Italy, Britain and other capitalist countries. When all that had been achieved, in

the main, the CPSU and the Soviet Government began to work for ever more extensive cooperation in the areas of politics, economics, science, technology, and culture. Much useful work has been done of late in these fields.

Relations between the Soviet Union and France have been a major component in building up lasting peace and security in Europe and elsewhere. Franco-Soviet cooperation has brought tangible benefits to both countries and at the same time has made an important contribution to international life and the relations between states with different social systems. The economic, scientific and technological links between the USSR and France have involved such areas as the exploration of space, computers and the production of unique types of machinery and other equipment.

Relations between the USSR and the FRG have become an important element in European stability. The joint declaration signed in Bonn in May 1978 during Leonid Brezhnev's visit to the FRG expressed the two countries' determination to develop political cooperation on a firm and permanent basis, this referring both to bilateral affairs and to major international questions, in the first place, peaceful coexistence, detente and curbing the arms race. A long-term agreement was signed providing for the extensive development of economic links.

Much has also been achieved in the relations between the Soviet Union and Finland, the friendship and mutual trust between the peoples of both countries becoming ever stronger. Economic, cultural and other links have acquired a broad sweep. Much has been done by both countries in the interests of world peace and security.

As pointed out in the book, the CPSU and the Soviet Government attach considerable importance to collaboration with all European countries, large and small, whose social systems are different. Relations in all fields with Italy, Sweden and Austria are making excellent headway.

Of decisive importance in reducing the threat of another world war and in consolidating peace was the turn for the better which was to be seen in the early 70s in the relations between the Soviet Union and the United States of America, the capitalist world's leading country. This improvement was a major contribution to an improved international climate, that including Europe. However, as is common knowledge, such a development is not to the liking of certain quarters in the USA, who are trying to reverse that process, accelerate the arms race and spread distrust of the Soviet Union, thus hampering normal cooperation between the two states. The USSR has always and firmly stood for detente to be made irreversible and for relations with the United States to

develop to the advantage of both countries, should the USA be willing. It goes without saying that the relations between the two countries in all areas can develop only on the basis of complete equality and non-intervention in each other's internal affairs.

Following the victory over fascism in the Second World War, to which the Soviet people made a decisive contribution, the yoke of colonialism has been cast off by over 2,000 million people in the former colonies and semi-colonies. These have achieved state independence and are playing an active part in world affairs. On the whole, the colonial system of imperialism in its classical forms may be considered a thing of the past, the book points out, a phenomenon of historic significance.

The dismantling of the colonial heritage of the past is proceeding apace. One can hardly overestimate the fact that many of the newly liberated states have rejected the capitalist path of development and have set themselves the aim of building societies free of exploitation, and oriented themselves towards socialism.

The attitude of the Soviet Union to the complex processes in the developing countries is clear-cut: it does not interfere in the internal affairs of other nations and peoples. Respect for the sacred right of each people and each country to choose its own road of development is an inviolable principle of the Leninist foreign policy.

As clearly pointed out in many statements by Leonid Brezhnev, the Soviet Union gives full support to the lawful aspirations of the new states and their determination to rid themselves of imperialist exploitation for all time, and to be masters of their national wealth. This approach underlies Soviet foreign policy towards the developing countries.

The USSR has given active support to the just demands of the developing countries that international economic relations should be restructured on principles of equality and that all forms of the exploitation by the capitalist states of their weaker "third-world" partners be eliminated. The USSR has come out with concrete proposals on this score, particularly in the UN. It bases its economic links with the developing states on observation of the principles of equality, mutual advantage, and non-intervention in their internal affairs, and is providing many newly liberated countries with aid in overcoming the economic backwardness inherited from the past.

The USSR's relations with India are a good example of its friendly ties with the developing countries. Registered in the Treaty of Peace, Friendship and Cooperation, these ties are extensive and varied, including collaboration in many branches of science, culture and art, and also involving joint action in international affairs with the purpose of serving the cause of

world peace. Soviet-Indian relations are developing in an atmosphere of calm and ease and are an important factor of peace and stability in Asia and the world.

Problems of war and peace feature prominently in the book, whose author has to his credit made an important contribution to the theoretical and political elaboration of these problems and to the shaping and implementing of the Soviet Union's Leninist foreign policies.

Summit conferences have an important part to play in promoting detente, peace and international cooperation: Leonid Brezhnev's visits to other countries, and his meetings and talks with leading statesmen and politicians there being of outstanding significance. Material covering such visits and meetings are included in the book and give an impressive picture of his indefatigable activities in advancing the cause of peace and progress.

The fourth anniversary of the Helsinki Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe and its Final Act falls this year, and the book shows the intense efforts of many years in preparing for and successfully conducting this historic forum, which laid the firm foundations for the construction of a new Europe as a continent of peace and cooperation. Peace has become more firmly established in Europe since Helsinki and, despite the obstacles raised by those opposed to detente, the platform of action by the European states as registered in the Final Act is being implemented step by step.

"It can be said with confidence," the book says, "that Europe, thanks to the Conference on Security and Cooperation, now stands on a higher plane than before. Europe has learned to be more persistent and effective in seeking solutions to burning international problems, to work in such a way as to achieve better practical results in the interests of easing tensions, broadening cooperation between states and establishing peace among nations."

All the prerequisites exist today for detente to become stable and irreversible. The accomplishment of that task would be an invaluable contribution to the consolidation of peace and security. At the same time, the complexity and the contradictions in the international situation today cannot but be taken note of. With the advance of detente, its opponents are displaying greater activity, this calling for greater vigilance on the part of the forces of peace.

"International relations," as pointed out by Leonid Brezhnev, "are now at a crossroads, as it were, which could lead either to a growth of trust and cooperation, or to a growth of mutual fears, suspicion, and arms stockpiles, a crossroads leading, ultimately, either to lasting peace or, at best, to balancing on the brink of war. Detente offers the opportunity of choosing the road of peace. To

miss this opportunity would be a crime. The most important, the most pressing task now is to halt the arms race, which has engulfed the world."

This task has acquired special urgency in view of the growing activity of militarist quarters in the West, which are feverishly stepping up war preparations as a reply to the setbacks in the social life of their countries, the loss of their colonial possessions, the departure of ever more countries from the capitalist road, and the successes of world socialism and the mounting influence of the Communist parties in their countries. Characteristically enough, the imperialist quarters are accelerating the arms race under the cover of such propaganda campaigns as the hullabaloo regarding the "growing Soviet military threat" and the like.

Grave danger to the cause of peace and socialism is presented by the actions of China's present-day rulers. Exploiting the ideas of great-power chauvinism and hegemonism, the Peking rulers have openly staked on an exacerbation of international tension and are resorting to all and any means to undermine the positions of the socialist community, and the revolutionary and liberation forces of the times.

In the conditions of today, the book points out, it is imperative that decisive counteraction be offered to any steps designed to weaken the process of detente and return world development to the times of the cold war. What is essential is firm adherence to the principles of non-intervention in the internal affairs of other countries, respect for the rights of all peoples to freedom and independence, and greater efforts to further peaceful cooperation between them, the possibilities of which have been clearly defined in the Helsinki Final Act, in UN resolutions, and other international documents.

To curb the arms race and go over to disarmament are the most pressing and important tasks confronting mankind. As convincingly shown in the book, these matters are constantly in the focus of attention of the CPSU Central Committee and the Soviet Government.

No other country has presented mankind with so extensive, concrete and realistic a programme as the Soviet Union has, a programme designed to slacken and then wholly eliminate the danger of a new war.

That programme involves all the fundamental problems connected with the arms race and has mapped out effective steps to curb it and then achieve disarmament. The Soviet Union has proposed the signing of a world treaty on the non-use of force in international relations, prevention of the appearance of new types and systems of weapons of mass destruction, and a complete ban on nuclear tests.

Today, when the influence of the Helsinki Final Act is making itself distinctly felt in Europe, the task of supplementing political detente with military detente has become ever more urgent. To accomplish that task, Leonid Brezhnev has proposed a platform of action which includes a number of important measures, among them the proposal that participants in the European conference should conclude a treaty with the obligation not to be the first to use nuclear weapons against each other. That platform of action, whose draft has been formulated by the Warsaw Treaty countries, includes a proposal that agreement be reached at least on the non-expansion, through new membership, of the military and political groupings and alliances facing each other in Europe, as well as a number of other steps in the area of military detente.

Ardent support has gone to the concrete proposals made by Leonid Brezhnev for the total cessation of further qualitative and quantitative growth in the armaments and armed forces of states with major military potentials. This clear-cut and constructive programme provides for the implementation of such measures as an end to the production of nuclear weapons of all kinds, the discontinuation of the production of all other types of weapons of mass destruction and a ban on such weapons, as well as an end to the creation of new types of highly destructive conventional weapons, and finally the obligation not to expand armies and conventional weapons of states that are permanent members of the Security Council and countries linked to such states by military agreements.

Leonid Brezhnev's book shows the consistent and persistent way in which the Soviet Union, whose approach has been marked by principledness and flexibility, has been exploring ever new avenues towards durable peace, the development of peaceful and mutually advantageous cooperation between states with differing social systems, and to check the arms race. These positive activities have won international prestige and recognition for the Leninist foreign policy of the CPSU and the Soviet state.

"The Soviet Union," the book points out, "is confidently pursuing a policy of peace. We actively and persistently call for the contest between socialism and capitalism to be decided not on the field of battle, not on munitions conveyors, but in the sphere of peaceful work. We want the frontiers dividing the two worlds to be crossed not by flight paths of missiles with nuclear warheads, but by threads of broad and diversified cooperation for the good of all mankind. By steadfastly pursuing this policy, we are giving practical expression to one of the main rallying cries of the October Revolution and carrying out one of Lenin's most important behests: Peace to the peoples!"

Social Science and Social Progress

PYOTR FEDOSEYEV

Our's is a world of accelerated fundamental change extending to every area of human life and endeavour. This applies to the scale and depth of social transformations, the restructuring of international relations, the pace of scientific and technological progress and the pyramiding of global problems facing mankind. Nor are the changes confined to man's objective conditions—his spiritual image is changing along with his action motivations, his attitude to the world around him and to himself.

That being so, the scientific knowledge we have acquired about man and society plays an increasingly important part in social activity, human behaviour and the direction of social processes. This has brought to the fore the problem of interaction between social science and social progress.

The knowledge requirements of social practice, which are met by the social sciences, cover a very wide field and are contingent on its character and direction and on the attitude of the social sciences to the changes taking place in the modern world. The reactionary, conservative forces need philosophical, historical, economic and other apologia to furnish a semblance of justification for the socio-political decisions they make in furtherance of their selfish class interests. Their purpose is to win mass support by presenting their programmes and actions as scientifically grounded and beneficial.

Progressive social movements, the advanced classes and their parties use the social sciences for the revolutionary renewal of the world. And these sciences help them, first, by giving theoretical expression to the main trends of social development, providing authentic knowledge of the processes taking place in the world,

their motive forces and direction. Second, in conjunction with the natural and technical sciences, they provide the basis for a concrete programme of action and effective solutions of the pressing problems in the socialist countries and the world community as a whole, relating to economic, social, political and cultural development, international intercourse and foreign policies. Third, they give form and shape to a system of ideas and values that serve the progressive forces as guidelines in the advance to their goal.

In the world of today, special attention attaches not so much to the influence objective social change exerts on the development of the social science, as to their potential for resolving social problems, their impact on social progress. And their potential, in turn, depends largely on the socio-political and philosophical positions and ideas of the scholar in analysing the fundamental problems of national and world development.

We know, of course, that sociological and political schools differ in their attitude to revolutionary transformations and to the social forces ranged against each other in the process of historical change. Conservative schools deny the necessity of a deep-going social renewal of the world and reject the very idea of progress. Opposed to them are socio-political and ideological movements attuned to social progress and regarding revolutionary renewal as the main content of history. The arbiter in this confrontation is history. For it clearly indicates the conclusion drawn by progressive socio-political and philosophical thought that history is a constant process of change of social forms and renewal of their content. Accordingly, we Soviet scholars are convinced that if only social science is premised on social development, on acceptance of social renewal as a law of such development, can it serve the advanced classes, parties and individuals as a reliable theoretical and philosophical guide in the complex processes of our age and accelerate social progress.

Of course, it would be unfair to judge the content, implications and historical value of one or another socio-political doctrine only by its attitude towards the processes of social renewal and change, for this concept is interpreted differently. It is hardly correct to regard as unbiased and comprehensive such socio-political doctrines that accept only evolutionary, slow and gradual change and preclude any and all revolutionary forms of social development.

In formulating the dialectical concept of development, Hegel warned against its one-sided interpretation, particularly in relation to the historical process, merely as gradual growth of the new within the gradually vanishing old. I would remind the reader of his famous words: "All birth and death, instead of being a

continued graduality, are rather an interruption of this and are the jump from quantitative into qualitative change."[1]

Marxism-Leninism has continued and deepened the dialectical analysis of the historical process, considering it as consistent change and necessary link of evolutionary and revolutionary stages of social development.

No less one-sided, in our view, is the pragmatic method, which deliberately bypasses the fundamental problems of historical development in interpreting the general course of history and in determining the directions of social action.

One should not absolutise indicators taken in isolation, but assess the development of society on the basis of a comprehensive system of criteria, both quantitative (per capita income, level of science and technology, etc.) and qualitative, such as forms of property, the nature of socio-economic relations, the presence or absence of class and national-racial antagonisms, the development of democracy, human rights and freedoms, attitude to such problems as militarisation, disarmament, etc. This is all the more important, since history has shown that social development is uneven and achievements in some fields can be more important than in others.

Lastly, a *sine qua non* of effective social research is appreciation of the vital significance of the problems it deals with. However, the results obtained (or expected) should benefit not only current, pressing practical requirements, but should also essentially enrich the methodological and philosophical basis of man's real material and spiritual activity. We are here dealing with the old, but nonetheless topical problem of the correlation of the practical and theoretical value of research. Sometimes the practicability of a piece of research can be reduced to purely concrete aims. As a result we have two extremes: insistance on developing only applied research on the plea that it alone has any practical value, and insistence on basic research, on the plea that it contributes to science, though it has no practical value.

In reality, however, the correlation of these two criteria is much more complex and much more dialectical. I would even say that there is harmony between the two. Fundamental research tackles major problems that help to reveal the laws governing the development of society. And they should not be contrasted to practical tasks; on the contrary, they contribute to their accomplishment. For such research facilitates solution of the pressing social problems posed by the very process of development. In fact, the relation between the two can be expressed in the aphorism: "Nothing is more practical than a good theory." But how to produce a good theory? By which methods? We Marxists-Leninists believe that it can only be done by fostering closer ties between

social science and life, by the focusing social studies on the new problems stemming from social progress and scientific cognition. As long as we social scientists fail to see the vital, practical implications of our theoretical research, are not up to the mark in our own theory, and fail to appreciate the ways of its development, we risk being stranded in verbal gymnastics.

More than a hundred years ago Marx and Engels laid the foundations for the study of social development and systems research of the social process. They anticipated—and this is acknowledged not only by Marxists, but also by a significant number of Western scholars—the research methods which have now won universal recognition. The dialectico-materialist methodology devised by Marx and Engels and comprehensively developed by Lenin, stands out as a model of scientific approach. No other theory can there be, capable of providing a comprehensive and scientifically substantiated account of social development.

However, while upholding our understanding of the crucial problems of world development and the role of the social sciences in their elucidation, we favour a wide-ranging dialogue with representatives of non-Marxist trends and concepts sincerely concerned for the destinies of mankind. Inasmuch as there are differing ideologies and world outlooks, there is only one way of reaching mutually acceptable agreement on questions that affect the life of everyone. And that way is objective, unbiased comparison of differing viewpoints. And the situation is ripe for a constructive, meaningful dialogue on a wide and multiform range of problems of social development and the scientific and technological revolution (STR). This is possible primarily because of international detente, now becoming the overriding trend of our time. And we can legitimately say that intellectual support for the positive changes taking place in the world, the promotion of political, cultural and ethical values that make for world peace and security, is now a key function of the social sciences.

And we are convinced that in present-day conditions world peace is the prime and supreme social and ethical value. Consequently, the situation imposes on scientists, statesmen and public personalities, whatever their philosophical and political views, convictions and creed, the highest degree of responsibility known to history—responsibility for the destinies of mankind, for the life and happiness of hundreds of millions in every part of the world. No realistically-minded person can afford to disregard the overpowering urge of millions of men and women to preserve peace. Accordingly, we base our own international policy on the aspirations and movements of these millions. If it is to survive and develop, and not perish in the crucible of nuclear war, mankind

has no choice but to accept and pursue peaceful coexistence of states with different socio-political systems.

There can be little doubt that an atmosphere of war preparation, instigation of war hysteria, and rampant militarism inhibit the creative ability of the human mind and suppress the humanistic in man, turning him into a pliant tool of conservative forces, thereby hindering social progress. By the same token, participation in the struggle for the triumph of the principles of peace and friendship among nations helps to bring out and develop everything humanistic and noble in man.

But there is no denying that there are theories still current that do not assist, but rather hamper the preservation of peace. And among these one can find concepts of every shade and hue—from preachment of war as an element of mankind's renewal, or acceptance of war as an eternal law of human existence, down to pessimistic fatalism and passive acceptance of the inevitable evil of war. And there is also the antihuman, philosophically untenable concept according to which the causes of war are rooted in the nature of man, in his "inborn aggressiveness", "militarist instincts", etc. Especially dangerous is the theory that the greater the stockpile of weapons, the more secure is the "balance of strength" and world peace. Then there are the cannibalistic theories of latter-day Malthusians. Their contention is that with the progressive exhaustion of natural resources only destructive wars can enable mankind to survive. The Maoist leaders have elevated to official doctrine the insensate idea that annihilation in a nuclear war of two-thirds of mankind would make it possible to build a new, better world on the ruins of our civilisation.

The situation today is such that standing aloof from the peace effort often degenerates into factual encouragement of the forces of aggression and war.

Genuine humanism requires not only condemnation of war, but effective struggle against the menace of war. And this applies, above all, to the development and proliferation of a new nuclear weapon, the neutron bomb. The project—on which work has already started—is being screened by talk of a "military balance", "security", "deterrence of a Soviet threat", etc. That is the talk, the reality is the acceleration of the arms drive from which only the most reactionary imperialist forces, the military-industrial complex benefit and certainly not the people.

There are many ways of working for world peace and security. They range from radical measures, including universal and complete disarmament under stringent and effective international control, down to partial but nevertheless essential measures, such as arms limitation, a nuclear-test ban by all countries, nuclear-free zones, reduction of armed forces in Europe, etc. Of vast

importance in this context are economic relations and trade free of discrimination, promotion of scientific, technical and cultural cooperation, joint effort to resolve global problems, etc.

The formulation and implementation of agreed measures to keep the world at peace comes within the competence of international organisations and national governments. But scientists and public leaders can contribute to the success of all detente and peace measures, from radical to partial. In particular they can do much to foster a genuinely humanist environment that would rule out the very possibility of using the findings of science and technology to the detriment of man, and would counter propaganda of theories and ideas which, in one way or another, justify the arms drive and hinder closer mutually-advantageous economic relations. Detente, an end to the arms drive and enduring peace throughout the planet—these represent one of the most important fields for concerting the research efforts of social scientists. For in no other field is there such a vital need for basic scientific elaboration of the ways and means of cutting back international tension, introducing a system of universal security and converting the military-industrial complexes to peaceful production so that people shall enjoy the benefits of disarmament.

The methodological basis for Marxist analysis of all these problems and our understanding of the role of international conditions and factors of social development, rests on the fundamental principle that detente and peaceful coexistence concern international relations and can neither repeal or alter the laws of class struggle. Peaceful coexistence of states with different socio-political systems does not imply their convergence or retention of the social and colonialist status quo. Hence, the worldwide struggle for peace and disarmament and closer international cooperation do not imply rejection of the struggle for social progress, against the historically obsolete social system, or active support of national liberation movements.

* * *

The scientific and technological revolution has confronted the social sciences with intricate problems, for by integrating various aspects and factors of the history-making process, it has become a centre for closer interaction of the socio-humanitarian, natural and philosophical knowledge.

Modern science and technology have given man tremendously powerful forces. No wonder, the idea is gaining ground that, in terms of depth and consequences, man's influence on nature can be compared with geological processes. And the unparalleled

constructive—and unfortunately destructive—opportunities latent in present and future technological progress compel not only writers, scientists, politicians, but also ordinary folk to reflect with concern on whom this new power serves and for what purpose. Will it bring us good or evil? That is why it is incumbent on the social sciences, first, to forecast the social, economic and ecological consequences of human activities, and, second, master the STR and place it under the supervision of society.

Our own experience indicates that supervision of scientific and technological development is possible only if we have a clear concept both of the intrinsic laws of that development and of the link between STR and social progress. For only if there is a comprehensive and truly synthesising approach to STR, only if it is seen in the context of fundamental social processes, can we correctly define its essence and its historic implications.

The main feature of our interpretation of STR is that it is a law-governed process, that social revolution accords with revolution in spiritual and material production. In analysing the industrial revolution of the 18th and 19th centuries, Marx and Engels showed how it was tied in with the social revolutions that consummated the assertion of the capitalist mode of production. The dialectic of our own age is manifested in the fact that in a number of countries the socialist revolution came before STR, thereby providing the necessary social conditions for its accomplishment. In these countries STR serves to develop and multiply the achievements of social revolution. In other countries STR may precede social revolution, thereby preparing its material prerequisites. This sequence is a concrete expression of the basic contradiction of our era, a manifestation of the polymorphic process of history-making. But in both cases STR is an inalienable component of the material prerequisites of communist society. Revolution in the productive forces prepares the material and technical basis needed for the communist mode of production. And here, too, we can see the inseparable organic unity of the historical process of our time.

Another essential characteristic of our understanding of STR is that it covers both its influence on society and its members, and the determinative impact the latter exerts on its development. Society and man are not treated as objects of STR, but also as its subjects, as its creators and motive force: the impact of STR is distinguished not only by the changes it makes in society, but also by what society and man do to direct it into desired channels. More, the Marxist approach to STR centres not on the problems it presents to society (which would separate STR from society, place it over society as an external unrelated force), but rather on what tasks society, its vital requirements of continued economic, social

and spiritual growth, set science and technology, thus revolutionising their development.

It stands to reason that in discussing society's influence on the development of science and technology we cannot deal with society in general, divorced from its concrete socio-class characteristics. For scientific and technological progress is socially-motivated: its forms, mechanisms and consequences are determined by the interests of the ruling classes of the given society, by the degree to which their interests coincide with those of other social strata, with the objective requirements of social development. For the first time, socialism removes the social limitations and restrictions that account for the contradictory character (from the standpoint of their consequences for the individual), of scientific and technological progress and places its achievements at the service of society as a whole.

Some Western scientists are inclined to the view that, both nationally and internationally, science is an autonomous institution, a sort of state within a state. Others take a simplistic metaphysical view of the social determination of scientific development in total disregard of the complex dialectic of the interaction of society and science. For instance, from the fact that the USSR and the USA are at practically identical level of scientific development the false conclusion is drawn, that the direction and manifestation of the social determination of scientific progress and the role of the state in developing science in both these countries are identical too.

A comprehensive study of STR, however, will show that science is a product of social development not only in its organisational forms, but also in its very substance and, in the final analysis, in its theoretical-cognitive evolution. On the whole, the objective regularity with which mankind passes from solved problems of scientific cognition to problems new in substance (and also, in the final count, in form), is of a dual character. On the one hand, this regularity matures within the scientific organism and, on the other, is determined and stimulated by social practice. In this way the development of science is conditioned not only by our accumulated knowledge, but also by the goals society has set itself.

As noted elsewhere in this article, STR has given a new dimension to the tangled problem of optimally combining scientific, technical and production activities with processes in the biosphere. This has given prominence to the theoretical and practical problem of the interrelation between the social and the biological. The subject of much social and political speculation, it has become the focus of sharp ideological struggle.

Some writers maintain that high moral principles will be found in many animals and, hence, good and evil are biologically predetermined. Man, we are told, shares with the animals the aggressive instinct born of the struggle for survival of the fittest. The logic of this line of argumentation could well lead to the biologisation of social phenomena.

Let it first of all be noted that attempts to interpret social phenomena biologically go back more than a hundred years. And there is ample proof of their scientific futility and of the reactionary nature of the social and political conclusions drawn from them.

Today, too, biological interpretation of social phenomena is being employed mostly to buttress false socio-political conclusions. Of these mention should be made of the thesis about the menacingly growing contradictions between the biological and the social in man. Supporters of this thesis focus their argument on the contention that the human race is passing through a period of stormy social development, whereas the biological basis of human life remains more or less the same. Social progress, they reason, is marching ahead much faster than biological development and man is therefore still prey to animal instincts and does not fit into the new social organisation. In this age of space flights, television and holography, man, by his very biological essence, remains just as aggressive as his distant ancestors. And from this the conclusion is drawn that war and every imaginable type of social upheaval are inevitable and unavoidable.

This theory has a fatal penchant for negative prognostication which, in turn, stems from an exaggerated assessment of the fission of the social and the biological and total disregard for their unity. And yet there is the record of history to show that their unity is steadily coming closer and exerts a deeper and more determining influence than their disunity. The socialist organisation of society makes it possible not only to humanise social contacts, but also to optimise the interrelation between society and nature, man and the environment, and consciously regulate, within certain bounds, the socio-biological relationship. This latest stage in the development of mankind furnishes a realistic basis for the biological being fuller and deeper mediated by the social.

There is no evidence to suggest that man's biological properties present an insuperable barrier to social progress. More, the latter exerts a transformatory influence on the biological. And yet in Western literature, even today, there is a veritable welter of theories about the primacy of the biological over the social, and moves are made to refurbish some obsolete concepts, such as social Darwinism, eugenics, Freudism, etc.

It is vogue today to speak of the convergence of biological and social research. The term is sometimes used to cover substituting biology for sociology. There is absolutely no scientific basis for that, and all such attempts run counter to the fundamental principles of scientific methodology which demands concrete examination of each specific phenomenon under study. Bringing biology into the social sciences is unwarranted if only because it does not take into account the developing and expanding structure of the material world and its historical differentiation. The biological vs. the social is part of the general philosophical problem of unity of being and the qualitative uniqueness of different levels, manifestations, spheres of the integral material world. They are subject to the overall laws of development that express the unity of the world but at each qualitatively unique level they are also subject to specific regularities. Thus, there is similarity, continuity, contact and, at the same time, qualitative difference between these spheres and levels of reality.

If we are to examine the problem of the biological and social, then we must first find the real concrete mode of interaction of the two—interaction that neither equates nor separates them. In other words, we must disclose the specificity of each of these spheres of the material world and, at the same time, their continuity, interconnection and intertransition.

We categorically reject biologisation of social phenomena because the behaviour of classes, nations and social groups in general is fully subject to social regularities. That does not preclude the need to investigate the correlation of the biological and social in the individual. And on this question there can be no return to any form of social-Darwinism or biologism. For us it is axiomatic that man is created by society, that he is a social being, that social conditions are determinative in his development, conduct, etc. But we also reject the simplistic view that there are no natural determinants in man. Man is a social being, but he is also part of nature and, in that sense, a biological being. Conduct depends, among other things, on his temperament, natural abilities and opportunities. This natural element in man does not vanish in the course of history, but it does undergo a certain change and development and acquires a qualitatively new form in the process of anthropogenesis and social progress. Accordingly, human needs, historically formed, should not be equated with animal needs.

We are resolutely opposed to all such unscientific and antihuman views. But while stressing the importance of social factors, it would be wrong to ignore man's biological properties and thereby renounce biological and genetic study of man. For example, analysis of human behaviour requires a differentiated

approach that takes into account both social and biological (and general natural) factors, the continuous interaction of which determines man's behaviour. In particular, we have to take into account the natural endowments which, in one way or another, influence the development of his abilities in the process of labour. Neither Marx, Engels nor Lenin maintained that all men were endowed with equal capabilities. Marxism understands equality as social, not biological, and certainly not as equal abilities.

With the continued development of biology (genetics, physiology, etc.), psychology, sociology, and related disciplines we are able more profoundly to investigate the interaction mechanism of the biological and social in man. More and more branches of the natural and social sciences are cooperating in the increasingly successful study of man, the most intricate and, at the same time, the most exciting of all scientific problems. While acknowledging the fruitfulness of this cooperation, it is necessary to emphasise, in the methodological context, the leading role of the social element in the study of man. That is evident, in particular, from the fact that continuing research in biology generally and genetics in particular is largely dependent on the solution of a number of ethical and legal problems. Of special importance in this respect are problems that define the bounds of genetic engineering, the social and ethical problems involved in replanting human organs, and in influencing the mental pattern of man.

Some scientists suggest singling out a special discipline, a special comprehensive science of man. That is hardly advisable, for man presents a very complex problem and is the subject of study not by one, but by several branches of research (anthropology, genetics, physiology, psychology, sociology, ethics, aesthetics, ethnography, etc.).

The tendency now is to integrate and differentiate sciences (in particular those concerned with various aspects of the problem of man). Integration, however, does not mean fusion or dilution, but interaction, mutual enrichment in order jointly to tackle some formidable problems, each aspect of which is the subject of a particular discipline. Such cooperation of different "sovereign" sciences in studying the comprehensive problem of man can produce fruitful results.

Modern man and his world can be understood only given allround account of the widely different aspects of reality, broad generalisations and mastery of the totality of culture and creative application by the scientist of all the achievements of other branches of knowledge.

* * *

Global problems, which in our day have acquired special urgency, provide another area for cooperation in social research.

The first and most disquieting of these are food supply and the closely related demographic problem. The uneven growth of population and labour resources results in major social collisions and presents complex scientific and practical problems. Suffice it to say that in the past few decades, with lower infantile mortality and epidemic disease, higher average life spans and birth-rates, the population growth rate in Asia, Africa and Latin America has more than doubled. In the twenty-five years, 1950-1975, their population increased by approximately 1,100 million (80 per cent of world growth). According to UN forecasts, their population will nearly double again by the year 2000, increasing from 2.5 billion to 4.9 billion people. Yet economic levels in all ex-colonial and dependent countries remain low. Considering that population growth in industrial countries is now stable (about 0.9 per cent per year), the share of population in the less developed regions will have increased from 60 per cent in 1950 to 80 per cent by the end of the century. All this greatly complicates the problems of food supply, of employment and education. The number of illiterates continues to grow and has already reached the thousand million mark.

These circumstances have given rise to Malthusian theories and to dubious solutions of the developing countries' population problems. The situation is also being exploited to boost the idea that the world is divided into "rich" and "poor" countries.

All that calls for concrete in-depth regional demographic studies, consistent exposure of anti-scientific demographic concepts, and scientifically grounded demographic policies. Generally speaking, science and technology can achieve a rate of food production higher than population growth. The world's resources and potentialities are colossal, but they can be put to use only if the present situation in agriculture is radically changed. The world's farming is being done mainly by illiterates, people steeped in poverty and superstition, entangled in debt, semi-feudal or feudal subjugation, using the most primitive instruments, etc. In other words, we have fundamentally to change the socio-economic situation in a very large part of the world.

The second target of concentrated research should be urbanisation, the mass influx into the cities, a process proceeding at a much higher rate even than the fantastic growth of population. The figures speak for themselves: at the turn of the century, less than 20 per cent of the world's population were in urban communities; the present figure is about 50 per cent and by the

year 2000, if the urbanisation rate remains the same (actually it is increasing), the figure will be 66 per cent. This massive exodus from the rural areas is not merely a problem of town planning, but an economic, ecological, demographic, ethnographic, educational, socio-cultural, psychological and legal problem.

The third group of global problems concerns the social consequences of comprehensive mechanisation and now also automation and cybernisation in all leading industries. This has significantly changed social structures, social requirements and the ratio of working to free time—in short practically every aspect of the way of life. In the early 20th century the labour force in most economically developed countries was largely concentrated in agriculture. Since then the proportion has changed drastically and farming now accounts for about one-fifth or one-tenth of the total work force (and only 3-4 per cent in the USA), and the proportion continues to decline. The same is largely true of the extractive and manufacturing industries. On the other hand, employment in the service industries, management, science and culture is rapidly increasing. To this should be added the widespread and keen interest in acquiring knowledge, in meaningful, constructive work, etc., which only recently were considered matters of secondary importance.

The fourth group of problems relates to the trends and perspectives of man's growing influence on nature, on the environment. The incomparably greater scale of production since the war has been attended by corresponding increase in the use of energy and raw materials. And there is the very real prospect that some of our sources of energy and raw materials will be exhausted within the coming decades. Early in 1978 prospected deposits of oil in the capitalist and developing countries amounted to 70 thousand million tons; with annual consumption estimated at 2,300 million tons, these reserves could be drained out in about thirty years.

Growth of production adds urgency to the problem of environmental protection, recycling of waste materials, etc. Increasing extraction of base products and disturbance of the ecological balance have made it imperative to devise more rational ways of using natural resources. All this calls for careful study of anticipated and likely consequences of interference in natural processes.

There is ample theoretical and practical evidence that the problems listed in these four groups, though they concern the entire world, present themselves differently in capitalist and socialist society. And experience has shown that, by its very nature, socialism offers the most favourable opportunities for their

solution, whereas capitalism, by its very nature, offers little or no solution.

This should not be taken to mean that we have no problems resulting from the influence of economic activity on nature. We do have such problems and many of them are due to the simple fact that Russia, the first country of socialist revolution, inherited a very backward economy. Its first and urgent need was to catch up with the more developed countries. This called for accelerated industrialisation, notably in heavy industry. We could not devote prime attention to environmental protection, which, in many respects, was disregarded in the allout industrialisation drive. But as soon as socialist society gained in strength and stability, the problems of adjusting the society-nature equation were given top priority by government and non-government organisations. This is typical of the very nature of socialism, a system oriented not only on the requirements of the present, but projected into the future and committed to far-reaching plans for the benefit of the people. Protection and rational use of the environment are firmly embedded in state policy. Suffice it to say that 11 thousand million rubles have been appropriated for this purpose under the current Tenth Five-Year Plan (1976-1980). Socialism has made harmony between society and nature, refashioned in the interests of man, one of its basic social values.

All the problems discussed here are comprehensive by their very nature. And in general, comprehensive, integrated research has become a guiding methodological and organisational principle in modern science. It stems not from subjective desires and noble aims, but from the objective character of the problems awaiting solution.

Let me emphasise that the method of comprehensive research is not something set for all time. Advances in science pose new "frontline" problems. Indeed, the effectiveness of scientific research is today largely contingent on close interaction of the natural, technical and social sciences. Unity of the three is determined by the interrelated character of the problems posed by the requirements of social development.

Our experience indicates that one of the most effective forms of concerting the efforts of social scientists and representatives of other disciplines is what has come to be known as target-programme method. This implies pooling the efforts of representatives of the natural, technical and social sciences on major fundamental research projects that have important practical implications. Priority is being given to the following programmes:

— Study of basic economic and social problems of developed socialist society and the laws governing its growing over into communist society;

— The theory and methods of economic planning and management under developed socialism;

— Regional economies and prospects of regional socio-economic development up to the year 2000; establishment and development of major economic complexes;

— Socio-economic problems of demography and reproduction of population and labour resources;

— Cultural development and education in mature socialist society;

— The regularities of economic development of the world socialist economy, socialist economic integration, extention and deepening of long-term economic contacts between socialist countries;

— Research into the economy of the main capitalist and developing countries; problems of Soviet foreign economic contacts with capitalist and developing countries; new phenomena in international relations and analysis of the foreign policy of the main capitalist states;

— Development of the international working-class movement and the world revolutionary process.

This list alone—and to it could be added formulation of a comprehensive programme of scientific and technological progress and its social consequences—provides a clear, though, of course, incomplete, picture of the volume and multiformity of the work being done by Soviet social scientists.

It need hardly be argued that elaboration of a national development programme is impossible without the active participation of the social scientists. Whether it deals with a country's energy or agricultural potential, demography or culture, social science in its economic, social, ideological components, plays an essential and sometimes dominant role.

Central to all social research in the USSR is formulation of the concept of developed socialist society. This represents a new and essential step in Marxism-Leninism. It discloses that socialism develops on its own basis, indicates the length of the socialist phase and the various stages of its development, brings out the essence of developed socialist society, its historic place in the assertion of the communist formation. In its practical implications, the concept of developed socialism provides guidelines for planning economic and social progress.

Much more is being done on the problems involved in the management of our expanding industries. Our overall aim is to increase the effectiveness of production by intensive methods, and special attention is being paid to drawing up criteria of effectiveness that reflect the unity of economic development and social policy. The general criterion of social and economic effectiveness

has been concretised and serves as the basis for a system of indicators for the economy as a whole, its various branches, regional complexes, industrial amalgamations and individual enterprises.

The development of the economic base of developed socialism goes hand in hand with the perfection of its social structure and statehood. A fresh impulse to active research into the realm of social relations and political development was given by the nationwide discussion and adoption of the new Soviet Constitution. It consolidates the gains of socialism beginning with the Great October Socialist Revolution and to our day, objectively and with scientific authenticity reflects the social structure and political system of developed socialist society and, at the same time, serves as the foundation for further studies.

The chief result of the Soviet Union's social development is the strengthening of its socio-political and ideological unity, closer friendship of all its constituent nations and nationalities and the resultant emergence of a new social and internationalist community, the Soviet people. The political expression of this process is conversion of the state of the dictatorship of the proletariat into a state of the whole people. Our social scientists are doing much to elucidate the dialectical process that is making our society socially homogeneous and show, concretely, how the popular character of the state and its interests accord with the class nature of state power.

The improvement of political relations in developed socialist society is manifested also in the law-governed process of extending and deepening socialist democracy. The experience of our and other socialist countries has shown that mature socialism is a society of genuine democracy, the political system of which ensures increasingly active participation of the people in the affairs of state and combines real rights and freedoms of the citizens with their duties and responsibility to society. In investigating the extention and deepening of democracy as part of the building of communism, our social scientists are concentrating on such aspects as the extension of democracy in economic management and other areas; wider rights and higher responsibility for work collectives and individual citizens; closer unity of legislative and executive functions; the bigger part of representative bodies of state power and of mass socio-political organisations; more efficient forms of public control over government bodies; stringent observance of socialist legality, law and order. Much attention is being paid to the study of problems involved in the development of democracy, problems raised by the scientific and technological revolution and the attendant expanding scale of production and the more complex management methods. Studies in all these

major trends of democracy in mature socialism are naturally linked with criticism of the formal and abstract concepts of human rights and freedoms as standing outside and above classes.

Recent years have seen more active research in the growth of social consciousness and spiritual culture. Investigations in this sphere are designed to assist the consistent formation of a spiritually rich, ideologically committed and intellectually and emotionally developed personality actively involved in the life of our society. Concretely, we are analysing behavioural motivation, the influence and interaction, in this context, of material and moral factors, the formation process of value judgements and the requirements and interests of the individual.

And still another comprehensive—I would even say synthesising—area of research in social being and social consciousness is the study of the socialist way of life. And here the focal point is the tangible change taking place in the reality of developed socialist society, and concrete elaboration of a system of indicators of the socialist way of life, and the methods of prognosticating its role. The socialist way of life arises and develops not in response to the subjective desires of people, but on the basis of a definite social system, namely triumphant socialism. And it is no accident that the problem of extending and consolidating the Soviet way of life stands before us in all its implications at a time when we have entered upon the historical period of mature socialism. Of course, elements of the new way of life begin to take shape from the very first day of the victorious proletarian revolution. They are asserted in a hard-fought struggle against the ingrained traditions of the bourgeois system. Formation of the socialist way of life presupposes two necessary and interconnected conditions—the socialist mode of production and its corresponding social system, and the moulding of the new man, a man with lofty communist ideals and sharing in the building of communism.

The socialist way of life opens up wide vistas to the flourishing of the personality and to the harmonious development of all aspects of his consciousness, behaviour and activity. However, the fact remains that such harmony does not immediately fully penetrate all aspects of the life of the individual, the collective and society at large. People's consciousness and behaviour develop unevenly, and there are inconsistencies and contradictions. There are still cases when, say, good work is not matched by high moral standards and acceptance of communist ideals is at odds with a person's behaviour. I think it would be right to say that unity of the ideological, moral and labour education is central to the moulding of the new type of man and promotion of the socialist way of life.

Achievement of that unity doubtlessly presupposes a more intensive struggle against survivals of the past. The most common source of such survivals is, in the final analysis, private property traditions. Cultivated over the centuries and firmly engraved in people's minds, customs and habits of the private proprietor make themselves felt under socialism, too—even after private ownership has given way to public ownership. It is equally true that the individualism stemming from these traditions, the individual opposing himself to society, tends to undermine and erode the collectivist principle and the individual's awareness of his duty to society. Individualism thus maims man, narrows his outlook and interests.

For centuries private property has split society into antagonistic classes, into dominant and oppressed nations, produced and nurtured racism, chauvinism, national discord. Imperialism has greatly intensified class and international contradictions, plunged mankind into the vortex of two world wars and into a multitude of local wars. Socialism, founded as it is on public property, has put an end to these inhuman social evils and has instituted new relations between men and between nations.

Peace and friendship between nations are, in our view, the most just and moral principles of human race. And they should not be seen in isolation—they are organically interconnected, interdependent. International friendship means peace and cooperation.

* * *

Marxist-Leninist social science is a constructive force because it is organically tied to reality, to life in all its manifestations. For society is the most dynamic and rapidly developing objective reality. Constant orientation on new phenomena and problems stemming from social practice and scientific cognition, reliance on the time-tested fundamental principles and conclusions of Marxism-Leninism—such are the unshakable pillars of scientific, creative development in the USSR of all branches of social science and its mounting impact on social progress.

NOTE

[1] G. W. F. Hegel, *Science of Logic*, Vol. 1, London, 1929, p. 389.

Policy of Peace and Our Time

GEORGI SHAKHNAZAROV

The desire of scientists of different views and orientations to expand the sphere of mutual understanding as much as possible and to find common approaches to the scientific analysis and practical solution of the problems of peace is a factor making for a really effective study of these problems. It is not only a matter of clearing up occasional misunderstandings that may arise as a result of the application of different research methods, terminological discrepancies or mistranslations. The problem of establishing a durable peace in the interests of all nations is today primarily a problem of *accord.* It can be solved only on the basis of political cooperation. For all the diversity of opinions, aims and interests, this kind of cooperation calls for mutual understanding already at the stage of political thinking, when various peace projects are put forward and discussed.

In this short article we intend to touch upon a wide range of scientific problems which relate to the theme "Policy of Peace". But along with such a study of individual questions, there is always a need to take a general view of the whole problem in order to see how its various aspects are interrelated.

Any judgements about the policy of peace are of value only if and when they *are based on the objective reality of international relations,* their nature, motive forces, development trends and prospects. At all times, there was no lack of projects for establishing a lasting and eternal peace, such as, for instance, the "universal consensus", proposed by Jiři of Podebrady, King of Bohemia in the 15th century. In the last few years alone scores of variants of a world government have been proposed and substantiated. But such speculative constructions are pretty useless,

even if they are motivated by lofty ideals. It would apparently be more useful to focus the attention of scientists first of all on what current world development requires and what can be done to preserve and consolidate peace today, in the existing historical conditions.

And another thing. The "all-or-nothing" maximalist demands are especially futile today. No matter how hard the attempts to explain such an approach by the desire to achieve an immediate and radical change in favour of peace, more often than not this slogan conceals political trends that do not want a normalisation of the international situation or even have contrary intentions.

In contemporary international politics whose problems are extremely complicated and the area of possible political accord is not particularly extensive, only people who are not interested in any progress can turn down a practically useful initiative for the only reason that it does not solve all problems at once and completely. Any initiative in the right direction, even if it concerns only individual aspects, deserves attention and support.

Of especial interest to the political theory and practice of international relations is the assessment of the prospects of detente as the transition from the cold war and nuclear brinkmanship to peaceful coexistence of states irrespective of their social systems.

Such a transition in international relations began in the 1970s. In spite of all the difficulties it had to contend with, the fact itself shows that in the world of today more than ever before the objective preconditions exist for the consolidation of peace and the expansion of the sphere of international cooperation. In our view, the *new correlation of forces in the international arena* is the most important of these preconditions.

Neither individual events of world history nor events taken collectively can be understood unless due account is taken of the general correlation of forces in the world and unless all factors shaping the international situation are analysed. An adequate assessment of international relations and a reliable forecast of their development are possible only after the following basic factors have been objectively evaluated:

— the forces actively influencing the international situation at the given moment;

— the class nature of these forces and methods of their action;

— their potential, or in other words, ability to achieve their ultimate aims and accomplish intermediate tasks;

— the form of their organisation (national or international, state, social or mixed);

— the mechanism of their interaction.

For centuries and until very recently the notion of force had been interpreted as the military might of states. And since military

might always belonged to several of the biggest states (powers), the world political climate was judged by their interrelations.

Thus, one can say that the "power" conception of international relations held complete sway in political theory. Although it far from embraced the entire range and diversity of international contacts, this conception, on the whole, corresponded to objective reality. That is why it could fulfil its applied functions with different degrees of success. The situation began to change radically in the 20th century and particularly after the October Revolution of 1917 under the impact of the social and scientific and technological revolutions.

First, with the division of the world into two opposed social systems, the axis of confrontation in the world arena gradually shifted from the national to the class sphere. If at first the class sphere was limited to the relations between the Soviet Union and the capitalist states, with the formation and development of the world system of socialism, this sphere embraced the relations between groups of countries having a powerful industrial, scientific and military potential and, by that very fact, acquired decisive importance in assessing the current correlation of forces.

Second, the correlation of forces in the world was no longer reduced to the balance of military might only, the importance of political, economic, ideological and moral factors sharply grew and is continuing to increase.

With the emergence of real socialism in the international arena, a force appeared renouncing war as a means of achieving political aims (with the exception of just wars for independence, social and national liberation). Of course, also in the past there was no lack of such slogans used by pacifist movements. The point is that the noble goal of banishing war from the life of humanity was for the first time proclaimed a state policy, reinforced by the international prestige of the USSR and other socialist countries.

Of no less importance is the fact that, unlike the pacifists with their abstract appeals for peace, Communists considered the idea of peace in direct relation to the idea of social progress. Not the discontinuation, in the name of peace, of the global class confrontation (which is a utopia in itself), but its transference to the sphere of economic competition and ideological struggle, observing the principles of peaceful coexistence of states with different social systems—such an approach corresponds to the objective processes of social development and, therefore, was bound to triumph sooner or later.

That could not happen, however, as long as the leaders of the imperialist states continued to count upon their military superiority and unhesitatingly used to settle international conflicts in their favour and to suppress the national liberation struggle of

oppressed peoples. It was only after they realised that they had lost military superiority, that the ruling circles of the capitalist countries began to acknowledge the objective necessity of peaceful coexistence. The so-called "nuclear deadlock" set a limit to the use of military might because there was no reasonable alternative to the policy of peaceful coexistence of states with different social systems. The sphere of all other forms of confrontation in the international arena had expanded accordingly.

Third, the correlation of forces in the world is no longer reduced to the balance of the potentials of the Great Powers and is to a large extent formed under the influence of all other states. This is connected above all with the disintegration of the colonial system of imperialism, with the emergence of new states or with the consolidation of the independence of the former semi-colonies in Asia, Africa and Latin America. The developing countries with their considerable material and manpower resources are exerting an ever greater influence on international affairs.

It should be emphasised that the decisive role in the democratisation of international relations belongs to world socialism which consistently upholds the sovereign rights of the peoples to decide their own fate, and the participation on an equal basis of all states, big and small, in international affairs. Leonid Brezhnev said: "We consider it a very important positive phenomenon that world politics is no longer the monopoly of a few powers, that ever more countries are being drawn into it as active participants." [1]

Convincing evidence of the effectiveness of the above-mentioned tendency was the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe (1975), which was prepared on the basis of strict observance of the principle of equality of all states, big and small, and which recorded this principle in its Final Act.

Fourth, the emergence of the working class to the forefront of history, the upsurge of the struggle for the liberation of the peoples oppressed by imperialism and other social processes of the revolutionary epoch gave rise to political movements of an international character actively influencing the development of international relations.

And finally, world public opinion should be noted among the factors influencing the international situation today. A peculiarity of this factor is that it does not operate constantly: in the overwhelming majority of cases class, national and other interests, lack of information and even outright misinformation hinder that. But wherever and whenever an international problem is clearly presented to the broad masses, the force and might of public opinion makes itself felt. This most strikingly illustrates the fact that in the epoch of the great social, scientific and technological

revolutions the peoples are ever more consciously striving to be the makers of history, not confining themselves to national interests and aware of their involvement and responsibility for the destiny of all mankind.

Such was the case in the last years of the US war against Vietnam when the demand to end the aggression became the universal demand of various political movements, including those in the United States. The world public resolutely condemned the assassination of President Allende and the overthrow of the government lawfully elected by the Chilean people; the isolation of Pinochet's fascist clique is so great that even its reactionary sponsors prefer not to demonstrate their sympathies with the Chilean butchers, aiding and abetting them surreptitiously. There are all grounds to speak about the existence of a world public opinion condemning the racist regimes in South Africa and Rhodesia; a similar phenomenon can be observed in relations to the support for a just settlement of the Middle East conflict.

A further in-depth study of the existing correlation of forces and of its tendencies of change will help to better understand the objective possibilities and potential of the peace policy and, consequently make corresponding recommendations by political science more realistic.

Along with objective conditions, of great importance is the *recognition by the international community of the need to put an end to the uncontrolled stockpiling of weapons of mass destruction*, to the mounting military confrontation and to the drift towards a nuclear war. The growing understanding of the character and possible consequences of the threat is the first condition for fighting it successfully. It would be no exaggeration to say that today a considerable and, more importantly, an increasing part of mankind ever more actively supports detente and links with it its hopes for a peaceful future and social progress. That, in turn, has a positive impact on the general international climate and has a stimulating effect on the various organisations and individuals concerned.

Of course, not all political trends welcome detente. Some imperialist circles and the Chinese leaders oppose it openly. Besides, different interpretations of the aims of and ways to detente and the attempts to make it contingent on unilateral benefits and advantages hamper the unfolding of this beneficial process, divert it from its course and sometimes even cause it to move backwards.

That is why it is important to note the erroneousness of the thesis that detente is allegedly advantageous only to one side. In fact, this process cannot be a "street of one-way traffic" if only because it can develop as a result of equitable agreements. And such agreements can hardly be signed without the good-will of all

the participants concerned, each of whom naturally will not allow his interests to be infringed upon. In short, a lasting peace meets the vital interests of all nations.

When evaluating the prospects of the deepening of detente, one should consider the *concrete directions and aims of the policy of peace.* This applies first and foremost to the so-called hot spots, to the method of settling existing international conflicts on a peaceful and just basis, to the liquidation of potential centres of tension. The fact that the ways of such "international prophylaxis" are widely discussed at various political conferences and scientific meetings (that was precisely how Section II of the first theme of the Moscow Congress of the International Association of Political Sciences was called), also testifies to the growing possibilities of ensuring security by the joint efforts of states.

I should like to dwell here on one of the directions of the policy of peace, that of ending the arms race which constitutes the greatest threat to international security.

In recent years important agreements have been reached between the USSR and the USA on averting the threat of a nuclear war, banning nuclear weapons tests, limiting strategic arms, etc. The SALT and the negotiations between a number of states on the reduction of armed forces and armaments in Central Europe are continuing. In the United Nations the set of proposals on disarmament submitted by socialist and other states are being animatedly discussed. A special General Assembly was convened to discuss disarmament, and the idea of holding a world disarmament conference was supported.

At the same time, it is becoming increasingly evident that the establishment of more or less strict control over the arms race is not enough. There must also be unremitting efforts to resolve a qualitatively new task, that of taking *practical steps towards disarmament.*

In this connection it becomes especially important to prevent the deployment of new mass destruction means of the neutron bomb type. The attempts to justify their production on the grounds that, unlike the conventional bomb, they destroy only manpower and not material objects are immoral and senseless. The neutron bomb can only increase the temptation of those who are thinking of a preventive attack to use nuclear weapons. Whether or not material values are preserved in the flames of a nuclear war, victory in it can only be a Pyrrhic one.

One of the difficulties in the transition to disarmament lies in lack of trust. But the reasons for that are sometimes misinterpreted. Some political scientists reduce the problem to the fact that a vicious circle has formed, that the opposed powers and their allies are equally afraid of yielding military superiority and only a

catastrophe—thank goodness if it will not be global!—can break this circle.

Such reasoning overlooks the main thing—*the sources of the arms race*, its principal motive force. These sources should be determined not for moral reasons only. Unless that is done, it will be impossible to find really effective political solutions able to put an end to the continuing arms race. That is why, in our view, studies of peace problems too should disclose the pernicious role of the socio-political forces that are interested in the arms race as a source of profit or regard it as escape from the urgent issues of the day—international, domestic, economic, social and political.

The struggle between the various forces on the issue of war and peace in the capitalist world has given rise to two vividly descriptive, if not quite scientific, terms: "hawks" and "doves". As far as socialist society is concerned, it is homogeneous in respect to the problem of war and peace. From the social point of view, this is due to the absence of social strata which would profit from the arms race and be interested in fanning war hysteria. From the economic point of view, this is due to the fact that under a planned economy there is no need to whip up the economy with military orders. From the political point of view, this is due to the fact that the peace and disarmament policy is strategic policy of the ruling Communist Party.

Contrary to the myth about the "aggressiveness of communism", the Marxist-Leninist doctrine renounces "export of revolution" and regards the dissemination of the ideas and practice of scientific socialism as the result exclusively of the internal socio-political development of countries, as the act of the sovereign will of the peoples. Finally, from the psychological point of view, the Soviet people's allegiance to the cause of peace can be explained to a great extent by memories of the Second World War in which they lost 20 million lives and 20 per cent of their national wealth.

Socialism's consistent and unremitting drive for disarmament is reflected in numerous documents. Of programme significance is the Declaration of the Political Consultative Committee of the Warsaw Treaty Countries adopted on November 23, 1978, in Moscow. The problem of disarmament is posed there, not as an abstract pacifist wish but as a realistic task which is consonant with the vital necessity to ensure the survival of humanity and can be accomplished under the present correlation of world forces.

The Declaration defines the concrete aims, on the achievement of which all those sincerely striving for normalisation of the international political climate should concentrate their main efforts. These aims are: resolute support for the policy of peace, detente, renunciation of the use or threat of force, and peaceful

settlement of controversial issues; negotiations between the five nuclear powers to exclude nuclear weapons from the arsenals of states, reduction of military budgets and successfully concluding the current talks on various aspects of the arms race and disarmament; abolition of the last remnants of colonialism and national and racial oppression, renunciation of the policy of neo-colonialist exploitation, restructuring of international economic relations on a just and democratic basis; the establishment in the relations between all states of norms of equality and non-interference in internal affairs, respect for national independence, the inalienable right of every people to freely choose its path of development, in accordance with its will and aspirations.

The question is sometimes asked whether it is realistic to hope that all these goals can be achieved in the present specific socio-political situation in the world.

We, as is generally known, adhere to historical optimism and are convinced that, objectively, these aims are achievable. What should be particularly emphasised at the same time is the great importance in achieving these goals of such subjective factors as the realism of the political thinking and responsibility of state and public figures for their political actions as well as initiatives of world public opinion.

In this connection the political importance of elaborating a *universal conception of the peaceful coexistence of states irrespective of their social systems* is evident. In fact, it is the elaboration of principles of a new system of international relations, which could become established as a result of the deepening of detente.

The long-term parallel existence of states with different social systems after the emergence in the world of two socio-economic systems was the premise of Lenin's idea of peaceful coexistence. However one assesses the prospects of each of the two systems and the possible results of their historical competition, it should be clear to all that a nuclear holocaust is the only alternative to the peaceful coexistence of the socialist and the capitalist countries.

That the principle of peaceful coexistence is interpreted differently by representatives of different political trends and aspirations is another matter. Still, we think, that even in this case agreement can be reached on some important issues.

First, peaceful coexistence of states is not equivalent to a "poor compromise" , for it implies not simply the prevention of war in each consequent historical period but stable international relations, including a mechanism to settle international conflicts by peaceful means. Peaceful coexistence to an ever greater extent implies also multilateral cooperation — political, economic, scientific, technical, cultural, ecological, all of which constitute, in the words of Leonid Brezhnev, the "material fabric of peace".

Second, peaceful coexistence of states does not at all mean discontinuation of the ideological struggle. They are right who speak of the need under the present conditions to end the "ideological war" which can be regarded as a synonym of a "psychological war" and a component of the cold war. But it would be incorrect to identify "ideological war" with the battle of ideas, which is inevitable at the present stage of human development and without which social progress is impossible.

It is highly important to observe the elementary rules of international relations (in particular, not to permit ideological and other subversive activities which can aggravate international tensions) and it is equally important not to make unrealistic demands, such as the demand to stop the ideological struggle. It is a matter of peaceful coexistence of states and not of ideas.

There are many international agreements and treaties that proclaim various principles of peaceful coexistence. The Final Act of the Helsinki Conference is considered to be the code of the peaceful coexistence of European states, the USA and Canada (we might note here that ten principles of the Act have been included in the new Constitution of the USSR, adopted on October 7, 1977, together with the Soviet state's commitment to observe them in its international activity).

Thus, the practice of international relations has already paved the way to a *common interpretation of the concept of peaceful coexistence.* The task of political theory is evidently to generalise the experience gained and stimulate practice with new ideas and recommendations.

And finally, the last question of principle concerns the relationship between peace and social progress.

First of all, any attempts to identify the peaceful coexistence of states and detente with a kind of social and political status quo in the world today should be qualified as indefensible. It is clear that neither people, nor social institutions, nor political forces can stop social progress even if they would consciously want to make such a sacrifice for the sake of tranquility and universal peace. As long as social and national oppression exists in the world, the struggle against it is inevitable. As long as socio-economic inequality remains, the desire to overcome it is likewise inevitable. The world is propelled by social change. As soon as mankind has solved current social problems, it will have to tackle other, more complicated problems. The history of human civilisation shows that this advance cannot be stopped.

At the same time it should be noted that social progress is linked with the state of the peace for its durability is in direct proportion to its equity, to how fully and reliably social and national problems have been solved. In our opinion, Professor

H. Alker of the United States is right when he says that a peace built on denial of the need for transformations in a society is a peace without a firm foundation.

In this connection consideration of the prospects of peace in close unity with the prospects of social and national development acquires fundamental importance. The future of mankind to a great extent depends on its ability to combine such development with the consolidation of peace and international cooperation.

This has nothing in common with the utopian idea of social progress without struggle. Progress of any kind is inevitably linked with struggle—the struggle between the new and the old, the advanced and the backward, the conservative, the reactionary.

This only goes to show that the inevitable struggle within a society should not be extended to inter-state relations, and thus trigger off a spontaneous chain of international conflicts leading to a nuclear apocalypse.

This implies conscious and purposeful actions by all member states of the international community. The intricate mechanism of peace which is characterised by ever broader and intensified cooperation of states in economic, political, scientific, technical, cultural, ecological and other fields, can be created and adjusted only on the basis of the settlement of international issues by negotiation, the rational settlement of inter-state contradictions and thorough and balanced account of the interests of all countries. In other words, peace must be *planned and purposefully built.* Political science can make its contribution to the fulfilment of this urgent task.

Can the future be forecasted with any degree of accuracy and, on this basis, influenced, especially when it is a matter of international politics? Our experience makes it possible to answer this question. The theory of Marxism-Leninism, the creative application of its scientific method to an analysis of social development trends have made it possible to create an effective mechanism for the planned development of the economy, culture and other spheres of social life. In the last decade the practice of planning is becoming ever more effective also in Soviet foreign policy activities. This has been embodied in the comprehensive programmes of the struggle for peace and international cooperation, for the freedom and independence of peoples, adopted by the 24th and 25th Congresses of the CPSU.

Such are some of the considerations which, in our view, deserve attention when examining various aspects of the theme "Policy of Peace".

NOTE

[1] L. I. Brezhnev, *Our Course: Peace and Socialism*, Moscow, 1974, p. 145.

Detente and the Problem of Conflict

GEORGI ARBATOV

It is inevitable that the history of international relations (as, indeed, the history of human society in general) has confronted researchers in social and political science with the problem of conflict. Although Western schools in politology, defined today by the terms "conflict management" and "conflict resolution", appeared relatively recently, the problem itself has been at the centre of socio-political thought for quite some time. This fully applies to the theory of Marxism-Leninism which not only defined class struggle (and thereby class conflict) as a prime force of social development, but discovered the objective material bases of that conflict. The dialectical essence of being is linked with contradiction, and contradiction is linked with conflict.

The researcher's task, however, is not to state general philosophical truths but to apply them correctly to the specific object of research, in this case international relations, and more specifically, political and military conflicts between states (although economic or other contradictions may be their prime source). In the present case we are primarily concerned with large-scale, or potentially large-scale conflicts (global or regional), especially those which may threaten peace or substantially involve the whole international system. Naturally, in the nuclear age international conflicts cannot be treated separately from the new realities and dangers introduced by it.

It is apparently in this context that one should view problems of conflict management or resolution and their relationship to detente. Semantically, both "management" and "resolution" of conflicts can and do occur in the conditions of detente as well, and they may be closely interrelated. Efforts to manage a conflict may

lead to its resolution, and attempts to resolve a conflict, while not necessarily eliminating it may yield some partial result assuring a degree of control over the situation and restricting the possibility of an escalation of the conflict.

But we cannot approach the concepts "conflict management" and "conflict resolution" only semantically: they define basic trends in the theory of conflict in Western politology. Without going into an extensive analysis (I must say that the latter trend appears to me on the whole more fruitful, especially as applied to present-day practical politics), I would like to set forth some considerations on the problem of conflicts within the framework of the relaxation of international tension.

First of all, it should be noted that detente is not a speculative political concept; it is a concept and a policy born of international practice in large degree as a response to the mounting acuteness of world affairs and the heightened danger of conflicts in the age of contemporary armaments. In this connection I would like to cite the definition of the concept given in Leonid Brezhnev's replies to questions of the American magazine *Time*: "When we say 'relaxation of tension', or simply 'detente' for short, we mean a state of international relations opposite to a state which is commonly termed 'cold war' and which was characterised by permanent tension threatening to develop at any moment into open conflicts. In other words, detente means, primarily, the overcoming of the cold war and transition to normal, smooth relations among states. Detente means a willingness to resolve differences and disputes not by force, by threats or sabre-rattling, but by peaceful means, at the negotiating table. Detente means a certain degree of trust and ability to reckon with each other's legitimate interests. This, briefly, is our understanding of detente." [1]

It is especially appropriate to quote this definition in view of the fact that a sharp controversy has developed in the West over the concept and meaning of the policy of detente, in the course of which the Soviet point of view is frequently being distorted. As for Western viewpoints, we find a very wide range of them from the rejection of detente as such to views fairly closely approaching those expressed in the Soviet Union. However, the most widespread are views proceeding, on the one hand, from the need to give up the policy of "cold war" (or at least its extremes fraught with the danger of a nuclear conflict) but, on the other hand, to one degree or another retaining the old "power approach" to international relations and acknowledging the need to change not so much the essence as the methods of foreign policy.

Taken as a reflection of the existing state of affairs on the world arena rather than a policy concept for resolving fundamen-

tal issues (as they actually claim to be), such points of view may appear to be quite realistic. For example, in the United States the interpretation of detente (at least in Soviet-American relations) as a combination of rivalry and cooperation has in effect become official. No doubt, both these elements are present today in Soviet-American relations. The very fact that the two nations belong to different social systems inevitably implies some forms of rivalry (though we would prefer the word "competition") in the future as well.

But this interpretation of detente, firstly, says nothing of the relative proportion of each of the two elements in relations between countries, which is certainly not a secondary issue (actually, some elements of cooperation were present even during the cold war, one of them being the very fact of maintaining diplomatic relations). Secondly, and probably more important, it offers no idea of the main direction of the policy of detente, of the trend in international relations it is designed to originate, develop and consolidate.

Naturally enough, even after accepting detente, different countries will pursue policies the objectives of which may differ. But, paraphrasing the well-known statement of Clausewitz, detente is not a continuation of the cold war by other (say, more cautious and safe) means. It is a policy which by its very nature and objectives is opposed to the "cold war" and aimed not at gaining victory in conflicts with means representing surrogates of nuclear war (though including, among other things, the use or threat of use of military force), but at the settlement and prevention of conflicts, reduction of the level of military confrontation, and the development of international cooperation.

All that does not mean that the existence of the present conflict situation, or possibility, and in some respects inevitability, of future conflicts, are denied. It rather represents a search for a sensible response to the conflicts inherent in contemporary international relations. Moreover, it is a realistic search, because it rests, along with recognition of those conflicts, upon a clear grasp of the key common interests which make it possible to resolve conflicts and even cooperate into preventing them.

In this sense, a truly unprecedented situation has emerged. The very development of history confronts mankind with problems never encountered before, and mankind has to resolve them, guided not so much by its historical experience as by its contemporary power of the intellect. It is not only that in the latter half of our century mankind is faced with the possibility of complete annihilation as a consequence of the stockpiling of nuclear weapons by potential enemies. We also find that the continued development of the productive forces, which ought to

serve the good of mankind, is fraught with such damage to the environment which can result in a degradation of humanity. A number of countries have already felt the sting of the energy shortage and may soon face the consequences of the raw material shortage due to the finiteness of the earth's resources, regarded by our predecessors as so inexhaustible that they gave no thought to their rational utilisation. We hold, of course, that these problems are largely social in the sense that their resolution depends upon social conditions; at the same time we proceed from the consideration that in the present situation they have acquired a worldwide character.

Thus, a whole series of important factors of the world situation are operating in aggregate, and one could say cumulatively, in favour of replacing relations of confrontation and military rivalry between states with relations of peaceful coexistence and business-like cooperation.

Detente points out the way to such a change in international relations.

But, speaking of conflicts, I may expect the question: even if common interests do occupy a higher place in an abstract list of political priorities, is it not also true that in concrete politics one sees existing contradictions constantly surfacing as various regional situations, especially in Africa and Asia, deteriorate?

In answering this question one should first of all remember that these conflicts stem largely not from contemporary, still less from future international issues, as from vestiges of the past. The vestiges of colonialism with which it is, of course, impossible to resolve the new problems arising before humanity. The vestiges of the cold war, which cause the West to blame all its difficulties and failures due to the fallacies and blindness of its own policies on "Soviet subversion" and "communist plots" and to try to turn every conflict into a bridgehead for new confrontations along the East-West line.

One can, of course, understand that the defeats in Southeast Asia, events in Angola, the Horn of Africa or Iran go against the grain of ruling circles in the USA and other Western countries. But emotions of any kind do not preclude the necessity to understand correctly the causes of the setbacks experienced by US policy. They are not due to the Pentagon's shortage of funds, to any lack of "national will", or to the "Soviet challenge" being left unanswered. These failures are due first and foremost to the fact that the United States has invariably risen to the defence of inexorably doomed causes and regimes. For decades American policies were prompted by cold war considerations and blind anti-communism which forced politicians to overlook the real issues or simply suppress them. Is it surprising therefore that

these problems have ultimately erupted and are still erupting to the surface?

Today this is admitted by some of the more realistic politicians in the United States. Thus, in December 1978, Senator Frank Church, Chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations, US Senate, bitterly remarked that the United States failed to do away with the chronic weaknesses of corrupt unpopular regimes in some developing countries despite the extensive economic and military support.[2]

In this connection I should like to point out another consideration. While engaged in an active and consistent drive for detente and peaceful coexistence, the Soviet Union and other socialist countries have never, and could never have, undertaken to guarantee preservation of the social status quo in the world or halt the class and national liberation struggles bred by the objective laws of historic development. Just as they never regard detente as a tool for "pushing" these processes.

Essentially, the issue involves different spheres of contemporary world affairs (though they certainly may influence one another in different ways). One of them is the sphere of social development, which inevitably makes its way in all international conditions, be it detente, "cold" or even "hot" war. (Suffice it to recall that the first major victories of socialism—the October Revolution in Russia and the formation of the world socialist system—crowned, as it were, periods of the most acute aggravations of the international situation: the First and Second World Wars.) Another is the sphere of relations between states in which highly important issues are also resolved: issues of war and peace, methods of settling controversial international issues, opportunities for mutually advantageous international cooperation.

To draw a clear distinction between these two spheres is one of the basic premises of the Soviet foreign policy of peaceful coexistence of states with different social systems, a principled and at the same time realistic policy in keeping with the ideals of Soviet Communists and their understanding of the problems of our time, a policy which honestly offers other countries peace and cooperation.

Detente certainly requires that all parties in international relations should, in a way, change their previous views and, most important, adapt to new world realities. For the West, this process was from the outset extremely painful and difficult, which in a way explains the contradictions and inconsistencies in the policies of the United States and some of its allies over the last few years. Such adaptation is necessary to respond to the challenges of today and tomorrow, and solve the problems they bring about.

One of these problems has been the avertion of a nuclear war. Today it is hard to find a politician, or anyone in his right mind, who would considered such a war acceptable and disagree with the need to avert it. I feel, however, that not all are really aware of the scale and complexity of this task.

For today as, apparently, in the foreseeable future, the danger of war is not necessarily associated with someone deliberately planning it or pushing the button at some zero hour. The suicidal nature of such an act is obvious. Nevertheless there is a real danger of situations arising that are capable of leading to war; in a world saturated with weapons they are quite possible as a result of aggravation of international tensions or flare-ups of conflicts latent in various regions. As some of the lessons of the recent past showed, it is impossible to preclude the possibility of some twist of events leading to crises that may get out of hand and draw states into dangerous confrontations.

That is why, to create reliable guarantees of peace, it is not enough to realise the futility of starting a war, and not even enough to undertake corresponding formal commitments. Much remains to be done to remove the causes of war. This requires continued efforts to improve the whole international situation, eliminate existing and prevent potential crises and conflicts, curtail the arms race and achieve disarmament, strengthen relations of peaceful coexistence and cooperation of countries with different social systems. The Soviet point of view concerning the actions necessary to accomplish this important task is clearly set forth in the Peace Programme and the foreign policy decisions of the 24th and 25th Congresses of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union.

Without repeating them all, I should like to note that arms limitation and disarmament occupy a special place among these measures. This is only natural.

When we speak of conflicts our first thought is invariably of acute regional situations in which economic and strategic interests may clash. Actually, the main issue today is the existence and continued growth of the quantity of armaments and the improvement of their quality, including weapons of mass destruction. The time has passed when the arms race could be treated as a consequence, a result of poor political relations. Today it has become one of their prime sources which generates mutual suspicion, uncertainty, tension.

Scientific and technological progress aggravates the danger, especially seen from the point of view of the future.

First of all, the very continuation of intense military rivalry between the Soviet Union and the United States, between the NATO and Warsaw Treaty countries, creates an overall situation which inevitably enhances the threat of the proliferation of

nuclear weapons. I would not like recognition of this truth to appear as a justification of those statesmen or governments who might opt for nuclear armaments. In any conditions such a choice would be a poor and dangerous one which, far from contributing to the security of a country and international security as a whole, could only undermine it. But this does not remove the responsibility from the powers already in possession of nuclear weapons: if they do not restrict the arms race, the proliferation of nuclear weapons will be more probable.

It is also important to see other aspects of the problem. If the nuclear powers realise the fatal consequences of the proliferation of nuclear weapons and really want to avert that threat, it is not enough for them to collaborate in strengthening the regime of non-proliferation, or even harnessing the arms race going on between them. Joint efforts are necessary to improve the whole international situation and eliminate hotbeds of tension the very existence of which increases the probability of more and more members joining the "nuclear club".

Today, the problem of proliferation of nuclear weapons, no matter how serious it may be, can no longer be identified with the threat of war created by the arms race. The two preceding decades offer an idea of the enormous growth of military arsenals, both in quantity and in quality, that can take place over such a period.

Simple extrapolation, however, will not give the whole picture. Over the past two decades strategic arms systems were developing, with some deviations and great excesses, in one direction: that of ensuring mutual deterrence and probably even of increasing its reliability. Without idealising the idea of deterrence we can nevertheless note that it created a situation of strategic deadlock which has so far helped to avert a nuclear conflict.

Looking ahead, however, it must be acknowledged that, given the current dynamics of the arms race (in both quantity and quality), it no longer fits into the deterrent framework and becomes ever more destabilising. The trend actually became apparent in the late 1960s and early 1970s. And whereas one of the destabilising systems that appeared at the time—anti-ballistic missile system (ABM)—has for the time being been restrained by the Soviet-American agreements of 1972 and 1974, in the other case the genie has been let out of the bottle and, it looks now as if irrevocably.

I have in mind the so-called multiple independently targetable re-entry vehicles (MIRV). Whatever the initial justifications for MIRV systems in the United States, their appearance has led to a growth in the quantity of nuclear charges which has gone far beyond the needs of deterrence. The war planners immediately

started looking for possibilities of using the "surplus" warheads which meant looking for targets for them. Thus was reborn (at a new and more dangerous level) the idea of counter-force use of strategic weapons.

Whatever the case may be, it is hard to imagine future programmes and weapons systems not going beyond deterrent needs. Rather, they will spur trends begun by the MIRV, including the trend of acquiring counter-force potentialities. That, in particular, is the meaning of current programmes for enhancing retargeting precision and flexibility, terminal guidance, miniaturisation of warheads, etc., and even more so, of plans of developing the new American MX missile and Trident II system.

It is not hard to see that all this may have far-reaching consequences, destabilising the strategic situation and feeding fears concerning the possibility of a debilitating "first strike", fears, which by themselves will aggravate the political situation. Thus, foreseeable trends in the arms race enhance the risk of a tragic, irreparable mistake in an acute international crisis.

I should like to believe that all this is too closely tied to the polemics of the mid-1970s and may prove not so relevant 10 or 20 years from now, if only because detente, as we continue to hope, will play its positive role. But other things may occur. Science and technology are developing on such a scale that one cannot preclude the appearance of dangers considered today as purely hypothetical.

I would like to draw attention to one more threat: the arms race may, and indeed is in some respects already beginning to develop along lines which will make it much more difficult, if not impossible, to reach new agreements on arms limitations or reduction by creating insurmountable obstacles on the way of their verification. This is one of the negative consequences of the appearance of the new cruise missiles.

Summing up, I should like to note that the continuing arms race doubtlessly increases the dangers of nuclear war, even assuming that no government wants or plans to start such a war.

If prevention of war is the paramount common concern that makes detente possible and necessary, then arms limitations and disarmament are the key issues of detente.

The common concern for detente is enhanced also by other motivations. One of them, which has not yet been extensively debated, is the growing relative importance of internal affairs and domestic policies in virtually all countries. The causes, of course, may differ in countries belonging to different social systems. But there are some common sources of this development which make it global: population growth, growth of the economy and its accompanying complexity, urbanisation, and the increasing impact

of civilisation on natural resources and the environment. And though the problems are differently solved in different societies, and differences in social systems provide different opportunities for such solutions, common to all societies is a growing concern for concentrating more resources, and perhaps attention, on internal affairs. The opportunities for this are provided by detente and cooperation, not military rivalry and tension.

As time passes, another important reason insistently demanding detente and a radical improvement of world relations makes itself felt. This is the aggravation of such global problems as the finiteness of energy and raw material resources, difficulties of feeding the growing population of the earth, environmental pollution, the need to wipe out the most dangerous and widespread diseases, to explore (and exploit) outer space and the World Ocean, etc. These and other large-scale problems are on the agenda today and are becoming more and more urgent. In the report of the CC CPSU to the 25th Party Congress it was stressed that in future global problems would "exercise an increasingly perceptible influence on the life of each nation and on the entire system of international relations. The Soviet Union, like other socialist countries, cannot hold aloof from the solution of these problems which affect the interests of all mankind."[5]

Although these issues are being discussed more and more actively, their interdependence with the international situation is often overlooked. But this interdependence does exist and should be reckoned with.

According to some estimates, by the year 2000 the population of the earth will increase by as much as it amounted to at the beginning of the 20th century. This will require huge construction: in less than 25 years people will have to build as much as they built in several previous centuries. If present trends continue, by the 21st century jobs will have to be found for some 900 million people. The energy and food problems will be aggravated immeasurably. An entirely new problem may arise: not of "daily bread" but of "daily air", both because of the release of harmful substances into the atmosphere and owing to the danger threatening the main producers of oxygen, the ocean and tropical forests. The list of such problems could be continued.

Even assuming that the scientists are taking too gloomy a view of some points or are mistaken in others, there is no denying that many new and serious dangers on a global scale have appeared on the horizon. They can and must be averted.

But once this is placed on the agenda it is legitimate to ask: Has humanity, and in the first place the economically, scientifically and technologically most developed countries, the right to continue to expend a vast portion of their intellectual potential,

manpower, means and resources for purposes of war? May these countries allow themselves the luxury of not doing their utmost to concentrate all these resources for the solution of such problems, to develop closer and more extensive cooperation to these ends, to create an international political climate favourable for such cooperation?

Of course, detente by itself cannot solve all global problems. But without it, without a policy capable of averting war and creating conditions making it possible to channel vast means and resources now swallowed by the arms race for creative purposes, mankind will hardly be able to even approach a sufficiently effective solution of these problems, given their present and future proportions.

In conditions of tensions, hostility and unrestricted rivalry the impact of global problems may be destructive and lead to new conflicts and crises. In conditions of detente the need to resolve these problems can cement relations between peoples, serve as a powerful incentive for cooperation, and be its motive force and, thereby, an important factor of international security.

Looking ahead, it may thus be said that detente in the broadest sense of the word is a vital necessity, the only acceptable road of development of relations between states with different social systems. The objective nature of this requirement and its inexorability give grounds for optimism. It is hard to believe that in our enlightened age humanity will stubbornly act against its own vital interests. But optimism must be realistic, and therefore cautious.

Of course, assessing the prospects of humanity on the scale of centuries, one can say with confidence that sooner or later (if only it does not make some irreparable mistake, such as a nuclear war) it will solve all its problems. But we cannot reason only in terms of centuries. The time factor plays a tremendous part in the life of every person as well as in major political developments.

The time factor is also of decisive significance in view of other problems, notably that of armament limitations. But if it is to be reckoned with, then the policies of at least the major participants in world relations must display clear orientation, clear choice and concentration on the main issues, even at the cost of losing some incidental, passing (and usually, as it turns out, illusory) advantages.

Detente implies just such a policy. In this it differs from many "conflict management" or even "conflict resolution" theories current in the West. Most noticeable in these theories is, in my view, still an entirely different mentality, a "power struggle" mentality, which clashes with the genuine requirements of the present stage and future development of international relations.

In fact, this is, unfortunately, to one degree or another typical of both the political theory and practical policies of the West. Herein lie the main causes of the difficulties encountered by detente. It is hard to combine detente with a policy of achieving military superiority and endless whipping up of the arms race, with attempts to interfere in the internal affairs of socialist countries, with "crisis diplomacy" and international intrigues having nothing in common with the cause of peace.

Speaking of the latter I have in mind first of all attempts to play the notorious "China card" against the Soviet Union. Actually, behind such attempts lies the fairly traditional political thinking in the "balance of power" spirit. It is reasoned that the growth of the military and economic potential of the People's Republic of China will create a "counterbalance" to the Soviet Union, a kind of additional lever to bring pressure to bear on the Soviet Union and other socialist countries in the international sphere. The authors of such a policy give little thought to the question that it is fraught with the danger of the emergence of a perilous military hotbed in the Far East, from which any conflict, military included, may spread beyond Asia and acquire a global scale.

In this connection mention should be made of ideas of a "multipolar balance of power" designed to justify the use of the "China factor" against the Soviet Union, and, moreover, praised as a "contribution" to the international stability, and thus the cause of peace. Such ideas became especially popular since the late 1960s and early 1970s, when Western politologists began to talk about the end of the "bipolar world" and its replacement by a "multipolar world". It was then that elaboration began in theory, as well as in policies, of possibilities of strengthening one's own political positions by balancing with several "centres of power".

The question arises: whether such policy can indeed assure stability in international relations? In answering this complicated question it is necessary to take into account the considerable differences between the "main characters" on the contemporary political stage. Not only in historical, cultural, social and psychological experience, but in basic political interests and premises as well. As a consequence, their approach to foreign policy problems, methods of formulating long-term foreign policy objectives and the respective methods of realising them differ substantially, and often qualitatively. It follows that, say, American evaluations of the current external political situation and the prospects of its long-term development (evaluations naturally closely linked with purely American political requirements and traditions) may, no matter how convincing and "comprehensive" they seem to be to their authors, prove incompatible with the

evaluations and calculations by other parties in the "multilateral balancing act". In particular, evaluations and calculations may be quite different in Peking.

In other words, in such a "free play of forces" each participant "plays" at his own risk, as he sees fit, taking into account only his own rules and not those drawn up jointly with other participants. The historical experience shows that no good comes of such games.

The advocates of the "balance of power" approach possibly believe they are acting according to the canons elaborated and verified by Metternich, Talleyrand and Lord Castlereigh when these principles were first officially codified by the Vienna Congress. But in that case they seriously underestimate the qualitative changes in contemporary international relations.

To take but one. In the first half of the 19th century a mistake in calculations, and the consequential disturbance of multilateral, mutually balanced manoeuvring of forces, was fraught with one more recarving of the map of Europe, the replacement of one or another ruling dynasty in some European state, etc. But these more or less significant historical episodes possessed one common feature: they were limited in scale and frequently historically reversible. The objective course of historical development, as it were, corrected the class-, nationally- or personally-limited calculations of the "political realists" of the 19th century. In this sense the guarantees provided by the "balance of forces" concept, even if unsatisfactory from the point of view of the stability of the international system in the framework of a concrete historical situation, were at least not fraught with the possibility of the destruction of the European civilisation.

Today, of course, the situation is entirely different. Today, if one accepted the basic postulates of the "balance of forces" concept, international relations should develop as a multilateral balancing of power possessing, or with the early prospect of possessing, nuclear and missile potentialities sufficient to destroy one or several principal opponents; this makes guarantees of lasting peace and stability shaky indeed, since any "mistake in calculation" could lead to historically irreversible consequences.

Even if this terrible alternative is avoided, it is hard to imagine how, in such a pseudorealistic world new problems of truly worldwide significance so urgently and insistently confronting humanity can be tackled seriously and on a truly worldwide scale. The issue today is not one of finding the ways to use force and to balance it more subtly, but of eliminating the use, and threat of the use of force in international relations.

Today a correct choice of policy is important as never before. In fact, the options are not many. Moreover, in the nuclear age

there is no reasonable alternative to peaceful coexistence and detente. In the final analysis, the truth voiced so many years ago by Plato, "Every person must live his life in peace, as long and as good as possible", is eternal.

NOTES

[1] "Replies of Leonid I. Brezhnev to Questions of *Time* Magazine", *Moscow News*, No. 3, January 21, 1979, p. 4.

[2] *The Washington Post*, December 13, 1978.

[3] L. I. Brezhnev, *Report of the CPSU Central Committee and the Immediate Tasks of the Party in Home and Foreign Policy. 25th Congress of the CPSU*, Moscow, 1976, p. 67.

Policy of Peaceful Coexistence: Underlying Principles

NIKOLAI INOZEMTSEV

In the world of today international relations and foreign policy play a particularly important role in the life of nations, in the activities of parties, governments and states. This is due to a number of circumstances, dictated by the specifics of the epoch and to the operation of a multiplicity of different factors.

To begin with, never before did the destinies of millions of people and of entire civilisation depend to such a degree, as it does today, on the international situation, on the solution of key international issues, and that of war and peace, in the first place. The scientific and technological revolution (STR) has led to the creation of weapons of unprecedented destructive power: a war started by imperialism using such weapons is fraught with the annihilation of millions upon millions of people, and of the very conditions of human existence. At the same time, the STR, while facilitating the much more rapid development of productive forces than in the preceding epochs, has brought mankind face to face with such global problems as rational exploitation of natural resources and providing vast masses of people with the means of subsistence and work, and as overcoming the economic backwardness of the developing countries. The STR, furthermore, is leading to considerable expansion of the international division of labour, of international economic cooperation, in all fields including energetics, exploration of outer space and of the World Ocean, and in environmental protection.

In the current epoch, a profoundly revolutionary one by its very nature, the impact of the masses on politics has sharply

increased, home and foreign policy issues have become particularly closely interconnected, the dependence of the course and results of the class struggle in this or that country on the general correlation of class forces in the world arena, on the state of international relations, has become immeasurably greater.

Lastly, a most important distinctive feature of this epoch is the parallel existence of states of two different systems—the capitalist and the socialist, of two different socio-economic formations, each developing according to the laws implicit in it. Naturally, this makes itself felt in the system of international relations, manifests itself in clashes—and at the same time in the interaction—between different general trends and laws of social development.

* * *

The principle of peaceful coexistence, advanced by the young Land of Soviets as a basis of relations with the capitalist states, was never a manoeuvre, a tactical stratagem on its part, as some bourgeois politicians and ideologists alleged. The concept of peaceful coexistence is intrinsic to the Leninist theory of socialist revolution.

From Lenin's conclusion about the intensification of the unequal economic and political development of countries in the conditions of imperialism and the possibility of the victory of socialism initially in one or several countries followed that a situation would arise in the world when socialist and capitalist states would coexist. The course of world events convinced Lenin that the socialist reconstruction of mankind would not be accomplished all at once, that it would be a long historical process. Hence the conclusion about the objective inevitability of the parallel existence of states with different social systems over a long period of history.

Lenin had no doubt that an acute and stubborn struggle between the old and historically doomed social system and the new one coming into being was objectively inevitable, that the contradiction between the two systems would become the main, determining contradiction of the entire transitional period, that imperialism would try to crush the victorious socialist revolution utilising all means to this end, including military intervention. Lenin however deeply believed in the creative potentialities of the Russian proletariat who had risen up in struggle for their liberation, in the force of example of the victorious socialist revolution, that it would be assured the international support of the peoples of many other countries, and first of all, of the working class concentrated in the principal centres of capitalism.

Lastly, the founder of the CPSU proceeded from such objective trends facilitating the victory of the revolution and subsequently the existence of the Republic of Soviets in a capitalist encirclement as the profound contradictions between the imperialists which inevitably divided the enemies of our revolution, and the system of the international division of labour, widespread already at the turn of the century, which heightened the interest of capitalists in a number of countries in the economic cooperation with our country vastly rich in natural resources and offering an enormous potential market. "There is a force," Lenin wrote, "more powerful than the wishes, the will and the decisions of any of the governments or classes that are hostile to us. That force is world general economic relations, which compel them to make contact with us." [1]

It was Lenin's deep conviction that the fundamental national interests of both the socialist state and the capitalist countries, that the vital interests of all mankind require that the struggle between states of different socio-economic systems be waged by peaceful, and not by armed, means; that the acute contradictions between the two systems be settled not on the field of battle but on the field of political and ideological confrontation and economic competition and in competition in perfecting the way of life and the ability to solve major universal problems. This is what Lenin meant by states living side by side in peace.

Immediately after the October Revolution, Lenin's ideas began to be translated into practice in the foreign policy of Soviet Russia. This meant a fundamental restructuring of international relations. The first decree of the Soviet state which had just come into being was, as we know, Lenin's Decree on Peace. By this decree, like by all its subsequent domestic and foreign policies, the young Republic of Soviets proved in practice that its ideal is discontinuation of wars and ensuring peace among nations.

Among the first foreign policy acts of the young Soviet state was the granting of state independence to Finland, rejection of the unequal treaties concluded by tsarist Russia with a number of states, assistance to Mongolia, Iran, Afghanistan, Turkey and other countries. The early 1920s saw the development of normal trade, economic, and in some cases also political, relations between the USSR and a number of capitalist countries. In those instances where some capitalist governments remained aloof from this process and chose not to establish relations of peaceful coexistence with the Soviet Union, the full responsibility rested with the most implacable circles of those capitalist countries' ruling classes who refused to give up hopes of forcibly doing away with the socialist gains of the peoples of the USSR.

The concept of peaceful coexistence made further headway in the subsequent years, and this even in a difficult international political situation for the Soviet Union when the capitalist powers of Europe and the USA made no secret of their preparations for a new world war. The report of the Central Committee to the 15th Congress of the CPSU(B), held in 1927, stated that "the preservation of peaceful relations with the capitalist countries is a must for us. Our relations with the capitalist countries are based on the assumption that the two opposite systems should coexist. Practice has fully justified it."[2]

The anti-Hitler coalition that was formed with the active participation of the Soviet Union during the Second World War, the Soviet Union's decisive role in the defeat of fascism, its efforts directed at ensuring the postwar peaceful settlement on a genuinely democratic basis—all that was fresh practical proof of both the Soviet Union's readiness to promote relations of peaceful coexistence with the leading capitalist countries and of the rewarding results of such relations from the standpoint of the interests of the peoples of all countries and of the interests of world civilisation. The anti-Hitler coalition united in a fighting alliance states with different social systems; it proved the possibility and also effectiveness of cooperation between these states on the most crucial issues relating to foreign policy and the conduct of the war. And as is generally known, none of the members of the coalition made any concessions in the sphere of ideology and did not demand this of the others.

Looking back it can confidently be assumed that if the joint actions of the anti-Hitler coalition participants had been supplemented in the postwar years by the development of broad political, economic and other cooperation between the former allies and if the objectively existing possibilities for such cooperation had been utilised, many of the world problems could have been solved earlier and at a smaller price than was the case. However, at the close of the 1940s and the beginning of the 1950s, the policy of the West was shaped predominantly by those political forces who saw their war-time cooperation with the Soviet Union only as a means of removing the direct threat to the vital interests of their respective countries posed by fascist aggression. Beyond these interests these forces had no intention of continuing cooperation with the land of victorious socialism.

As regards the Soviet Union, it continued to pursue, even in the cold war years, a foreign policy based on the Leninist principle of peaceful coexistence. But many years were needed before this principle won broad international recognition, before the policy of peaceful coexistence was incorporated in a number of bilateral and multilateral acts.

By the close of the 1960s and the beginning ot the 1970s, the international climate, the entire course of developments in the world arena, and world politics generally began to undergo major changes—changes in the direction of relaxation of international tension and reducing the danger of a new world war. What factors prompted these changes?

First, the further consolidation of the positions of the Soviet Union and other countries of the socialist community and the growth of their economic might and political influence. It is this factor that played a decisive role, for it showed the futility of US ruling circles and of other capitalist powers banking on retaining their military superiority over the Soviet Union and the other states of the world socialist system. The successes achieved by the USSR in safeguarding its security and that of the entire socialist community spiked the calculations of the West, put an end to the USA's "monopoly on invulnerability". The parity attained, especially in strategic arms, made the "positions of strength" policy of the cold war years not only obsolete but dangerous for the West itself.

Second, the reshaping of the entire political map of the world following the successes of the national liberation movement and the emergence and development of dozens of young states. Most of these states flatly rejected the imperialist *diktat* and sided with the socialist countries in the struggle against aggressive acts and for peace and international security. Big changes had also taken place in the alignment of forces within the imperialist system. Many capitalist countries which in the 1950s had obediently followed the US lead began to take a different line.

Third, the growth of the anti-imperialist forces in the world, the upsurge of the working-class movement in the capitalist countries and the consolidation in most of them of the positions of the Left forces, of the parties of the working class and especially of the Communists. A feature of the political situation in the last decade is the active development in most of the capitalist countries of broad general democratic movements, and of antiwar movements, in the first place.

Fourth, the changes taking place in the ruling circles of leading capitalist countries, and the growth of realistic trends in these circles and in the policy of many of the countries in the West. This process is a complicated and often contradictory one. Its main feature is the realisation by a considerable group of statesmen in the West of the consequences and dangers the unrestrained stockpiling of weapons is fraught with, and a growing understanding of the need to find new approaches in foreign policy. To this should be added the growing support that realistically thinking bourgeois figures are meeting with on the part of large segments

of public opinion, of an increasingly bigger number of the electorate. A fact of no small account.

All these factors, taken in their totality and refracted through the consciousness of classes, social groups and a number of the more influential state and political figures, contributed to the fact that towards the end of the 1960s sentiments in favour of revising the dogmas of the cold war began to prevail in the leading capitalist countries.

That is how the objective and subjective conditions evolved which made possible the actual passage from the cold war to a relaxation of international tension, to the development of normal relations between the states of the two systems, to the practical and international-legal recognition by the West of the principle of peaceful coexistence. "The passage from cold war, from the explosive confrontation of the two worlds, to detente," stressed Leonid Brezhnev, "was primarily connected with changes in the correlation of world forces. But much effort was required of people—especially those responsible for the policy of states—to become accustomed to the thought that not brinkmanship but negotiation of disputed questions, not confrontation but peaceful cooperation, is the natural state of things."[3]

* * *

The transition from cold war to detente, broad recognition of the principles of peaceful coexistence was not accomplished at a stroke. It was a comparatively long process manifesting itself with different intensity at different periods, affecting different regions of the world in different ways, a process taking different forms in the relations of the Soviet Union and other socialist states with capitalist countries.

This process manifested itself most incisively in Europe, the continent where states of two opposed socio-economic systems and their principal military organisations—NATO and the Warsaw Treaty—directly confront each other.

The first among the leading capitalist countries to take the path of improving relations with the Soviet Union was France. This was of great importance both as a precedent facilitating the normalisation of relations with a number of other countries, and from the standpoint of the role France plays in world history, in world politics, economics and culture. The new stage in Soviet-French relations began following President de Gaulle's visit to the USSR in the summer of 1966. It marked a turning point in the relations between the two countries and one that was of enormous importance for both the countries concerned and the

process of detente as a whole. Soviet-French relations over the past decade are a striking example of the embodiment of the principles of peaceful coexistence and cooperation between states with different systems and are an important factor in the normalisation of the entire complex of European and international relations.

A signal event in the postwar history of Europe was the Moscow Treaty of 1970, which became a cornerstone of detente in the European continent and meant the normalisation of the relations between the Soviet Union and other countries of the socialist community with the Federal Republic of Germany. The importance of this event followed from the FRG's specific position in the entire system of postwar international relations, from the role it had been assigned in the cold war, and from the great potentialities of the West German state. During twenty-five years after the war, the complex of problems connected with the FRG and West Berlin, in one way or another, remained in the focus of the confrontation of the two systems, was fraught with a real possibility of a new war. That is why the normalisation of the FRG's relations with the socialist countries and the normalisation of the situation in West Berlin were of such great importance for relations of peaceful coexistence.

The Soviet Union has also always considered the improvement and positive development of relations with Great Britain and Italy, who also occupy a notable place in European and world politics, to be of fundamental importance. The relations with these countries have good prospects both as regards political contacts and economic and other spheres of cooperation. Along with improving relations with the leading powers the Soviet Union has always attached great importance to maintaining and expanding normal relations with the smaller capitalist countries.

Many more examples of positive bilateral cooperation with countries of Western Europe could be cited. However, bilateral relations by themselves, for all the benefit they bring and the need for them, cannot resolve the European continent's main problems. This requires collective, multilateral efforts of the continent's various states, irrespective of the social system they belong to.

Europe is politically, economically, and in all other aspects, not least of all the military, a part of the global system of international (in the broadest sense of the word) relations, and a very important and active part at that. But at the same time, Europe has its own cluster of problems in the most diverse fields of life and these can be satisfactorily resolved only by combining the fruitful bilateral relations between individual European states with collective, multilateral efforts of all the continent's states.

Indisputably, international security was and continues to be the most crucial of European problems, requiring a multilateral

approach. This problem is by no means a new one: it was raised in one or another form at least over the past century and a half. The two world wars which began on the European continent graphically demonstrated the futility of all the earlier attempts made in this direction. One of the lessons of the past is that the problem of European security can be solved only on a joint, equal, voluntary and multilateral basis, which would include all countries, big and small.

The CPSU and the Soviet government have always believed that there can be two kinds of peace. The one—peace as a respite, a temporary interval between two wars, when there is no state of war nominally but the participants concerned actively prepare for its possible resumption; it was this kind of peace that was most frequent in human history, particularly at its capitalist stage, and the tragic culmination of which were world wars which took a toll of scores of millions of human lives. The other—peace as a state of relations between states (including relations between states belonging to different social systems), which rules out wars between them and presupposes the broad development of all forms of cooperation. It is this kind of interstate relations that the Soviet Union means by the words "security", and "European security", and regards the achievement of this state as most important aim and task of Soviet foreign policy.

It is therefore only natural that the socialist countries advanced the initiative of convening a European conference at which the most important problems concerning security and the development of cooperation between all the European states would be raised and solved. The meeting of the Political Consultative Committee of the Warsaw Treaty Organisation held in Poland in January 1965, addressed a corresponding appeal to all the European powers. Many conferences and meetings of the Communist and Workers' Parties held in the subsequent years came out in support of the idea of convening a European conference, as also did numerous public organisations and forums of the peace forces. The task of ensuring the convocation and success of a European conference became one of the major points of the Peace Programme adopted by the 24th Congress of the CPSU in 1971.

The consolidation of socialism's positions in Europe, the advent to power in the leading Western states of political forces and statesmen who took a realistic approach to international problems, the changes in the international situation in the mid-1970s, the advances in detente, the positive experience accumulated in the relations between states of different systems—all this made it possible to raise the question of convening a European conference.

In August 1975, the leaders of 33 states of Europe and of the USA and Canada met in Helsinki and affixed their signatures to

the Final Act of the Conference, whose work lasted two years, and political preparations—ten years.

The very fact that for the first time in the history of Europe representatives of all the continent's states met to discuss the problems of their region, will go down in world history as an event of great importance. The main political result of the Conference was the adoption of the principles guiding relations between the European states which were recorded in the Final Act. These principles, formulated with due account of the views and interests of all the participating states, not only reflect the understanding and recognition by the corresponding countries of the situation existing in Europe and of the experience of the postwar relations between them. More importantly, these principles are projected into the future. They are, in a manner of speaking, the practical political lesson drawn by the Conference participants from the negative aspects of European reality of the cold war period and from the experience of the development of positive relations between states belonging to different systems.

Of particular importance, both from the fundamentally political and from the purely practical aspects, is the fact that in Helsinki, not only the general principles guiding realtions between states were agreed upon and coordinated but also the main directions and areas in which the expansion of cooperation will, in the opinion of the participating states, most favourably affect the political climate in Europe in the immediate and distant future. Cooperation in practical fields, utilisation of the advantages of the international division of labour, including between states of the two social systems, can bring each country tangible economic benefits. But no less important is that now the countries are trying to solve the European problems jointly, that mechanisms and procedures have been set up to facilitate this, that the mutual trust between European states have been consolidated and there exists their real and positive concern for each other and for the development of European cooperation.

In assessing the results of the all-European Conference, the 25th Congress of the CPSU stressed that they were well worth the efforts expended. The Conference collectively reaffirmed the inviolability of existing frontiers, worked out a set of principles for interstate relations conforming fully, in letter and in spirit, to the requirements of peaceful coexistence, outlined the perspectives of cooperation in a number of areas and defined measures to build up confidence between states. "The main thing now," said Leonid Brezhnev addressing the Congress, "is to translate all the principles and understandings reached in Helsinki into practical deeds. This is exactly what the Soviet Union is doing and will continue to do."[4]

Convincing proof that this is exactly what has been done is the inclusion in Article 29 of the new Constitution of the USSR of the basic principles contained in the Declaration approved by the European Conference, thereby giving them the validity of the Fundamental Law of the Soviet State. Article 29 states: "The USSR's relations with other states are based on observance of the following principles: sovereign equality, mutual renunciation of the use or threat of force; inviolability of frontiers; territorial integrity of states; peaceful settlement of disputes; non-intervention of internal affairs; respect for human rights and fundamental freedoms; the equal rights of peoples and their right to decide their own destiny; cooperation among states; and fulfilment in good faith of obligations arising from the generally recognised principles and rules of international law, and from the international treaties signed by the USSR."

In the period following the European Conference extensive and useful work was carried out to put into effect the decisions and understandings reached in Helsinki. This was noted also at the Belgrade (October 1977-May 1978) meeting of representatives of the participating states in the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe.

At that meeting, the Soviet delegation advanced a comprehensive programme of practical measures projected into the future, and aimed especially at reducing the dangers of a military confrontation in Europe and of a nuclear war. At the same time, the Soviet Union supported such major European initiatives as the convocation of conferences or international meetings of cooperation in the fields of environmental protection, energetics and transport. The Soviet delegation once again confirmed that the USSR is in favour of further expansion of cooperation in the humanitarian fields and that such cooperation be carried out on the principles defined in the Final Act.

A special place in the complex of relations between states of the two world systems and in international relations as a whole belongs to Soviet-American relations. This follows from the position of the USSR in the system of world socialism and of the USA in the system of world capitalism, the role of both countries in the world economy and world politics, their military potentials, especially in strategic, nuclear weapons. While rejecting in principle the "two super-powers" concept as being profoundly contrary to the basic principles of Soviet foreign policy, the Soviet Union could not fail to take into account that the nature of the relations between the USSR and the USA exerted and continue to exert considerable influence on the climate of international relations generally, on the concrete situation in one or another

region of the world, on the state of international cooperation in various spheres. Another weighty circumstance that could not be overlooked was that for much of the postwar period the USA had been the principal architect of the "positions of strength" policy and of the cold war.

The Central Committee of the CPSU and the Soviet Government, taking account of these factors, consistently advocated improvement of Soviet-American relations and their development on the principles of peaceful coexistence. The changes in the correlation of forces of the two systems, especially in strategic arms, fundamentally altered the USA's military-strategic position and compelled its ruling echelons to make a certain "reappraisal" of their foreign policy, to pass gradually from the policy of cold war and confrontation with the USSR to a policy of negotiations, and recognition of peaceful coexistence as the objective basis of relations between the states of the two systems.

A big role in the normalisation of relations between the two countries, and in the process of detente and strengthening of international security was played by the Soviet-American summit meetings in the first half of the 1970s. During these meetings numerous documents, agreements, treaties and protocols were signed, designed primarily to reduce the danger of nuclear war as well as to help mutual understanding and ensure the stability of relations. As a result, considerable headway was made in expanding mutually advantageous cooperation in many fields.

It should be noted, however, that in the latter half of the 1970s the forces opposed to detente and further improvement of Soviet-American relations sharply stepped up their activities in the USA. This added many new problems and difficulties to the relations between the two countries, considerably slowing down their constructive development.

While attaching paramount importance to the implementation of the principles of peaceful coexistence in relations with the capitalist countries of Europe—the continent where the two world wars started, and with the USA—the heartland of modern capitalism, the CC CPSU and the Soviet Government have, at the same time, always proceeded from the desire to extend these principles to relations with all other capitalist and developing countries. The USSR has consistently advocated the establishment of good-neighbour relations with Japan. The friendly relations with India hold a special place in Soviet foreign policy. The Soviet Union has good and constantly expanding relations with many countries of Asia, Africa and Latin America.

* * *

At the 25th Congress of the CPSU it was clearly stated that, "in its foreign policy, the Soviet Union intends to search patiently and consistently for more new ways of expanding peaceful, mutually advantageous cooperation between states with different social systems".[5] Such cooperation is fully consonant with the vital long-term interests of the Soviet Union, since it makes for the most favourable conditions for socialist and communist construction. It also wholly corresponds to the vital interests of the peoples and countries of the capitalist world, since only in this way can a new world war be averted, international security ensured and a number of the complex global problems facing mankind resolved. Hence the importance of consolidating the process of detente, of making it irreversible.

However, as the facts show, international detente cannot be regarded as something achieved once and for all, as something firmly established, as something developing automatically. No matter how deep detente's roots in present-day international relations, it continues to be an object of sharp struggle in the international arena, and primarily between the states of the two mutually opposed social systems, between the forces of peace and the forces of imperialism, and also within the capitalist countries, and not only between their ruling classes and the broad masses, but within the ruling groups as well. This is due to a number of reasons.

First of all, we should not forget that even in the present conditions, characterised by a fundamentally new correlation of world forces, capitalism continues to be capitalism—with its inherent drive for aggression, militarism and exploitation not only of its "own" people but the peoples of other countries, for using force and coercion not only in its "own" but also in other countries. Added to this is the fact that in the USA and in several other capitalist countries the military-industrial complex has become a weighty economic and political factor strongly influencing the actions of governments, parliaments and bourgeois political parties.

What should also be borne in mind is that recognition of peaceful coexistence as a historically unavoidable type of international relations in the present epoch, as the only sensible alternative to a new world war, is not as yet universal in the capitalist countries. The point is not only—as has been the case time and again in the past—that the most rabid militarist and reactionary forces place their own political interests above the national interests of their countries, even more, above elementary common sense. The point is that these forces, exploiting the

inertia of the cold war, influence certain groups in the US Congress and parliaments of Western Europe and Japan, that on many issues the ultra-Right circles of these countries' traditionally conservative parties move in lockstep with the said reactionary forces. In their actions spearheaded against detente, these forces have the support of the Right trade-union leadership, especially the American. Another major factor obstructing detente is the activity of bourgeois ideologists who remain on positions of rabid anti-communism, and of the mass media in a number of capitalist countries.

Such are the forces in the capitalist countries who are opposed to detente. The Maoist leadership is displaying a similar tendency; in their actions aimed at undermining world security, preventing normalisation of the international situation, Beijing went so far as to launch an armed attack on socialist Vietnam and is now aligning itself with the most orthodox advocates of "back to the cold war."

One also cannot fail to see the dangers stemming from the various political machinations regarding detente. There are not a few government and political leaders and bourgeois ideologists in the West who, while officially supporting peaceful coexistence and detente, try to distort their essence and take steps which, in effect, run counter to the goals of strengthening international security.

One of the directions of such distortions is the attempts to represent detente as a "one-way street", as a process from which only the Soviet Union, the socialist and developing countries allegedly benefit while the Western countries are the losers. What can be said on this score? First and foremost, that all states—the socialist, capitalist and developing, that the peoples of all countries—big and small, are equally interested in averting a new world war—and this can be achieved through detente. As regards the fact that in many countries and regions of the world the democratic and liberation forces are achieving success, this is an inevitable result of the historical process. Incidentally, this is not only due to detente. We have witnessed the same during the two world wars unleashed by imperialism and during the cold war period.

Another direction of the speculations around detente is the attempts to ensure the Western powers—under the guise of actions ostensibly designed to build up confidence among states and consolidate international security—advantages, especially in the military sphere, and to create certain conditions facilitating interference in the internal affairs of the Soviet Union and other countries of the socialist community. A glaring instance of this is the attempts in recent years to make a number of unfounded demands of the Soviet Union, which are contrary to the principles

of reciprocity and equal security, that it unilaterally reduce certain types of its arms and armed forces.

The counteraction to detente thus originates from different social and political circles and is dictated by long- and short-term considerations. It is not surprising therefore that the question of detente, of its perspectives, is in the focus of sharp discussion in a number of countries. It is one of the main issues of the struggle between the antagonistic classes in the capitalist countries, one of the main areas of the activities of the broad general democratic movements in which representatives of different classes are participating. Detente is also the subject of an inner-class struggle, so to speak, considering the growing differences in the ruling echelons of the leading capitalist countries between the enemies of detente and the supporters of political realism.

The course and the outcome of the struggle between the supporters and the opponents of detente are being determined, to a large extent, by the alignment of social and political forces within each of the capitalist countries and, of course, by the further changes in the correlation of forces in the world as a whole. At the same time this process is strongly being influenced by the active foreign policy of the Soviet Union and other socialist countries; by the actions of the forces fighting for the strengthening of peace, the consolidation of the positive changes achieved in the world situation, for the extension of detente to all continents, to all regions of the world, by the resolute opposition to all acts of aggression. It is of paramount importance that the political detente be supplemented by a military detente, that the arms race be halted, that equal economic cooperation, which may be said to be the material basis of the peaceful coexistence policy, be widely expanded.

Looking back, there is every ground to say that the experience gained in the development of international relations, taken in all its diversity, in all its positive and negative aspects, testifies to the viability of the principles of peaceful coexistence, to the need that they be implicitly observed by all states.

It should be noted that the combination in the foreign policy of the Soviet Union and other socialist countries of class, socialist, and democratic, humane elements greatly strengthens the effectiveness of this policy, ensures it sympathy and support not only in their own countries but far beyond their confines. In the light of this, it is only natural that the principles of peaceful coexistence of states, providing for the renunciation of wars as a means of settling issues, respect for the sovereign rights of all peoples and states, non-interference in the internal affairs of other countries, are meeting with ever wider international recognition, and are

increasingly becoming a generally accepted norm of international life.

As never before, the policy of peaceful coexistence is today becoming an objective necessity. In the nuclear age, and this is becoming the accepted opinion, there is not and cannot be any other sensible alternative to this policy.

The need to observe the principles of peaceful coexistence is dictated by the fact that in the conditions of the unprecedentedly rapid development of the productive forces, science and technology, the interconnection and interdependence of countries and peoples sharply increase, the international division of labour deepens, economic, scientific-technological and cultural cooperation between countries on an equal basis acquires growing importance. Mankind is increasingly contending with problems, truly global in scale, whose solution requires the collective effort of different states.

These factors taken in their totality, the interrelation of class and social problems with humane problems, the interlacing of the contradictions between the two systems with the contradictions between nature and society, the combination of the possibilities arising from the scientific and technological revolution, with the dangers engendered by it—all this cannot but affect present-day international relations. They are relations in which, in accordance with the transitional character of the epoch, different ideologies, different principles, different foreign policy courses clash: the course of the socialist states, the course of the capitalist countries, the course of the developing countries. At the same time, these are relations, characterised by the quest for mutually acceptable solutions, especially with a view to preventing a new world war, a nuclear collision; by the desire of many states to establish elementary norms of international law which would ensure respect of their sovereign rights. And lastly, these are relations of expanding international cooperation in the spheres of the economy, science, technology, the environment, in the humanitarian and other fields.

Thus, peaceful coexistence is the dialectical interconnection, blending of competition, struggle and cooperation of states with different social systems, and, of course, not cooperation at any price, but on the principles of equality and the observance by all states of the norms of international law.

The peaceful coexistence policy has nothing in common with "freezing" of the social status quo, with any artificial conservation of progressive trends, which is what its opponents in the bourgeois camp would like, or as the Peking "theorists" try to represent it. This policy—and in this lies its strength—proceeds from the objective content of historical progress, from the inevitability of

struggle against exploitation and inequality as long as they exist in the world, and for recognition of the right of every people to choose their own path of political, economic and social development.

The principles of peaceful coexistence of states with different systems are viable and are being implemented ever more widely, because they most fully accord with the character, the basic regularities and features of the present era and with the system of international relations implicit in it.

NOTES

[1] V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Moscow, Vol. 33, p. 155.

[2] *15th Congress of the CPSU(B). Verbatim Report*, Moscow, 1961, Vol. 1, p. 54 (in Russian).

[3] L. I. Brezhnev, *Report of the CPSU Central Committee and the Immediate Tasks of the Party in Home and Foreign Policy. 25th Congress of the CPSU*, Moscow, 1976, p. 20.

[4] Ibid., p. 23.

[5] Ibid., p. 30.

The Developing Countries: Some Problems

EVGENY PRIMAKOV

A fundamental feature of present world development is the irreversibility of the process of national and social liberation of the peoples of the former colonial empires. The principal and determinative trend in the changes in states that have emerged on the ruins of the former empires, or have torn asunder the fetters of semi-colonial dependence is the consolidation of national sovereignty, the abolition of feudal landownership, development of the state sector, nationalisation of foreign enterprises and the growth of national consciousness. The peoples in many of the liberated countries are carrying out deep-going internal socio-economic changes under the slogan of the socialist orientation. The positive role of the newly free countries in international life is growing, and this is strengthening the front of the fighters for peace and world security.

At the same time, two diametrically opposite tendencies have emerged over the past few years within the framework of this historical and clearly promising process: radicalisation of the transformations in some of the liberated countries and a swing to the right in others.

It is noteworthy, for example, that the disintegration of the colonial system, completed by the collapse of the last colonial empire, the Portuguese, led to the emergence in Portugal's former colonies of anti-imperialist regimes which are orienting themselves in their development on scientific socialism. This came about thanks largely to the fact that the victory of the national liberation revolution in the former Portuguese colonies was preceded by a long, stubborn struggle in the course of which revolutionary

cadres grew up and became tempered, who regard the future of their countries in indissoluble connection with the destinies of the other components of the world revolutionary process—the community of socialist states and the international working-class movement.

The revolution triumphed in Ethiopia and the revolutionary-democratic leaders who came to power also took the road of deep-going social changes under socialist slogans. The revolutionary movement in Afghanistan won a historic victory. The revolutionary changes in the People's Republic of Congo, Madagascar, the People's Democratic Republic of Yemen, in Benin, Tanzania, Algeria, Libya and in other countries, become deeper.

In Pakistan, Sri Lanka and Bangladesh, however, the axis of power shifted in a different direction. Egypt deviated from the socialist orientation. Also some other of the developing countries veered to the right. What accounts for these processes? To answer this question, it is necessary apparently to consider some of the new internal and external conditions in which the liberated countries are developing, and the dialectics of the interconnection and interaction of these conditions.

* * *

A whole number of factors complicates the development of the liberated countries.[1] A more clear-cut class differentiation than in the past may be regarded as a common feature of the present situation in them. In those which have taken the capitalist path, the gap between the bourgeoisie and the working people has widened.

At the same time, mostly external conditions have brought about certain changes in the character of the bourgeoisie of the developing countries, notably of the big and middle bourgeoisie. One can speak of the preservation and emergence, in new forms, of contradictions between the local bourgeoisie as a whole and foreign monopoly capital. However, alongside this, another tendency has become apparent, that of its rapprochement with imperialist monopolies. This tendency is intensifying, being the result of the effect of general processes in the world capitalist economy. Local capital's cooperation with multinational corporations which have sharply stepped up their activities, has become an important form of concentration and centralisation of capital in a group of the newly independent countries and, consequently, in the development of the bourgeoisie.

Suffice it to note that multinationals within the capitalist world control more than 90 per cent of all foreign investments. Today the output of the foreign branches of US corporations exceeds the cost of the United States' entire export more than four times. And that is despite the fact that a feature of recent years is the relatively increased share of the industrialised countries as a sphere of operations by multinationals, in absolute indicators their operations in the developing countries are steadily expanding.

In connection with the ecological crisis in the industrialised capitalist countries and especially after the nationalisation of a number of enterprises producing raw materials, the multinationals which supply industrial centres of the capitalist world with raw materials, fuel and agricultural products now prefer processing the primary product on the spot, close to the raw-materials sources of the developing countries. The construction in these countries of energy-consuming, material-consuming and "dirty" enterprises oriented on the market of the developed capitalist countries brings the multinational corporations considerable benefits.

Another direction of multinational corporation operations in the developing countries is the setting up of import substitutive industries. As a rule they are oriented on the local market. Still another form of activity that has become widespread in the past decade is based on international intra-branch specialisation of production. For such branches, which in point of fact have been turned into shops, cheap labour power is all important. Their operations in various countries are consolidated by the parent companies.

All these forms of the multinationals' activities in the developing countries presuppose the close cooperation of foreign capital with the local bourgeoisie and, of course, certain changes in its structure as a result of this cooperation. That such changes will increase in the future is only inevitable.

The two most widespread forms of the multinationals' activities in the developing countries are the establishment of mixed societies with the participation of national capital, or contract relations with it, but preserving the foreign character of the corporations' branches there. The multinationals always strive, of course, to have dealings with big local capital which possesses not only the necessary means but the corresponding political influence. A survey made by the *Economic Times* in India showed, for example, that of the 172 agreements on corporation with foreign firms 80 per cent fell to the share of the country's major monopoly groups. Such cooperation makes the big bourgeoisie in the developing countries a junior partner of the multinational corporations. Its common interests with foreign capital prevail over contradictions. Small wonder that the Indian Birla and Tata

monopoly groups urge expanding ties with the Western monopolies and insist on the liberalisation of investment legislation which does not allow the multinationals to extend their operations to banking, the plantations and other more profitable branches of the economy. A similar attitude to the multinational companies is to be observed also in the feudal-bourgeois upper echelons of the oil-producing countries of the Middle East.

A certain deformation is taking place also in the ranks of the middle bourgeoisie. A considerable section of it is somewhat involved in cooperation with foreign capital. It is noteworthy that many multinationals for their part are anxious to have the middle bourgeoisie of the developing countries participate in such cooperation. Twenty-five multinationals, for example, among them Borden and Dow Chemical, founded the ADELA joint company in Latin America to encourage mixed enterprises with the participation of middle and part of small national business. PICA in Asia and SIFIDA in Africa, companies set up by foreign capital, pursue similar aims.

Many representatives of the middle bourgeoisie act as middlemen of the multinationals or as their sales agents and not infrequently increase their incomes through "commissions" received for operations and deals, often illegal ones such as those at the expense of the state. This part of the bourgeoisie, which has either lost touch with the direct productive sphere, or has never participated in production, is infected with the typical neocomprador psychology. In some of the developing countries part of the officials, of the bureaucratic apparatus, aligns itself with the neocomprador bourgeoisie and not infrequently dissolves in it.

It should be noted, however, that the middle bourgeoisie of the developing countries, not counting the frankly neocomprador elements, and to a still greater extent the petty commercial-industrial bourgeoisie, continue to hold anti-imperialist sentiments. But the national character of the middle bourgeoisie, and it is most important to note this, expresses itself today mainly in a struggle not so much against the dominance of foreign capital as for better conditions of cooperation with it.

The intensification of the state's regulating role in respect to the activities of the multinational corporations, is due in some cases to the influence of middle business, especially as regards the transfer of technology so extremely important for domestic capital. By making enormous profits on their operations in the developing countries and regarding them more and more as part of their common "multinational" production process, the corporations in many instances choose to tone down the terms of their operations, to a certain limit naturally. Thus, whereas some ten years ago practically all foreign companies strove to establish complete

control over the firms set up by them, now they are not infrequently satisfied with a smaller share in mixed enterprises. However the tendency towards accomodating foreign capital to local conditions is leading to the ever increasing coincidence of its interests with the interests of the big and middle bourgeoisie of the developing countries. Such coincidence is secured at the expense of the broad masses, including the petty bourgeoisie, who are mercilessly exploited and who are shouldering the burden of the developing countries' ever deeper involvement in the world capitalist economy.

It does not follow, of course, that in the liberated countries moving along the capitalist path there are no longer local business groups which regard foreign capital as their direct competitor. However, more and more often the big and middle local bourgeoisie cooperates with foreign capital it has to compete with.

The situation in the countries following the capitalist path does not change radically as a result of the development of the state sector. In some of them it continues to bar the path to the uncontrolled introduction of foreign capital. But in others it leads sooner to certain changes in the forms of capital's activity and sometimes to what is usually called partnership, i.e., to cooperation of the nationalised or the state's newly established enterprises with the multinational corporations. The state directly participates also in mixed companies with foreign capital.

As a result of the active measures taken by a number of developing states, mainly in the 1970s, they succeded in restricting the foreign raw-materials monopolies. For example, nearly all the oil-producing foreign companies situated in the territories of the Arab states passed into their hands. However, in the capitalist-oriented countries, foreign capital has not been deterred by these, basically progressive, measures which opened the way to the redistribution of profits between the foreign companies and developing states. Partnership and contract agreements between them are becoming a regular feature. There are cases when foreign companies undertake to act on behalf of the national company being set up.

The process of class differentiation which is connected with the local bourgeoisie's tendency towards alignment with foreign monopoly capital, naturally affects the internal political situation in individual developing countries, shifting the centre of gravity of their political life to the right. In this case the relative organisational and political weakness of the proletariat in these countries and underestimation of the need for real unity of all progressive forces undoubtedly tell.

However this tendency is a temporary one. It does not at any rate determine the future of the internal political life of the

newly independent countries. The shifting of the axis of power to the right will inevitably lead to intensification of the class struggle. And the development of the working class, the expansion of its ties with the labouring peasantry and democratic intelligentsia will, more and more, make itself felt on the results of this struggle.

* * *

Along with the increased class differentiation, the character of the liberated countries' development, including the zigzags and dissimilarities, is affected by the law of the uneven development of modern capitalism. It is noteworthy that Lenin included in the spheres of operation of this law all parts of the world capitalist economy, including its "periphery", which at that time was represented by the colonies and semicolonies and today mainly by the young states.

Extremely important from the methodological point of view, especially when analysing the present situation in the liberated countries, is Lenin's proposition that the law of uneven development leaves its imprint on the relations, not only between the imperialist world, on the one hand, and the group of developing states, on the other, but on the relations between these states themselves. At the beginning of the 20th century, which was the subject of a study by Lenin, capitalism grew particularly rapidly in some of the "overseas" countries, which did not experience direct colonial oppression, or which Lenin included in the category of those colonies to which the "surplus" population moved from the home countries (such as Canada, Australia, South Africa). Lenin also noted the extremely rapid growth of capitalism in a number of countries with colonial regimes—even if one-sided and deformed, still it was a rapid growth of capitalist relations leading subsequently to the formation of a monopoly bourgeoisie in many countries.

The conditions that took shape as a result of the collapse of imperialism's colonial system on the whole favoured the growth of capitalism in the liberated countries as a rule. The operation of the law of uneven development tended to intensify differentiation within that part of the world economy where at present a number of states are showing higher growth rates than the group as a whole in the national income, the gross national per capita product, capital investments and labour productivity. Among these states are the oil-producing countries of the Near and Middle East, and some of the Latin American countries. At the other end of the pole the United Nations Organisation in 1971 listed 25 the least developed states on the basis of such criteria as the smallest

per capita income, minimal literacy level and very weak industrial sector. In 1975, another four states were included in this group bringing the total to 29.

The uneven development of the liberated countries became more sharp as a result of capitalism's structural crises which extended, particularly in the 1970s, to entire spheres of the world capitalist economy and came to be known as the raw-materials, energy, currency and ecological crises. They brought in their wake the extremely rapid, uneven growth of the national income in some of the developing countries (notably the oil-producing countries); acceleration of the industrial development of others; accumulation (or "over-accumulation" if its direct utilisation was impossible because of the insufficient capacity of the home market) of capital and its export, including to the industrialised capitalist states; structural shifts in the economy caused by the transfer to the liberated countries of ecologically "dirty", labour-consuming, energy-consuming and material-consuming industries.

Thus, between 1973 and 1976, the revenue of the oil-producing countries, belonging to OPEC, tripled from 42,200 million dollars to 132,500 million. In some OPEC countries the increase was even more spectacular. This triggered off a boom in investments. In Saudi Arabia alone, where oil exports in 1977 totalled 42 thousand million dollars, it is planned to spend 142 thousand million dollars on the five-year development plan (1976-1980), that is, a sum four times that of the total investments of the entire group of developing countries in 1970. Of course, there is every reason to assume that it will not be possible to fully realise this sum, to turn it into capital considering the shortage of skilled and, in general, hired labour force and poor development of the infrastructure. But despite that, the possibilities for Saudi Arabia forging ahead economically are on hand. A similar picture, if not a more contrasting one, considering the much greater degree of development achieved earlier, is to be observed in Iran.

The group of oil-producing countries—Saudi Arabia, Iran, Kuwait and the United Arab Emirates—has become a major exporter of capital. In 1970, Saudi Arabian foreign investments totalled 893 million dollars, in 1976, they had increased 55 times, reaching the 50,000 million mark. *Middle East Reporter* believes that by 1981 the country's foreign assets may reach 133 thousand million dollars which would ensure an annual revenue of 10 thousand million dollars.

According to the estimates of the US Treasury, OPEC countries invested more than 31 thousand million dollars in the US economy between 1972 and April 1977; 41 thousand million was invested for the same period in the economy of West European countries and about another 10 thousand million, in

international financial institutions. The export of capital from the developing countries to the industrially advanced capitalist states is a fundamentally new phenomenon, a phenomenon distinctive of the 1970s. To say nothing of the fact that it is becoming a source of rapidly growing revenues for some (true, individual) liberated states, the export of capital is also turning into a new and very effective means which imperialist circles are utilising to tie this important part of the developing world to modern capitalism's main economic centres.

Most Western researchers predict intensification of the uneven development of the newly free states in the 1980s and 1990s. According to the estimates of the American economist W. Leontief, the highest growth rates over the forecasted period are expected in the oil-producing countries where it is assumed that the manufacturing industry will grow more than two times quicker than in the African countries and nearly two times quicker than in the Asian countries not producing oil. According to the same estimates internal investments in absolute figures will increase in the oil-producing countries 104 times between 1970 and the end of the present century, whereas in the countries of Latin America—17-22 times, and in the non-oil-producing countries of Asia and Africa—6-11 times.

* * *

The essence of the law of uneven development at the stage of monopoly capitalism, which was discovered by Lenin, lies not only in the statement of the uneven growth of various industries and entire countries, and even not in the substantiation of its inevitability. Lenin has shown how this inevitability affects policy, disclosed the dialectical interconnection between uneven economic and political development. In the conditions of the existence of two opposing socio-political systems and the changed correlation of forces in favour of world socialism, the contradictions springing up between capitalist states do not necessarily, as before, end in war. However, the operation of the law of uneven development as before leads to the formation of various centres of power in the capitalist world, the competition and struggle between whom determine the daily practice of their relations. The centripetal tendency developing on the basis of the internationalisation of production and the policy of opposition to world socialism, only modifies the form in which the contradictions between the capitalist countries manifest themselves, but it cannot either prevail over internecine dissension, rivalry and strife, abolish them, or

bring to naught the inter-imperialist and, more broadly speaking, intercapitalist contradictions.

The dialectics of the interaction of uneven economic and political development manifests itself also in the group of developing countries in the form of individual centres of power—subimperialist islands in a manner of speaking. Although still falling within this group according to such of their basic criteria as the relative underdevelopment of the productive forces, the special place they occupy in the world capitalist economy; a multi-sectoral economy; the objective need to participate in the movement for the democratisation of the existing international economic order, etc., individual liberated countries are gradually switching to a new level of relations both with the industrialised capitalist states and with other developing countries.

The relations of such individual states with developed capitalist countries contain a large element of interdependence, but at the same time the inequality of the partners in the level of economic development and in ability to utilise the achievements of scientific and technological progress is generally preserved. This kind of interdependence is resulting in the more obvious involvement of these states not only in the world capitalist economy but in the system of imperialist politics as well. However, the area of divergence of interests remains, and on some issues may even widen.

By pursuing an expansionist policy in relation to the liberated countries, constituting micro-regions surrounding them, such individual states, at the same time, act as the vehicles of the policies of American and West European imperialist circles. To a large extent this is facilitated by their intensive equipment with the most up-to-date sophisticated military hardware, supplied mainly by the United States. A case in point is Saudi Arabia which in the past few years has bought arms to the sum about 5,000 million dollars in the United States.

The economic and political manoeuvres of local reaction, whose bastions the earlier mentioned subimperialist islands are becoming, represent a serious danger to the progressive regimes of the Middle East and to the national liberation forces of that region.

After the defeat in Indochina, the policy known as the "Guam Doctrine" or "Nixon Doctrine", proclaimed in 1969, was pursued with greater intensity in American imperialism's struggle against the revolutionary forces of Asia, Africa and Latin America. This doctrine relies on the support of local reaction in the struggle against the national liberation movement, the stepping-up of this struggle with US support, including military, but without direct involvement of US land forces.

Seeking to put into practice the calculations of the "Guam Doctrine", US ruling circles attach great importance to the so-called controlling of international conflicts. Still in the 1960s, the United States gave wide currency to the view that it should actively participate in controlling disputes between the developing countries with the object of preventing such disputes growing into global ones, and directing their development in such a way as to ensure the interests of US policies to the maximum.

In Asia, Africa and Latin America, conflicts and crises flare up between states, kindled by imperialism and its agents. Some of them arise in connection with the borderlines of the former colonies, others in connection with the location of raw materials and natural riches, with the problem of their transportation across the territory of neighbouring countries. Still others—with the expansionist policy of the ruling circles of individual states which are in alliance with imperialism. The conflict situations in Southern Africa are due to the domination of the racist minority in the Republic of South Africa and Rhodesia, which is trying, with the help of imperialist circles, to preserve the apartheid regime which not only holds the overwhelming majority of the population of these countries in racist slavery, but is also a threat to the security of the neighbouring African states.

Besides preventive measures designed to slow down the national liberation and revolutionary activity of the peoples, US imperialism exploits conflict situations to strike blow at the existing progressive regimes. Take the many years of US diplomatic manoeuvring in the Middle East. By supporting the expansionist course of the Israeli government and arming it with the latest military equipment, US imperialism seeks with the hands of Israel, and now of Sadat Egypt, to strike blows at the Arab national liberation movement, at the progressive Arab regimes developing under anti-imperialist slogans.

The USA not only makes use of conflicts, it provokes, incites their eruption into critical situations. Their actions against the People's Republic of Angola is a case in point.

The liberated countries are passing through a complex stage of development. Utilising the objective processes, imperialism is trying to thrust them back, to impede the revolutionisation of the peoples. But the course of social development is irreversible.

NOTE

[1] In scientific and political literature, the group of developing or liberated countries is often called the Third World. Such a definition does not adequately express the essence of the really common character of these countries which are united not only by their colonial past but by a whole number of current common objective factors: low level of economic development; a special position of

"asymmetric" dependence on the economically developed capitalist countries within the system of the world capitalist economy; the multi-structural character of the economy.

Very important in any description of the developing states as a relatively single group are common subjective and political factors, which have become particularly perceptible in recent years. They include the policy of non-alignment and the struggle for democratisation of international economic relations and for a new economic order.

All this, however, gives no grounds, without risking coming into conflict with the scientific conception of the indicated community, for calling these countries the Third World, coexisting with the world of capitalism and the world of socialism. In describing the common character of the developing states, it would seem appropriate to proceed from two basic features: the characteristic of the present world as one divided into two opposing socio-political systems, and the characteristic of the present historical epoch as an epoch of the transition from capitalism to socialism.

* * *

Literature and Art in Today's World

MIKHAIL KHRAPCHENKO

From the Editors: This essay is a passage from an article of the same title published in full in *Novyi mir* (New World), No. 9, 1977.

Of late the purpose and the destiny of contemporary art and literature have once again drawn the keen attention of writers, sociologists, philosophers and literary critics. In the heated discussions on this subject, conducted in the press in many countries, the most extreme views are expressed by militant members of the ultra-Left intelligentsia in the West. Art, they declare, has lost its former significance, its former place in the spiritual life of people. In its major forms art has in fact become useless and unnecessary and will soon die away. But in the meantime, they say, the various phenomena of contemporary art may perform a negative function.

Some Leftist writers and critics stress the idea that works of literature and art in contemporary capitalist society, which invariably express the ideology of the bourgeoisie, exert a negative influence on the public and must therefore be repudiated.

What, then, in the view of these relentless demolishers, should take the place of art? On this subject opinions vary among the Leftist theorists and "practitioners". Some call for the development of "anti-art", by which is often meant the creation of "material-object" constructions, or even some combinations of "impressive" objects; applied to literature this means the substitution of documentary-journalistic genres for "fiction". Other demolishers of art assign a foremost importance to verbal and every other kind of experimentation. Still others say that it is necessary to have a new system of signs and designations which can replace an imaginative portrayal of the world, and so on.

In their resolute rejection of the role of art, the ultra-Left positions are in some ways close to the view held by some cyberneticists and physicists, according to whom the rapid advance of science and technology has pushed art into the background, and this is especially true as regards the spiritual world of young people. The idea has been, and is often now, voiced that literature and art have no perceptible influence on the development of society. They are incapable in our time of giving their "customers" anything of importance or value as compared to science. The sharp controversy between "physicists" and "lyricists" has not in fact ceased. But now it is increasingly taking on the character of an intramural dispute.

Of course there are scientists who hold other views on the subject. According to one such view, art undoubtedly has social value. But its evolution in the 19th and 20th centuries and the important changes taking place in its "life" have depended, and continue to depend, on the development of science and technology. And this is particularly obvious in the present epoch of the scientific and technological revolution which is exerting a marked influence on society and intellectual culture throughout the world.

The only way to ensure that art will have a meaningful place in contemporary society, scientists often say, is to draw art closer to science. This alone will open new prospects and new possibilities for art. But who denies this?—some literary and art critics are quick to retort. Hasn't art already taken this path and thereby achieved no small success in recent years? Can anyone deny, these new participants in the discussion continue, that a distinctive feature of contemporary literature, theatre and cinema lies in the broad interest in the realities of life, in that they are largely based on documentary materials? Reliance on documentary materials is a sign of the times. It is becoming a leading tendency in contemporary art. The growth and consolidation of this tendency, and the gravitation towards it are the best evidence of art drawing closer to science. And this process has to do not only with the subject-matter, but also with the methods of artistic exploration.

These are but some of the many views on the destiny of art in our time; they undoubtedly are of interest both because of the points of contact and because of the points of divergence between them.

It should be said at the outset that the development of contemporary literature and art, their basic principles and the ferments at work behind their growth manifest themselves in a far more complex way than it may appear to those who want to pronounce quick and final verdicts and rigid conclusions. But however debatable or untenable these verdicts and conclusions may be, it is important that we should explain their origin and the

social significance of nihilistic theories of art and then try to define the true relationships between art and science, which constitute one of the basic problems of contemporary aesthetics.

Among the views of the radical demolishers of art one can trace two basic tendencies. Some theorists and "practitioners" reject artistic creativity because they deny the very possibility and desirability of embodying generally significant, objective artistic values in works of art. Extreme modernists have always held that artistic activity should be divorced from the problems and issues in real life. For decades the main concern of modernists has been the creation of an art of pure forms. Withdrawal from reality, and the rapid succession of various schools and trends, which repudiate both predecessors and colleagues, have led to a situation in which the object of art as a basic principle of creative work, has in fact disappeared. The aims which artists pursue have become so amorphous and vague that they are simply incapable of stimulating genuine creativity.

The rejection of art by the extreme modernists is not really something surprising. Their ideas concerning art have been taking shape over a fairly long period. Their denial of imaginative works of art is a historical and logical outcome of that gradual decay of art which can be seen already in abstractionism, pop art and many other modernist trends. This phenomenon, both in terms of the prerequisites of its existence and of its concrete forms, is undoubtedly one of the expressions of the profound crisis of bourgeois art, which has largely lost touch with the real world, with the living public, and can no longer meet the spiritual needs of people.

As for those Leftist artists and writers who are in one way or another associated with the democratic movement, their attitude to artistic creativity is strongly influenced by the isolation (which they themselves have pointed out) of literature and art of the capitalist countries from real life, and especially the life of working people. And this isolation, in their opinion, apart from everything else, shows the impotence of art of getting to the essence of contemporary social phenomena and of meeting the spiritual needs of the democratic strata of society. Here one sees how the idea arises about the futility of art, which in some ways comes close to the views of the "orthodox" modernists.

In many capitalist countries television has become a substitute for culture. But although TV-viewing is widespread, a considerable part of the population even in such a developed country as Italy does not watch TV. And it is also significant that a large number of TV viewers in Italy are illiterate. But in the capitalist countries literacy itself does not always provide a means of access to cultural values. Out of 100 TV viewers in Italy 65 never read

books, and not necessarily because they are illiterate, and 15 rarely read books; 43 never read a newspaper, 6 buy newspapers once a week, and four once in 15 or 20 days. A majority of TV viewers in Italy (51 per cent) never go to the cinema.[1] A similar situation in the cultural sphere is found in several other capitalist countries. In conditions of the general crisis of capitalism such processes and tendencies manifest themselves in still sharper forms.

But the essence of the matter cannot be reduced to a simple statement of such facts and trends, from which different conclusions can be drawn. The historically most valid conclusion is that progressive culture must be made available to the whole people, and for this it is necessary to change the social system which hinders working people from developing their creative energy and from acquiring cultural values. But other conclusions are also conceivable, such as that art and many cultural gains are to be rejected, at least until circumstances permit the rise of a better society.

Such conclusions, which undoubtedly point to a collision with contemporary bourgeois society, at the same time show that the ultra-Leftists have little understanding of the real needs and aspirations of people. At a time when the democratic strata of capitalist society regard the access to knowledge and to progressive culture as an important means for the achievement of great historical goals—social justice and change of the social structure itself, the "Left" demolishers of art hope that mankind and society may move forward through the "liberation" of working people from cultural values.

Here we see a deliberate ignoring of the experience of the socialist countries, which has convincingly shown that, first, a reconstruction of social relations ensures working people the broadest access to world cultural values, and, second, the mastering by working people of the cultural gains of their own country and of the world is a powerful stimulus to creative activity on their part, to the building of a new society.

The ignoring of the experience of real socialism is clearly seen in the fact that the ultra-"Left" conceptions of culture are narrow and do not stand up to criticism. Shutting one's eyes to important historical facts has never been a sound basis for formulating theories. Even more brilliant and at first glance convincing ideas—have collapsed because they contradict the trends and laws of historical development.

The ultra-"Left" vulgarisers are not only unwilling to recognise the complexity of the processes taking place and incapable of making a careful analysis of social phenomena and, on the basis of such an analysis, of drawing sensible and wise conclusions, but also show an irrepressible inclination towards all kinds of "extreme"

positions, an inclination which, among cultural workers, at times manifests itself in the form of anarchistic verbal bravado.

The social and ideological life of the 20th century strikingly confirms Lenin's historical perspicacity. While consistently calling for an attitude of care for the cultural heritage of the past and pointing out the necessity of mastering and reworking of all that is of value in past culture, Lenin at the same time emphasised the importance of creating a new art which can and should be available to the broadest sections of working people. A genuine revolutionary, Lenin firmly rejected the seemingly revolutionary views and programmes of the futurists and the members of the Proletarian Culture Group; he clearly saw the living ties between the cultural heritage of the past and the present and future cultural development, and the prospects of growth of art and literature under socialism.

Implementation of the Leninist principles has constituted the ideological foundation of, and the main factor in, the development of a new and dynamic art, an art that is rich in content and form, first in the Soviet Union, and later also in other socialist countries, an art which now occupies an important place in world culture. Its significance in the spiritual life of society is growing steadily. The 25th Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union has pointed out that the growth of our society in the coming years is inseparably linked to the "further raising of the role of *socialist culture and art* in the ideological and political, moral and aesthetic education of Soviet people, in shaping their intellectual needs".[2]

Time itself has shown that the destiny of literature and art in today's world is to a large extent linked to the development and consolidation of socialism, to the emancipatory struggle of the working class and broad sections of the working people in the capitalist countries, and to the national liberation movement. Advocates of the bourgeois way of life often talk about the inevitable decline of art in conditions in which intellectual and artistic values are created for the whole people; such theories and notions are unfounded and are contradicted by facts.

The history of art in the 20th century fully bears out Marx's observation that "capitalist production is hostile to certain branches of spiritual production, for example, art and poetry".[3] This observation is not at all contradicted by the fact that since Marx's time capitalism has created a whole industry for the production of art for mass consumption. What Marx had in mind is genuine art, genuine poetry, and not sham art which is often nothing but mass commercial art. The wide propagation of such art by businessmen is aimed not only at earning profits (although this is an important part of it), but at inculcating in the minds of people "conservative", reactionary ideas. The hostility of capital-

ism to certain branches of spiritual production finds expression today in the creation under capitalism of a mass commercial art which is largely alien to people's genuine aspirations and which hampers progress.

* * *

The development of contemporary literature and art—and this is generally known—is closely related to the giant strides in science and technology in our epoch.

However, the complex processes and changes taking place in literature and art in our time are not solely accounted for by the contemporary scientific and technological revolution and its influence. The cause of these processes and changes is to be sought in the movement of life itself; they are related to changes in social conditions and in people's psychology. There is no question, of course, that scientific and technical progress is an important part of contemporary reality. And thus it would be just as wrong to ignore its effect on the development of art in our time as to make it an absolute factor in this development.

One encounters fairly often a persistent exaggeration of the influence of the scientific and technological revolution on literature and art in our time. What this amounts to, in one form or another, is the idea that scientific and technical progress not only influences individual phenomena of art, but somehow transforms the very nature and essence of art, specifically in such fields as literature, painting, music and theatre.

But, as we know, the replacement of the goose quill by the steel pen point and then by the typewriter, and the extraordinary advances in book printing, did not cause a revolution in literature; the use of chemical instead of natural paints did not introduce a new "stage of development" in painting; and musical composition with the help of electronic computers has not, in most people's opinion, contributed to music in any significant way, at least up to now.

Neither have there been any real artistic-technical changes, say, in the art of musical performance. The appearance of jazz marks the birth of new forms of music rather than its technical "re-equipment". A good performance of an interesting musical work by a symphony orchestra using the traditional solo instruments—piano, violin, cello and others—continues to move listeners. Electronic musical instruments have not justified the great hopes placed in them, although in a certain way they may be said to have enriched the means of musical expression.

The opinion is often voiced that the appearance of such mass media as radio and television, which introduce large numbers of people to works of art and literary works, significantly changes the very nature of various forms of art. But what are the evidences for this? There are none. Poems and prose works, when broadcast over the radio, do not acquire new properties and become something different from what they are when read in different surroundings or recited in a hall. A ballet like the *Swan Lake* or *Spartacus*, shown on TV, does not undergo any real transformations as regards its artistic structure and aesthetic nature. The same is true of theatrical performances. No one will deny the fact that any changes introduced in a play for TV broadcasting, due to technical reasons, are of less significance than different interpretations of a play by different directors, such interpretations being the essence of living theatre.

There is no doubt that television has considerably enlarged the circle of people interested in art, but it has not altered the nature of art itself.

In the opinion of some scientists, science influences not only the content but also the style of works of art. In recent years there has been much talk about a single style of contemporary art, a style which allegedly is taking shape or even has already taken shape under the influence of contemporary science. This new style, it is said, is characterised by laconism, clarity, simplicity, and economy of detail. The defenders of such a style assert that in our turbulent, eventful epoch the reader, spectator and music lover experience an urgent need for an art that is laconic, that they have a great thirst for just such an art.

But all this is a myth. How can one speak of a yearning for laconism when film-makers put out films in 10, 15 or even 27 series, and when spectators, fascinated, watch them day after day for two weeks or even a whole month—an unbelievably long period for art appreciation. Movie-goers are obviously fond of lengthy, multi-level cinematographic narratives packed with details. (This, of course, does not exclude other "crazes".) In the field of literature, too, there is a large demand for works of epic length, for novels in two, three and more volumes.

It should be emphasised that there simply does not exist a single style of art formed under the influence of science. Ideas about its development are contradicted by the growth, the advance of socialist literature and art. Wealth of style, a great variety of styles—this is one of the most important features of art under socialism and a distinct sign of its maturity. Herein are manifested both the originality of the creative search and discoveries of individual artists, and the richness and multiformity of reality itself which is portrayed in the artists' works. Style and originality—

these are closely related concepts. Not very talented writers and artists may have a common ("single") style. But the style of a great master is always particular, individual, his own.

Any attempt to "unify" styles, including attempts made presumably according to the demands of the epoch of the scientific and technological revolution, would only impoverish art. When we speak of style we have in mind not only the writer, composer, or painter, but also the reader, music or art lover. A great artist or writer always has his own public, his own audience which is particularly attracted to his works.

The real links between contemporary art and scientific and technical progress, it seems to me, are to be seen in the fact that science, scientists and scientific problems have become an organic, inalienable part of the imaginative world created by writers and artists, and are now an important subject for art. In the past, too, scientific subjects had at times occupied a prominent place in art. Thus, not only in the period of the Enlightenment but also in the Renaissance artists were deeply interested in the scientific trends of their time. In our epoch the interaction of scientific and technical progress, on the one hand, and life and intellectual culture and art, on the other, is of an essentially different nature and rests on the basis of the new and extraordinarily great potentialities which contemporary science and technology possess owing above all to the fact that science has become a direct productive force.

In the literature and art of our time one finds many different ways of perceiving scientific and technical progress. They do not merely consist in the creation of images of scientists and engineers—creators of new technologies in whom interest is understandably great. Science and technology today influence various aspects of man's life. The development of science, and the uses to which scientific and technical achievements are put affect not only the fate of individual groups of people or individual regions of the world, but the fate of all mankind. This phenomenon is in one way or another reflected in literature and art, and, naturally, in different manners in different artists. An imaginative treatment of this phenomenon may be considered successful when it is not merely shown as it is, in its rational and logical essence, but revealed in all its depth through the spiritual world of man, through man's innermost strivings.

For art, the most important scientific problems and technical achievements remain an inert thing unless they are given life by the flame of human strivings and longings so that we feel that they are not something cold and abstract but are intimately connected with our joys and sorrows, with our fate. No imaginative treatment of phenomena in life can be separated from

our emotional attitude towards them, from our standards of moral conduct as applied to them. That is why a purely "expository" depiction of the phenomena connected with scientific and technical progress is contradictory to the very nature of art, just as a formal descriptive account of the achievements of science and technology would be.

It has often been said and written that art and science are drawing closer to each other, and it is said and written in a manner as if this is an indisputable truth. But much of what is said and written on this matter is far from being indisputable truth. Hardly anyone will assert that science, in its content and method of investigation, is moving in the direction of art. As evidence of the drawing together of art and science are usually cited the many instances where prominent scientists show a keen interest in artistic creativity and various artistic trends. These instances are often interesting and in some ways undoubtedly important. However, the fact that many scientists are art lovers does not change either the general trend of development of science or the methods of scientific investigation.

Now the impressions produced by works of art can often be highly stimulating to great scientists in their own field of work. And not only do they stimulate the researcher to intenser efforts, but can also in some ways help him find solutions to complex scientific problems. Einstein, for example, once said that Dostoyevsky gave him more than any thinker did including Gauss. But nevertheless, it should be noted that the psychology of scientific creativity and the development of science are not the same thing.

In actual life, in the actual development of culture, art and science are in continuous contact with each other and interact with each other in many ways. But these processes have not arisen only today, but have been taking place over a very long period. Undoubtedly in the mid-20th century, especially in the last ten years, they have become more intense and complex than previously. But nonetheless there is no ground to assume that the borderline between science and art has been erased or even displaced, and that science and art are rapidly drawing closer to each other and are being transformed into something in-between, a blend of the two, or at least into two varieties of one and the same thing.

And what kind of approximation to science can one detect, say, in music, opera, ballet, painting or sculpture? Even the "best" ways of making these and other forms of art "scientific" can only lead to the destruction of their essential characteristics, of their innate capacity for exerting an aesthetic influence on man. But the basic question is: is there a real social and aesthetic need to make art "scientific"? No one has yet succeeded in proving that such a

need exists. Art constantly enriches itself with its "own" new methods and devices of coping with the world and with the social and spiritual life of man. It is this that enables art to analyse and generalise new phenomena in life and to describe the movement of human strivings and feelings.

A basic premise of the theory of the drawing together of art and science (and this is not always clearly and openly stated) is as follows. Art, presumably, in comparison with science, is an inferior form of man's intellectual and spiritual activity; and works of art not only lack the force of influence on society which is possessed by science, but also contain much less significant information. The joining of art to science, therefore, can enrich art, enhance its social significance and make it much more effective. A second premise, which is related to the first, is that in the epoch of a great scientific and technological revolution it is impossible for art to stand aloof from science, and it must inevitably be influenced by science and gradually draw closer to it.

Both these premises, it seems to me, are totally unfounded. The idea that art is a "young oaf" that needs at least a college education or, even better, post-graduate training, is unconvincing. Contemporary progressive art is not something incomplete or underdeveloped; it is on the same level as the great ideas and noble aspirations of our epoch. And this is so because great artists in their creative search are in close contact with contemporary trends of thought; they have a deep desire to know, and a spiritual need to be in step with the times. And the effectiveness of art does not at all depend on the extent of its approximation to science. It depends above all on the depth and scope of the artist's revelation of the main principles of life and its tendencies and on how vividly and convincingly his perceptions and insights are bodied forth. An imaginative apprehension of the world has always been, and remains a basic property of art, a manifestation of its inexhaustible energy and power.

Those who subscribe to the theory of the drawing together of art and science, whether they wish this or not, proceed from the idea that literature and art in our time can play only a minor, an auxiliary role. Even the best literary works and works of art need to be "corrected" and "approbated" by scientific thought. A similar point of view, based on somewhat different premises, is held by some cyberneticists.

It is obvious that if art fulfils only an auxiliary function, then no matter how much it is fortified by the vitamins of science, it cannot be truly effective. Losing its originality it loses the strength which it alone possesses. A straightforward "drawing together" of art and science leads to the production of works which, without enriching scientific thought, cease to be works of art.

In socialist society literature and art are called upon to fulfil, and they do fulfil, an important social mission. With their "own" specific means they actively participate in the communist education of working people and in the moulding of the new man, and effectively promote socialist morals and principles of conduct and interpersonal relations. Education of the new man is most important on our road to communism. The influence exerted by literature and art on the spiritual world of man has no substitution.

Here it is necessary to note the tremendous role played by Soviet literature, cinematography and music just before and during the Great Patriotic War of 1941-1945 in inculcating in people courage, confidence in their own strength, heroism, and an ardent love for and loyalty to the socialist Motherland. In new conditions, in the period of mature socialism Soviet literature and art continue to flourish, the best works in this field being based on an active involvement with life and on a revelation of the new and the significant in socialist reality.

There is more ground to speak of a *cooperation* between art and science rather than their drawing together. And this is a point to be emphasised. This cooperation arises both because of certain features which they have in common and because of the different social functions which they fulfil. The famous physicist Robert Oppenheimer has said with remarkable insight that the man of science and the man of art always live at the edge of the incomprehensible; they must constantly bring into harmony the new and the already known in order to establish some order in the general chaos.[4]

That art and science possess similar features is due to the fact that the purpose of both is the acquisition of knowledge, a mastering of the world that surrounds us, an understanding of man and society, and promotion of their development and perfection. The differences between art and science are due to the fact that the essence of art cannot be reduced to cognitive principles, and that cognition or knowledge in the field of art is of a different nature from that in the field of science.

Marxist philosophy underscores the principle that the reflection of reality in man's intellectual activity, and an active cognition of reality are not the same thing. Architecture and the applied arts (including design) reflect in a certain way the real characteristics of an epoch and its spiritual aspirations, but they do not participate in an active cognition of the world. Their purpose is to enrich the life of people and their environment, embodying as they do the principles of harmony and beauty; they perform a practical function. The principles of harmony and beauty retain their important role in all forms of art where they closely interact with other ideological, structural and aesthetic principles.

In art, the focus, in the matter of coping with reality, is on man and his inner world, his activity, and his relations to the world around him. But the peculiar features of the cognitive process in the sphere of art are not limited to this. Whereas the discovery of scientific truths and laws implies an elimination of subjectivity, whereas these truths and laws have no "personal" features, artistic generalisation always bears the imprint of the creative personality of the artist.

In art, the objective and the "personal" merge into an organic whole. The artist's subjectivity (which is not to be confused with subjectivism) impels him to seek and discover the new and significant in the life of man; it does not at all prevent him from revealing the generally significant and the typical in reality, but is in fact an intrinsic part of the process of understanding and portraying them. One's emotional attitude to the object of cognition and one's ideological and aesthetic evaluation of various phenomena in life are a most important property of art. I am not speaking here of the differences between artistic generalisation and scientific truth and law, which are also significant. In the unity of its various aspects and properties, art—in constant cooperation with science—helps man to understand the world and himself in relation to the world, to discern in the complex development of reality the beautiful and the ugly, the noble and the base, and the tragic and the comic; art attracts us by its power to move us emotionally, to arouse our enthusiasm, and to inspire us to creative activity.

* * *

Many theorists see in the development of the documentary genres a movement of art (especially literature and cinematography) towards science. The question of the documentary tendency in art is interesting not only from the point of view of the relation of art to science, but also in terms of a broader question—that of the general trend of development of art in our time.

The view that the growing documentary tendency in literature is a clear expression of closer ties between science and art is ill-founded, if only because literature has fairly often in the past, too, shown a tendency towards portraying real facts and events and real personages.

It is well known, however, that today documentary literature is growing both in volume and variety, and the interest in memoirs is especially great. What accounts for this active and even intense interest in documentary literature? The reason, first of all, is

undoubtedly a desire to know the truth about the past and the present, truth without admixture of what is fictitious and unadorned with elements of legends. The complex phenomena and conflicting events of our turbulent epoch cannot be immediately depicted as they really are. For they are often surrounded by false notions, illusions, and myths. In turning to documentary literature the reader is prompted by a desire to know and understand the real nature and meaning of these complex phenomena and events.

But this is not all; the reader also wants to read unbiased accounts of the life of real personages and biographies of outstanding people. A remarkable example of this is the *Brest Fortress* by S. Smirnov, which has won national acclaim. The author's account on TV of his search for the Brest heroes and his book on the subject aroused great interest among viewers and readers who were deeply moved by the heroic episodes of the defence of the fortress, by the strenuous trials of the defenders as told by the surviving members and by the whole truth about this defence as established and narrated by Smirnov.

The reader of documentary literature is attracted both to truth based on a sober analysis of real events and to truth about heroic exploits. It is not accidental that in many documentary works on the Great Patriotic War these two trends are often combined.

Devotees to documentary literature are convinced that it alone can give the reader the whole truth about life, that it is free from the influence of ideas and conceptions which can distort truth. Such views, it should be pointed out, form one of the myths that have arisen on the tide of popularity of documentary art. Undoubtedly documentary art at its best conveys, and often effectively, truth about reality. But it definitely does not possess those "exclusive" powers of revealing truth in all its depth which are attributed to it. And what is important, documentary art is not isolated from the ideas and ideological trends of our time; it is not devoid of ideas. In fact, it is through an alliance with progressive ideas and conceptions that it acquires truth.

There is no question in my mind that documentary art, and especially documentary films, have contributed much to our spiritual life, to socialist and democratic culture. But I strongly object to the theory that documentary art, as compared to other forms of art, plays a special, primary role in the discovery and defence of truth, of the multi-faceted truth of life. This theory clearly does not correspond to reality.

Documentary art has its strong and weak sides. Its influence, and this has often been noted, is due first of all to the authenticity of what is depicted. It is also due to that emotional-moral coefficient which is united with a description of all the facts

involved, with a delineation of real people, and the "presentation" of documents. In dealing with certain phenomena in life, including painful ones, authenticity is a living source both of important information and of sufficiently powerful effects.

However, authenticity is not the "whole" truth. An authentic account of a phenomenon often contains only some aspects of the truth about that phenomenon. To arrive at truth in its fullness, it is often necessary not only to have the obvious facts but also to seek out and reveal those aspects about the present or the past which are hidden from the observer. That is why authors of documentary works readily resort to imagination and invention as "supplementary" means of establishing truth.

The importance of documentary works as "eyewitness" of what is taking place or has taken place is undoubted and often considerable. It is sometimes said that truthful art is a chronicle of an epoch. But this probably best applies to documentary works. They are a convincing record of the outlook of an age, of the outlook of generations succeeding one another. Thus it is with the most intense interest that we watch, for example, documentary films about the period of the Great October Revolution, of the five-year plans, and of the Great Patriotic War, and various phenomena of life in foreign countries; such films give us much information. This also applies to many literary works of a documentary character, but probably to a less extent.

But here again we come up against certain contradictions. As soon as our interest in an event which is the subject of a documentary work fades, the intensity of the "life" of that work falls sharply. In the case of documentary works whose chief claim to interest is the information they contain, one may observe what may be called the "single" effect. That is, the reader or viewer, once he has obtained the information contained in a work, feels no need to turn to the work again, since such works perform no other function than providing information.

The situation is different with works of documentary genres which do not merely contain information but also reveal broad areas of social reality. This feature is what makes the reader or viewer want to turn to such works again and again.

Sometimes doubts are voiced about the very possibility of making creative generalisations in documentary art. In principle such doubts are not justified. Significant works in this field are distinguished by generalisations that are imaginative and forceful. The great masters of documentary art understand the social and aesthetic importance of such generalisations. Peter Weiss, a prominent author of documentary works, said: "The strength of documentary theatre consists in the fact that from fragments of reality it creates a kind of general model of contemporary

historical processes, a model which is applicable to many different situations."[5] These words point to a distinctive feature of imaginative generalisation, namely the possibility of applying them to different situations in life.

It is one thing to attempt to draw general conclusions; it is another to embody them in works of art. Here the artist-documentarist often finds himself in a more difficult situation than the master who freely uses and transforms documentary material. For not all facts about reality, even facts that are remarkable in one sense or another, contain the necessary concentration of "weighty", significant features from which general conclusions can be drawn.

In order to make significant, imaginative generalisations based on documentary material, what is needed, apart from the author's talent (which is of course important), is the selection of such facts and events and the depiction of such real personages which in themselves possess distinct, typical features. It is through revealing these features (and this is not at all a simple or easy matter), through disclosing them with their "own" emotional and moral tonality and in a definite historical perspective that it becomes possible to formulate significant, imaginative generalisations. This path of creativity differs largely from those methods of artistic creation used by masters in the field of literature and art.

In the creation of images writers often rely on prototypes, on the characters of real people. But while in "free" imaginative narratives the prototypes are often a kind of basic building material, the real personages in a documentary work are living objects to be depicted. The difference here is essential, and not only a matter of degree; it has to do with different methods of imaginative depiction of the world, and each method yields its own results. In this connection it should be noted that such a genre of art as portrait painting has always in fact been "documentary", and this has not prevented it from achieving great successes.

Both in imaginative works of art and in documentary works there constantly exist side by side phenomena of different levels and quality. And this is only natural. Failure in artistic recreation of reality is often a result of the writer's isolation from life, a result of shallowness of writing. Shortcomings and failure in documentary works are usually a result of a "faithful copying" of reality, the raising of individual factors to the level of general, immutable truth. Documentary authenticity, which in itself implies many positive qualities, is often transformed into uninspired scribbling, which in some cases is "enriched" by the author's reflections on urgent problems and in other cases by publicistic fervour. When documentation becomes mere reportage and reportage is set against imaginative, creative writing, it is not art proper that

suffers, but primarily documentary art, which is thus unwarrantedly reduced to its more primitive forms.

When we consider the strong and weak sides of documentary art, we must be aware that usually it does not lend itself to a portrayal of the inner life of man. And this is understandable. The inner world of a person cannot be observed directly. One can judge it or discover it from the many qualities that manifest themselves in his deeds, words, gestures, in the expression of his face, and so on. The artist thoroughly analyses the discrepancy between a character's outer appearance, his deeds and words and the inner current of his thoughts and feelings. And he uses various devices, traditional and contemporary, for disclosing the psychology of a person, including soliloquy and internal monologue.

In order to achieve complete, factual authenticity and at the same time to remain within the framework of "pure" documentary genres, the writer-documentarist has no possibility of making a detailed analysis of the psychology of his characters, and he usually avoids making such an analysis. For the means by which a writer shows the logic of factual events and the means by which a writer reveals the movement of people's inner world are not the same.

Meanwhile, an analysis and an imaginative description of the psychology of contemporary man are of the greatest interest. This is so because man, with his strivings, thoughts and feelings has always been, and remains, the chief object of art. An illuminating description of a person's inner "I", of his innermost attitude to what takes place in the complex world today helps us in many ways to gain an understanding of social relations.

Psychological analysis is especially important for an understanding of the processes of the formation and development of the new man, processes which are of basic significance for the development of socialist and communist society. Such an analysis reveals both how the new outlook on life and the new motives and standards of conduct are formed, and the difficulties and contradictions that accompany the moulding of the new, socialist man.

In the last ten years or so writers in socialist countries and also progressive writers in other countries have shown a keen interest in the inner life of man. This, undoubtedly, reflects the spiritual needs of broad sections of the reading public. And how do we explain the coexistence of this tendency with the lively interest in documentary literature and art? Here we must take into account the popularity, mentioned earlier, of lengthy moral-dramatic narratives in literature and cinematography. And what about comedy and science fiction, which are equally popular? And one

can name many other genres that arouse broad enthusiasm. The whole point here is that the genuine spiritual needs of the peoples, of socialist society are diverse and are not confined to any particular form of art or tendency; and people derive satisfaction from artistic discoveries and from artistic values contained in real art, in art characterised by originality, breadth and diversity.

In assessing the development of contemporary literature and in considering its future, some critics and literary theorists are inclined to interpret its basic tendencies and principles in a way that is highly debatable. They tend to speak about a crisis of belief in imaginative activity, in invention, and about the growing role of documentary art to which, in the opinion of some of them, the future belongs. "One of the distinctive features of the literature of our time," V. Ivasheva writes, "is a heightened interest in different documentary works, which are *essentially of a same documentary type, especially reportage.* One observes a thirst for narratives that have the precision of official records, at times even for clear-cut, straightforward factual narratives."[6]

And this, Ivasheva firmly believes, has to do with both overall changes in contemporary intellectual culture and with important changes in aesthetic taste. Imaginative literature in the form which satisfied the reader of past centuries has lost its significance. Ivasheva writes: "Time sets new standards before literature: authenticity and convincingness, and attention to established facts, to documentary trustworthiness."[7] And in order to describe Ivasheva's point of view fully and in an "authentic" manner, I will quote here one more statement by that critic: "The documentary trend is apparently one of the manifestations of the powerful influence (though this influence is not always consciously felt) exerted by scientific methods of apprehending the world, and by that rational urge to verify and substantiate, which is also a result of the development of the 'exact' sciences."[8]

But documentary literature in various forms has existed long before our time, and its development in the contemporary epoch is in many ways independent of the scientific and technological revolution. What is noteworthy about Ivasheva's views of contemporary literature and of contemporary intellectual culture as a whole is not so much her references to the scientific and technological revolution (such references can be found in many articles and books) as her conceptions of the spiritual and intellectual outlook of the contemporary "consumer" of literature. The basic characteristic of this "consumer", it seems, consists of a rational urge to verify and substantiate, a demand for precise information of the external world and an interest in facts, in documentary authenticity. And that is all. But these are the strivings and interests of the businessman, and primarily in a

business setting; beyond the boundary of this setting they are also different. The interests and aspirations of people in socialist society simply cannot be summed up in what is described and stated here by Ivasheva. The harmonious development of personality as one of the goals of the building of socialism and communism presupposes breadth and depth of knowledge, a keen desire to understand what takes place in the world, creative activity, sensitivity and refinement of feeling, and genuine wealth of spiritual and aesthetic aspirations.

What real grounds do we have for saying that contemporary man, the man of socialist society, can fully satisfy his intellectual needs by reading only one type of documentary works (as Ivasheva puts it)? Why must reportage become the main component of the spiritual nourishment of people of our time? There are no sound reasons for making such conclusions; but of course one can arrive at such conclusions by pure speculation. The views of the apologists for documentary art are far removed from real life.

Television is a fairly sensitive barometer of the spiritual and aesthetic needs of broad segments of a nation's population. The programmes on Soviet TV, and the colossal number of letters received by Soviet TV workers (not to mention other evidences), testify to the diversity of intellectual and artistic needs of the Soviet man. Theoretical assumptions, views, and forecastings which are based on a simplified idea of such needs cannot stand up to scrutiny or criticism.

The view that documentary art occupies a place of foremost importance in contemporary literature and that it has a great future is shared by P. Palievsky, who, however, bases his conclusions on a different set of assumptions. According to him, what is documentary is life itself in its wholeness, directness, and motion. "A real reason for the success of the documentary," Palievsky writes, "lies in its ability to pierce through literary cliches."[9] Facts, says Palievsky, have long been knocking at the door of the house of imaginative literature. At first they made little headway. But later, in the early decades of the 20th century, the situation materially changed.

The penetration of facts and of the documentary into literature, Palievsky assures us, was facilitated by Gorky's works, thanks to which facts were finally granted equality, "won a position for itself" and "burst into the open".[10] But we are all familiar with Gorky's opinion concerning the importance of imagination in a literary work. "Fact," Gorky wrote, "is not yet the whole truth; it is only the raw material which we must first smelt and from which we must draw out the real truth of art."[11] Gorky's opinion here does not correspond at all to Palievsky's views.

According to Palievsky, documentary images derive their strength and superiority from the movement of life itself. He writes: *"In their incomplete, crude form there glimmer myriads of colours and patterns* coming to us from within life itself—a direction which in art is always preferable to the other professional direction where meaning is being attacked instead of being allowed to flow freely."[12] And while the experts on form, "the masters and virtuosos are studying one another's innovations, the documentary image opens up a third way: to provide an outlet for the talent of life itself".[13] Palievsky's position is clear enough: in "professional" art, which presumably includes the classics, there is an onslaught on meaning, whereas the opposite is true with documentary images which express the spontaneous, unorganised force of reality itself. Palievsky seems to be saying that what is especially valuable is the rawness and crude form of life-material, whereas its processing and refinement distort its essence.

Art as such, then, is not needed at all, since art has always implied above all processing and refining, the transformation in one way or another of life-material into artistic images. That is precisely why art is considered a creative activity. One may put the following question to Palievsky: if the working of life-material is unnecessary and even harmful, how do documentary images, about which he speaks with such enthusiasm, arise at all? The movement of life itself, life's talent—all that is fine, but they do not create images or formulate generalisations themselves. It is the artist who does this. Here we can see that there is something wrong with Palievsky's conception.

To hold that raw, incomplete form of life-material is of value in itself is to relegate the artist to the role primarily of a collector of unusual, striking facts, facts permeated with myriads of colours. At best he will be able to arrange them in some order. But the writer, one who is imaginative and creates new intellectual and aesthetic values, does not belong here at all. He is not really needed in a scheme of things in which the development of events is delineated only as a result of the victorious onslaught of facts and of the documentary.

Documentary art has its place in the artistic culture of our time, but it is not the determining factor in the development of contemporary literature and art, especially socialist literature and art. A profound and unbiased investigation of the most diverse phenomena and facts of reality and the attempt to understand them, and an effective generalisation of these phenomena and facts in which a foremost role is played by creative imagination, retain their usefulness and significance in our epoch. This does not mean that the nature of the link between art and life does not change. As man and society change, as art itself undergoes

evolution, so the interaction of art and life is transformed. But they—the links and the interaction—do not become narrower or weaker, but richer and more extensive.

Born at the dawn of civilisation true art has for thousand of years been a good and sincere friend of man; it expresses his innermost thoughts and feelings, his aspirations and achievements. At its best it fulfilled, and fulfils, the great mission of proclaiming humanistic ideas and principles. The Great October Socialist Revolution and the new social system have opened broad prospects for the development of literature and art in our epoch. The building of socialist society, the emancipation of the creative forces of the people and the creation of conditions for the allround development of the potentialities and capabilities of the new man are the rich soil out of which the wonderful fruit of socialist art grows. Socialist literature and art do not stand aloof from the development of art in other countries and accept all that is progressive and valuable that has been created by great artists from other countries. At the same time, the literature and art of the socialist countries are in many ways a guide to progressive writers and artists of various schools; they arouse the greatest interest among readers, playgoers, movie and TV viewers, and music lovers in many countries. International recognition of socialist art and literature is directly related to the fact that they tell the truth about the new society and the new relations between people in that society. Their strength lies in an effective embodiment of the ideas of social justice and humanism, of peace and friendship among peoples, and of social progress.

NOTES

[1] A. V. Kukarkin, *Bourgeois Society and Culture*, Moscow, 1970, p. 285 (in Russian).

[2] *Documents and Resolutions. 25th Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union*, Moscow, 1976, p. 110.

[3] K. Marx, *Capital*, Vol. IV, Part I, Moscow, p. 285.

[4] Robert Jungk, *Brighter Than a Thousand Suns*, New York, 1958.

[5] *Inostrannaya literatura*, No. 7, 1968, pp. 213-214.

[6] V. Ivasheva, "Signs of the New Epoch", *Voprosy literatury*, No. 9, 1975, p. 79 (Italics mine—*M. Kh.*)

[7] Ibid., p. 85.

[8] Ibidem.

[9] P. V. Palievsky, "The Role of the Documentary in the Organisation of the Artistic Whole", *Problems of Artistic Form of Socialist Realism*, in two volumes, Moscow, 1971, Vol. I, p. 404 (in Russian).

[10] Ibid., p. 394.

[11] *Russian Writers on Writing*, Vol. 4, Leningrad, 1956, p. 67 (in Russian).

[12] P. V. Palievsky, op. cit., p. 404.

[13] Ibid., p. 405.

The Development of the Theory of the Efficiency of Capital Investment

TIGRAN KHACHATUROV

The balanced development of the national economy is a major advantage of socialism, stemming from the socialist ownership of the means of production. It makes it possible to directly manage the concentration and distribution of all resources and means at all economic levels between the production and non-production spheres, between branches, enterprises and various non-production institutions with a view to developing social production most effectively, satisfying the population's requirements and raising living standards.

The Soviet Union has extensive experience in planning the gross product and national income, accumulation and consumption and the distribution of assets and investments between branches, districts and enterprises. An important aim of planning production and distribution is to attain the maximum effect in economic development by choosing the most efficient ways and achieving proportionality between the various sections of the national economy at all levels. This is being done with the help of a dynamic model of the national economy, which has been worked out theoretically and which takes into account, among other things, the fact that the structure of the national economy and the growth rates of its component parts largely depend on the deadline to achieve the maximum effect: either by the end of a long-term period, or in a sum total for all years of this period, or in the nearest possible period.

The models of this type have their own characteristic features at each stage of the construction of socialist society and its

progress towards communism, depending on the attained level of economic development. Thus, the GOELRO Plan, which V. I. Lenin termed a second Party programme, proceeded from the idea of electrification as the basis of the country's economic development and the restoration and upsurge of industry, transport and agriculture.

The models of economic development for the first prewar five-year plans were evolved proceeding from the ideas of industrialisation, creation of large-scale socialist agriculture and a social and technical reconstruction of the economy. A characteristic feature of these plans (and to a certain extent, of subsequent plans) was a certain restriction of the increase in current consumption for the sake of enhancing accumulation and production capacities to achieve, in the future, the maximum effect in conformity with the principal goal of socialist production. This orientation was modified in accordance with the growth of the country's economic potential.

As the economic development level of the country attained greater heights, more possibilities emerged for increasing current consumption, accelerating the rates of improvement in people's living standards and bringing them up to present-day requirements. In postwar years the models of economic development for each five-year period contained new essential features determined by the overall upsurge of the economy and culture, technical progress, fuller utilisation of resources, intensification of production and a rise in living standards.

The quantitative targets of the plan, its feasibility and fulfilment and the proportionality and interdependence of its components are determined in accordance with the ideas laid at the basis of the model of the national economy. Planning is not only a science but also the art of its implementation. In drawing up a plan it is necessary to know the resources—labour, production and natural—and establish the projected growth rate of labour productivity. It is also necessary to correctly outline the prospects of scientific and technological progress, substantiate the growth of the production apparatus and its future capacity and take into account the possibilities of the development of production, proceeding from natural resources and their rational utilisation. A plan should be drawn up in such a way that the available resources would be used to obtain the maximum economic effect, in other words, an optimum would be reached. The CPSU Programme states that to attain maximum result with minimum outlays is the immutable law of economic construction. This is what determines the necessary optimum level which is required of a plan and which is expressed in the efficiency indicator.

A theoretical model of the national economy with its ideas, optimal for the given stage is based on the Marxist-Leninist theory of socialist reproduction. A specific feature of socialist reproduction as a process of the constant renewal of the work force, means of production and production relations is a planned growth of its efficiency, improvement of proportions between expenditures and output based on an increase in the knowledge and skill of workers and technical progress. In accordance with this feature of socialist reproduction, the theory of efficiency as a component part of the theory of reproduction is of great significance. In turn, the theory of the efficiency of capital investment holds an important place in the theory of the efficiency of socialist reproduction.

* * *

Both the theory of the efficiency of capital investment and the theory of socialist reproduction embracing it were a result of the development of the political economy of socialism and the implementation of aims formulated by the founders of Marxism-Leninism. Creation of the material base of socialism, industrialisation of the country, socialist transformation of agriculture and liquidation of the relations of exploitation required a definite orientation of economic development. At the same time, as Lenin emphasised, Marxists never maintained that they could chart beforehand the road to socialism in all its concrete forms. It was practical experience that showed the best ways.

To achieve the aims set by the people it was necessary to create and commission an economic mechanism of planning. The GOELRO Plan included and implemented, for the first time, one of the basic methods of socialist planning—the balance method—to which Lenin attributed an especially great importance. This method was adopted for all subsequent plans as the basic method of planning, reflecting Lenin's idea about cognised proportionality as the essence of balanced planning. The balance method began to be employed not only in formulating plans but also in analysing plan fulfilment. The first such balance was evolved by the Central Statistical Board of the USSR on the data for the 1923-1924 economic year. The outlines and methods of the balance of the national economy and interbranch balance were later borrowed from the USSR by economists in the USA, France and other countries for use in statistics and forecasting (for example, input-output schemes and national accounts).

But it was impossible to confine oneself to the balance method and accounts in kind, no matter how innovatory they had been. From the very first steps of socialist planning, along with balances and other economic calculations, value accounts began to acquire

an ever greater significance for choosing the most efficient ways of economic development. Operating in the epoch of the formation and improvement of socialist production relations in a cost-accounting, value form, they reflected the expenditures of live and past social labour; in this lies their essence and meaning under socialism. Value accounts are an important instrument of national economic planning. Accounting in the form of optimum labour expenditures will remain indispensable in the future, too, after the transition to the higher stage of communism.

Lenin emphasised time and again the importance of economic efficiency for national economic planning. In March 1920, in his letter to G. Krzhizhanovsky about the GOELRO Plan Lenin proposed to calculate the efficiency of the development of the electrified national economy, as against another possible variant, comparing both variants by their costs and in kind. He believed it was necessary to compare the expenditures on the restoration of transport, with electrification and without it, both in the form of cost—in rubles—and in kind—in the expenditure of fuel and workdays. Similar calculations were suggested for industry and agriculture. An analysis of the comparative efficiency of electrification was made in substantiating all projects under the GOELRO Plan, with the use of the percentage method, proceeding from the annual 6 per cent. Thus, the ideas of recoupment and comparative efficiency, being used at present in choosing variants, go back to the Lenin GOELRO Plan.

Efficiency in socialist economy has characteristic features which radically distinguish it from efficiency under capitalism, and among them, an approach to its definition from the angle of the interests of the entire national economy—no matter whether it concerns an individual enterprise, a branch, a region, or the economy as a whole. This means, above all, that all economic measures should be considered not separately, but in their mutual connection, as the component parts of a planned system—a model of the national economy worked out for a given period.

The national-economic approach demands that, apart from direct effect in a given link, the total indirect effect (or damage) must be calculated in the related links, in the entire national economy, and for that matter, in the social, political and other spheres, as well. This effect should be calculated not only for a given moment, but for a long-term period, with due account of the fact that the basic effect is obtained not immediately but over a period of time. It should be emphasised that the effect must not be interpreted in a narrow sense—only as a cost evaluation of the measure under review. Although this evaluation is important, one should not confine oneself to it, due to the necessity of a national economic approach for a long-term period as well.

Realisation of the ideas laid at the basis of a model of the national economy may not lead to economy of expenditures but nevertheless prove effective in political and other considerations, which cannot duly be expressed in value terms. Besides, the higher the development level of production and the economic potential of a socialist country, the more possibilities there are for carrying out expensive measures in the social sphere: education, culture, child upbringing, environmental protection, improvement of services and recreation facilities, and the raising of living standards—measures which ensure greater economic returns.

These initial premises of the theory of socialist efficiency have been evolved and applied gradually. The first works on the questions of the socialist efficiency of capital investment appeared in Soviet literature back in the 1920s, at a time when the national economy was being restored, the first annual national economic plans elaborated and the first five-year plan discussed and drawn up.

Economic journals carried articles recommending, as efficiency indicators, labour productivity and saving expenditures, output-asset ratio, the national income in relation to the assets, as well as the sum-total of various indicators: labour productivity, production cost, quality of production, capital-output ratio, etc.

Such a variety of views was largely due to the fact that in those years the generally accepted theory of the political economy of socialism had not yet taken shape and various opinions were being expressed about the laws of socialist economic development, planning and value categories.

This situation in theory hampered a correct solution of the practical questions of capital construction. Many construction projects had not sufficient economic substantiation. The orientation to implementing capital construction in accordance with the general line evolved by the Communist Party and duly appreciated by the people, aimed at the country's industrialisation, the socialist transformation of agriculture, technical progress and an increase in the number of skilled personnel, were not always complemented by economic calculations for each measure. Great importance was attached to reaching maximum growth rates and the speediest attainment of the goals set. Academician S. Strumilin wrote in 1928 that in view of an insufficient elaboration of efficiency problems the compilers of the First Five-Year Plan relied in their estimates on the technical appraisal of experts in production.

In the conditions of the steadily growing capital construction and the priority development of the material and technical base of socialism, the requirement in economic substantiation of projects in blueprint and under construction, primarily such large

and costly ones as electric power stations, iron-and-steel plants and railways, became more and more pressing for Soviet society. It was necessary to solve the questions about choice of variants to implement major economic tasks envisaged by the evolved models of economic growth, in accordance with the five-year and annual plans: whether to construct hydro- or thermal electric power stations, where to erect iron-and-steel plants and build railways.

Accordingly, suggestions were made on coordinating capital investments and current outlays and preparing economic substantiations of such large-scale projects at the time as the Dnieper Hydropower Station, the Magnitogorsk Metallurgical Plant and the entire Ural-Kuznetsk complex, the Turkestan-Siberian Railway and the Moscow-Donbas Railway. Books were published giving good grounds for construction projects, including works on the economic problems of power engineering by Academician I. Alexandrov, Academician B. Vedeneyev, Professor S. Kukel-Krayevsky, works on prospecting and designing of railways by Professor M. Protodyakonov, Professor K. Oppengeim, and other scientists who turned to the problems of the economic efficiency of designing.

The questions of the use of value indicators of efficiency in comparing and choosing variants were further minutely worked out after the Second World War. These investigations were promoted by the elaboration of the general theoretical problems of the political economy of socialism already in prewar years and after the war, when a discussion was held on political economy, the economic laws of socialism were formulated and works summing up these problems appeared. At the same time, the volume of capital construction grew with every passing year, new and ever greater projects were implemented and the new eastern and northern regions and the non-Russian republics were developed. The comparing of variants with the use of efficiency standard and percentage quota began to be used in designing. However, this standard was not established, and the comparison of variants was used to show with what efficiency standard the given variant proved acceptable. At that time, works on economic comparison of variants according to the value indicators—capital investment and current expenditures—began to appear.

An All-Union technico-scientific conference on questions of efficiency of capital investment held in 1958[1] was an important stage in the development of theory and practice in this field. The main paper at the conference was delivered by the author of this article on the basis of the many-year elaboration of this problem. The paper underlay the conference recommendations which formed the core of the "Model Methods of Determining the

Efficiency of Capital Investment and New Technology" (1960). The ideas evolved boiled down to the following.

The economic efficiency of capital investment is based on a national economic plan determining the volume and orientation of capital construction, its aims, and proportionality of development. The model of the national economy to be created should be optimal. From it follow the indices of absolute and comparative efficiency.

In determining the economic efficiency of capital investment, principal importance attaches to absolute (or general) efficiency as the ratio of the national income (D) to the fixed and circulating assets (F), or the ratio of the increment of the national income (ΔD) to the capital investment (K) responsible for that increment: $\frac{D}{F}$, or $\frac{\Delta D}{K}$. The first of these indicators is the *efficiency of assets*; it is the most generalising one, reflecting as it does the efficiency of the entire national economy for a given period. However, it does not provide the possibility of determining the efficiency of various kinds of assets created earlier and more recently, with a higher or lower technical level for branches, districts and enterprises. To determine the absolute efficiency of assets it is important to have data not only for the national economy as a whole, but for all of its sectors. It is especially necessary to determine the efficiency of assets conformably to the time of their commissioning and actual utilisation, which requires more advanced statistics.

Of great importance for increasing the absolute *efficiency of capital investment* are the deadline of construction and the deadline of the development of the production capacity commissioned, which requires, among other things, the stocktaking of the time lag between capital investment and the result obtained. Inasmuch as one should not relate capital investment for the current year to the increment of the national income for the same year, for the investment can yield results only in subsequent years, a time lag should be introduced (by approximate calculations, it is one to three years). Planning of the indicator of the absolute efficiency of assets and capital investment is now envisaged by the Methodological Instructions for the elaboration of the state plans of the USSR economic development. In turn, absolute efficiency itself is an important indicator of planning.

The fixed assets, capital investment and national income are calculated in prices. Therefore, it is essential to ensure the comparability of prices, especially taking into account the possibility of their considerable changes in the course of time.

A question arises how to determine the standard of efficiency. The standard of absolute efficiency, set in a plan, depends on the sum total of factors that influence the economic progress of a

branch, sub-branch, district or an enterprise. Among them are: an anticipated rise in labour productivity determined by technical progress, decrease in the material and power outlays, growth in the volume of production, etc. In view of this, these standards should be differentiated by branches and be higher where economic indices are better. In the sections of the national economy where the national income is not calculated, the profit-assets ratio, or the growth rate of profit-capital investment (with time lag) ratio are recommended to be considered as the absolute efficiency standard. Considering that the national income consists of the aggregate product created by live labour and is used for both accumulation and consumption, it would be more appropriate, as far as the composition of the national income is concerned, to calculate absolute efficiency at an enterprise by relating the sum-total of profit and wages to the assets or capital investment. But proceeding from cost accounting practice, profit serves as the numerator.

The standard of absolute efficiency for branches is calculated as suggested by the Economic Research Institute under the USSR State Planning Committee, with a view to covering all payments: payments for assets, rent, interest on credit, etc. Such an approach makes it possible to fix, with enough precision, the size of the standard for branches. Simultaneously, it is believed that it can also be used for comparing variants.

However, under the Model Methods, the standard of comparative efficiency is set specially, proceeding from t, that is, the pay-off time which is characterised by the ratio of the difference between capital investments $(K_1—K_2)$ to the saving in current costs $(C_2—C_1)$ according to the variants:

$$\frac{K_1—K_2}{C_2—C_1}=t.$$

The standard of comparative efficiency E, which is inverse to the pay-off time, depends on the volume of accumulation and requirements in investment. The greater the accumulation, the lower the standard, and vice versa, the greater the requirement in investment, the higher the standard.

Sometimes the view is put forward that if the standard of efficiency is set at a higher level, efficiency itself will increase. But this is an erroneous view. It should be borne in mind that the level of new industrial equipment, the use of which is economically expedient, depends on the efficiency standard. If the standard of comparative efficiency were equal to nil, it would be profitable tc use the most up-to-date machinery, no matter how expensive, provided it could ensure a decrease in current costs. If the standard of comparative efficiency is raised to an indefinitely high

level, the introduction of most ordinary machinery would become ineffective and manual labour would be most profitable.

The Model Methods recommend fixing the standards of comparative efficiency, geared to a uniform level, but with due account of the specificity of branches and with corresponding economic calculations. The standard of comparative efficiency is assumed to be 0.1 in agriculture and land reclamation and grow up to 0.2 in the light and food industries. The standard for reducing investments made at different times to a definite period is assumed to be less than the standard of efficiency for comparing variants (in the now operating Model Methods they are 0.08 and 0.12, respectively). Differentiation for branches is not envisaged for the standard of reducing.

A question arises: should the reducing of variants to a definite moment apply only to capital investments made at different times or should it also include current expenditures in their dynamics? If capital investment is reduced, then long-term current expenditures should be inevitably reduced, too, otherwise it may turn out that in time the capital investment-current expenditure ratio will decrease, and with a sufficiently distant deadline the comparison of variants will boil down to comparing them only by the size of their current expenditures.

The principles of determining the efficiency of capital investment, according to the Model Methods of 1960, are reflected in other rules, too: determination of the efficiency of new technology and equipment, mechanisation and automation of industrial production (1962); the efficiency of scientific research (1964). In the latter Model Methods a new element is classification of scientific research and the singling out of its sphere (applied) by which economic effect can be ascertained. B. Weinstein proposed to introduce the concept of "economic potential" (i.e., a 100 per cent implementation of the research work) and of its part which depends on the concrete scope of implementation. Approximate coefficients were also suggested of distributing the results by stages: research—designing—experiment—production.

After the publication of the second edition of the Model Methods (1969) several dozen branch rules evolved, itemising and regulating the use of the Model Methods in each branch. Both editions of the Model Methods and the instructions they contain are widely implemented in designing and planning. Not a single plan or project is now released without profound substantiation in accordance with the Model Methods. New concepts and terms have come into being and are now widely utilised in economic theory and practice: absolute efficiency, comparative efficiency, pay-off period, reduced expenditures, investments made at different times, output-asset ratio. The principles underlying the

Model Methods are being used in the methodological rules of comparing the efficiency of capital investment of the CMEA member countries, as well as in methodological rules elaborated in individual socialist countries. Thus, it is not only the theory of efficiency that has been created as a new section of economic science, but also the practical significance of this theory that has been demonstrated on the basis of broad implementation.

In 1977, a book was published, *Methods of Ascertaining the Economic Efficiency of New Technology and Equipment, Inventions and Innovations Employed in the National Economy.* It should be borne in mind that the efficiency of new technology and equipment is, in essence, the efficiency of capital investment in that sphere. Its efficiency level depends on the growth of labour productivity, decrease in labour-intensiveness, and material and capital intensity of production resulting from introduction of new machines and equipment. The methods of this book are based on the main premises of the Model Methods, and, notably, on the difference in efficiency coefficients used for comparing variants and reducing expenditures made at different time to one period. The level of standards is somewhat higher than that envisaged in the Model Methods (15 per cent for comparing variants and 10 per cent for reducing expenditures made at different time, which, generally speaking, is within the bounds set in the standard rules for branches).

Among other proposals developing and complementing the theory of the efficiency of capital investment, two, at least, should be singled out: on distribution of the effect obtained from a production complex, between its individual elements and on the growth of integral economic effect.

The first proposal comes down to the following: the effect obtained from a production complex as a whole, a hydropower unit, for example, consisting of a hydropower electric station, locks, irrigation and other installations, should be distributed between the individual elements of the complex, proportionately to the cost of the fixed assets of each element. It is assumed that investment efficiency is the same for each element and it is only the absolute value of effect that differs proportionately to expenditures. Another possible means of calculation is a separate assessment of the effect obtained from each element of the complex (that is, separately from electric power, transport through the locks, irrigation, fisheries), and relating this effect to capital investment in each element of the complex. In the latter approach, the idea of the connection of individual elements in their entire whole becomes somewhat less pronounced. But this calculation can be more precise and complete.

The second proposal can be reduced to assessing the efficiency of the performance of large-scale projects—for example, territorial-production complexes being built over several years—by the sum of the effects obtained not for just one year but for an entire optimisation period. Calculation of integral effect is of especially great significance in cases when consecutive capital investments are being made in different branches of a complex. Here, a question arises as to the duration of optimisation period for determining integral economic effect, bearing in mind that with each consecutive investment, the economic range of its operation is expanding, and the investment made before the end of the set period may not have enough time to realise its effect (for example, in calculating integral effect for a decade it will be evaluated completely only during a shorter period: seven or eight years); in this case calculation period should be prolonged.

In view of this an adjustment period is introduced, which follows optimisation period, and during which the effect of the capital investment of the past years manifests itself. Evidently, there is a possibility of establishing a connection between the method of calculation of integral effect and the method of calculation of annual effect, provided the size of investment and effect for the entire optimisation period will be divided by the number of years in the period for obtaining average annual effect (with due account of investments made at different time). It should also be remembered that with expanding the time range of planning, the indices of prices, cost and capital investment become increasingly indeterminate.

* * *

Elaboration of the theory of the efficiency of capital investments and the improvement of its implementation will, undoubtedly, continue to advance. A lot remains to be done in order to solve a number of important questions connected, first and foremost, with the socio-economic aspect of the efficiency of capital investment or the efficiency of investment in the non-production sphere.

Take, for instance, capital investment in housing and the social services. At the time the Model Methods were being elaborated it was assumed that in planning the commissioning of industrial projects, account should have been taken of the efficiency of capital investment only in the sphere of production. Practice has demonstrated, however, that provision of an enterprise with the work force, especially in a new development area, largely depends on the necessary housing and other facilities (nurseries and kindergartens, schools, shops, transport, recreation centres, etc.).

If these conditions are not observed there will be considerable labour turnover, a drop in labour productivity and, consequently, a low efficiency of capital investment in production. The example of the construction and operation of the Volzhsky Auto Works in the town of Togliatti, as well as other enterprises, has shown that both production and non-production capital investments should be made in a complex; in this case they can yield a maximum effect.

The effect of some types of investment in the non-production sphere can be measured. Investment in education is aimed at training skilled personnel and thereby raising labour productivity. To quantitatively determine the efficiency of this rise it is necessary to carry out special investigations at enterprises. The effect in public health service can be seen in a drop in the incidence of illnesses and in the number of out-of-work days, which also directly influences labour productivity. The effect obtained from improvement in the functioning of municipal transport results in a decrease in transport fatigue and the time required for travelling to and from work. Better supply facilities and daily services (laundry, repair of household utensils, etc.) reduce the time spent in queues, going from shop to shop, etc., and increases leisure time, which has a positive effect on labour productivity as well.

Special mention should be made of the efficiency of expenditures on the protection of the environment. They are already great and tend to grow. They envisage measures for a comprehensive utilisation of raw materials and curtailment of requirements in them, greater use of wastes, recycling of water, lubricants and other materials, prevention of air and water pollution and their purification, and preservation of landscape. The economic effect obtained from these measures can be realised in the nearest future, for example, in a comprehensive utilisation of raw materials and the use of wastes, or in the future saving of natural resources for the subsequent development of production. A social effect can also be obtained either now—in a drop in the incidence of illness, in greater opportunities for rest and recreation, or in the future, for example, in improved conditions for the growth of the population and its well-being.

Investigations in the field of the efficiency of capital investment have a solid organisational foundation. In the Institute of Economics of the USSR Academy of Sciences, there is a department studying the reproduction of fixed assets and the efficiency of capital investment, which has published several monographs on the subject. A great deal of work in this field is being carried on at the Economic Research Institute under the USSR State Planning Committee, the Institute of the Economy of Construction under the USSR State Committee on Construction,

as well as in a number of institutes of economics at the republican Academies of Sciences—in Kiev, Minsk, Yerevan, Alma Ata, and elsewhere. Since 1957, a Scientific Council on the problem "Economic Efficiency of Fixed Assets, Capital Investment and New Technology and Equipment" has been functioning at the USSR Academy of Sciences. Research work is being coordinated at branch and republican institutes and other bodies; scientific papers on the most timely problems of the efficiency of capital investment are being discussed, and collections published—*Methods and Practice of Determining the Economic Efficiency of Capital Investment and New Technology and Equipment.*

The results obtained in this important sphere provide a reliable foundation for the further elaboration of the theory of the efficiency of capital investments and for the development of the practice of their utilisation.

NOTE

[1] *The Economic Efficiency of Capital Investment and New Technology*, ed. by T. S. Khachaturov, Moscow, 1959 (in Russian).

History of the Pra-Slavs

BORIS RYBAKOV

In the study of Slavic history the problem of the origin of the Slavs, or more specifically, the question of their original homeland has tended to push into the background the question of their historical destinies.

Research into Slavic tribal history usually starts with the 1st millennium A.D.—more often than not, with accounts left by Tacitus and Pliny and with detailed surveys of the Slavic colonisation of the Balkan Peninsula in the 6th century A. D. However, nothing is said about the Slavs' history during the many thousands of years B.C.

It is necessary to make a historical study of the Slavs' ancestors who lived at the end of the Bronze Age and in the Scytho-Lusatian epoch.

An interesting periodisation of early Slavic history has been suggested by B. Gornung (1963).

1. Linguistic ancestors of the Slavs (5th-3rd millennia B.C.—Neolithic and Aeneolithic).

2. Proto-Slavs (end of the 3rd millennium—beginning of the 2nd millennium B.C.).

3. Pra-Slavs (from the 15th century B.C.).

According to linguists, the end of the pra-Slavic epoch, with the isolation of the Western and Eastern Slavs and the emergence of the Southern Slavs, goes back to the beginning of the first century A.D., or the early centuries of the 1st millennium A.D. (V. Georgiyev), or even the middle period of the 1st millennium A.D. (F. Filin). In other words, the pra-Slavic stage of Slavic history lasted almost 2,000 years.

The Slavs' linguistic ancestors emerged in the northern part of the Indo-European area. In the Neolithic and Aeneolithic periods the agricultural tribes dispersed north of the European mountain barrier, which was formed by the Rudnik, Sudetic, Tatra, Beskid and Carpathian mountains, coming into contact with the local hunting tribes, which had been living here since the Mesolithic period.

In the proto-Slavic stage stock-breeding developed rapidly; there were armed clashes over herds and pastures and pastoral migrations in horse-drawn wagons.

Archaeologists attach particular importance to what they call the Globular Amphorae culture, which developed at the end of the 3rd millennium B.C. This culture spread over the vast area between the Elbe and the Dnieper and further outwards. In this epoch the tribes which lived north of the Sudetes and the Carpathians engaged in what may be termed their first historical *activity*. The results were a developing social structure of the tribes, emergence of the warriors, consolidation of different ethnic elements and expansion of linguistic contacts. W. Hensel (1973) assumed that a large part of the territory of the Globular Amphorae culture was occupied by the proto-Balts (Pomerania and Prussia), the proto-Germans (Oder-Elbe) and the pra-Slavs (Oder-Vistula-Dnieper). The tribes continued to migrate through the northern half of Europe in what is known as the corded ware time.

The two-millennium *pra-Slavic* period, following which the Slavs began to form individual branches, was not purely evolutionary. Twice during this period centuries of calm, uneventful and somewhat isolated existence of the Slavic tribes were followed by centuries of turbulent upsurge and the development of extensive external relations.

Pra-Slavic history can be divided into five stages. So far, they are traceable only archaeologically, and they are subject to subsequent linguistic verification.

1st stage (15th-12th centuries B.C.). The Trzciniec-Komarovo culture.

2nd stage (11th-3rd centuries B.C.). It can provisionally be termed Lusatian-Scythian and subdivided into two phases, with the 7th century B.C. as the boundary.

3rd stage (2nd century B.C.-2nd century A.D.). The Przeworsk-Zarubintsy culture. At this stage the Slavs, known as Venedi, were first described by classical authors.

4th stage (2nd-4th centuries A.D.). The Chernyakhovo-late-Przeworsk culture.

5th stage (5th-7th centuries A.D.). Prague-type culture.

This was followed by the formation of the Southern, Eastern

and Western Slavs on a new and much larger territory. Pra-Slavic unity had come to an end.

Up to now none of the researchers has indicated one important point. On three occasions during this period the archaeological areas of the pra-Slavic cultures of different stages became nearly identical: the area of the Trzciniec-Komarovo culture (first stage) was the same as that of the Przeworsk-Zarubintsy culture (third stage), and both largely overlapped the area of the Prague-Korchak culture of the 6th century A.D. (fifth stage). In each of these stages the same type of archaeological culture extended from the Dnieper to the Oder, north of the European mountain barrier (Carpathians—Sudetes—Harz). The archaeological uniformity of this territory lasted about 900 years. This uniformity marked the beginning of the pra-Slavic period in the Bronze Age, following the turbulent migrations of warlike horse-riding herdsmen, and it also marked the end of the pra-Slavic period in the middle of the 1st millennium A.D., before and during the Balkan campaigns and the start of the great Slavic migration over Central and Eastern Europe.

This thrice-exhibited geographic uniformity of archaeological findings spread (as the sum total of three chronological stretches) over half of the whole pra-Slavic period, justifies the use of "pra-Slavic area" rather than the original homeland of the Slavs (although it is close to this concept). It would be an error to assume that this pra-Slavic area despite its centuries-long stability, was, figuratively, encircled by an impenetrable wall protecting the pra-Slavic world. The contact zone must have been highly changeable. There might have been ethnic diffusion from the direction of both the pra-Slavs and their neighbours.

The tracing of processes of one-way and two-way diffusion calls for a more careful archaeological analysis.

Twice during the pra-Slavic period the patriarchal set-up was disrupted, the historical process developed more rapidly and culture attained such heights that Slavic society appeared to have reached the threshold of statehood.

This first happened at the 2nd stage (mainly during its second phase). The pra-Slavic world then lost its unity: its Western half was drawn into the Lusatian tribal league, which was larger than the Western half of the Slavdom. The Eastern half of the pra-Slavic world during the second phase of the 2nd stage became part of the sphere of the Scythian culture and came under the political influence of Scythia. The pra-Slavic farmers (known as Scythian tillers) exported grain to Greece—a factor that had an effect on their social development.

The two halves of the pra-Slavic world, which found themselves in two different spheres of influence, began to lead different lives.

Archaeologically, the Lusatian and Scythian or Scythoid cultures were of different patterns.

The pra-Slavic area as an integral historical whole disappeared from the researchers' view and, so to speak, ceased to exist. Scythian archaeological culture and the Lusatian culture continued to develop separately. However, people of that time were distinctly aware of the kinship of the whole pra-Slavic world, which stretched from Scythia to the Baltic Sea: in the geographic conception of Pytheas, which dates to the 4th century B.C., "Scythia" extended as far as the Ocean, i.e., the Baltic Sea, neighbouring on "Celtica" in the west. According to archaeologists, in the Bronze Age the Celtic area reached the Elbe (W. Hensel, 1973).

Traditions of unity can also be seen in the subsequent archaeological history of Europe: as soon as the Scythian power disappeared and the Lusatian Celto-Slavo-Illyrian relationships disintegrated, i.e., as soon as both centrifugal forces ceased to operate, the pra-Slavic world regained its unity (3rd stage) which lasted over a period of 300 years.

From Tacitus, Pliny and Ptolemy—contemporaries of the Przeworsk and Zarubintsy culture—we learn the common ethnic name of this archaeologically discovered unity—Venedi. (The ethnicon Venedi within an all-European framework is a subject in itself.)

The second departure from unity (or the impression of such departure) goes back to the 2nd-4th centuries A.D.—the happy centuries for Slavdom which the author of *The Lay of Igor's Host* called the Trajan centuries (4th stage).

The cohesion of the Western and Eastern halves of the pra-Slavic (Venedian) world was not lost here: the late-Przeworsk culture was closely related to the Chernyakhovo culture. There are no grounds for counterposing one to the other. On the contrary, one should identify the many features of their affinity and kinship. However, the concept of the "Chernyakhovo culture" is vague, and, broadly speaking, Chernyakhovo and "Chernyakhoid" archaeological findings could belong to either the pra-Slavs (the wooded steppe along the middle Dnieper) or the Goths (the steppes of northern Black Sea shore). The Slavic wooded steppes and Gothic northern Black Sea shore were divided by a fairly wide, sparsely populated band of Sarmatian steppes. The Chernyakhovo archaeological culture went far beyond the bounds of the Slavic area. This, however, did not signify an expansion of the Slavic area itself. Culture and ethnos are not always identical.

The uniformity and high level of the Chernyakhovo culture (in the broad sense) were conditioned by the rapid extending of the Roman borders under Trajan towards the area populated by the pra-Slavs and the Goths. These new neighbours maintained mutually advantageous trade and for three centuries, Rome exercised a potent influence on its trade partners. The re-emergence of an external grain market for Slavic agricultural produce again led to a rise in cultural standards, as at the 2nd stage. The archaeological map of the 2nd-4th centuries shows that the Eastern half of the pra-Slavic world occupied a much larger area than the pra-Slavic settlements proper, which consisted of only the northern part of the vast Chernyakhovo area. This territorial scope of the uniform culture was due to historical rather than ethnic factors.

The fall of Rome, the peopling of the steppes by the Turkomans and the withdrawal of the Goths from the northern Black Sea shore to Western Europe created a new historical situation, which caused the Slavic population to reassemble and form a single uniform mass.

By the 6th century A.D. there emerged on the territory which was the area of the Trzciniec-Komarovo culture in the Bronze Age and of the Przeworsk-Zarubintsy culture in the early Roman times, a relatively primitive new culture which was first called the Prague culture and later, following the excavations of I. Rusanova in the Ukraine, the Prague-Korchak culture.

The great migration of the 6th-7th centuries A.D. began at the stable ancient boundaries of the pra-Slavic area, whose last historical marks were Prague-type ware settlements.

Interesting observations can be made on the form of tribal names within the pra-Slavic area and outside it: within it all names of major tribal leagues (known from the Nestorian and other mediaeval written sources) have endings "*ane*" or "*yane*" (Polyane, Vislyane, Mazovshane, Drevlyane, etc.), while the names of the tribal leagues outside the pra-Slavic area, i.e., those that appeared as a result of extensive Slavic migration, have endings "*ichi*" or "*itsy*" (Krivichi, Radimichi, Neletichi, Lyutichi, Tivertsy, etc.). In the colonisation zone the archaic form which ended in "*ane*" is sometimes met with, but on autochtonous pra-Slavic territory the new form "*ichi*", peculiar to the migrants, is not found either in the Western or Eastern half of the pra-Slavic area.

All this suggests that the very organisms of the tribal leagues had originated within the pra-Slavic area long before the colonisation process began. Otherwise it would be difficult to explain the abrupt change in the form of tribal names. The question of how long ago the formation of tribal leagues started

will become clear from an analysis of the 2nd stage of pra-Slavic history.

Continued observations of ethnica lead to another major conclusion: the terms "Slavs" and "Slovene" never occurred within the pra-Slavic area. They occurred exclusively within the colonisation zone, outside the autochtonous pra-Slavic area: Slovaks, Sloventsy, Slovintsy, Sloviny (on the Baltic Sea), Novgorodian Slovene, etc.

Sixth-century authors said that in their epoch the name Venedi was replaced by other names, especially Slaviny and Antae.

The tribes within the pra-Slavic area bore the name "Veneti" or "Venedi", in which the root basis "*-vene*" and the plurality suffix "*-ti*" can be identified. The Finns and Estonians to this day call the Russians "*vänä*"—a name which goes back to the ancient name cited by Tacitus.

It is logical to assume (and suggest for linguistic judgement) that Slovene—a 6th-century coinage that appeared during intensified and large-scale colonisation—designated only migrants from the Vene land. The migrant-colonists were *s'ly*, i.e., people who came from some definite land, representatives of this land. Slo-vene could stand for people who originated from the land of Vene-ti, left their old territory, which was part of the pra-Slavic area and strove to retain their ancient collective name.

The geographical location of the ethnicon Slovene (in its different variants) *along the periphery* of the mediaeval Slavic world permits the following definition:

a) *within the ancient pra-Slavic* area the tribal leagues bore names like Polyane while the collective name was Veneti or Venedi (perhaps Antae in the east?).

b) *outside the pra-Slavic* area, in the zone of later colonisation (from the 5th-6th centuries), the tribal leagues were called according to the new principle (like Radimichi or Vyatichi). The common name for all Venedi colonists in different places was Slo-vene, which stood for the people from the Venedi land.

The aforementioned classification of five stages of pra-Slavic historical life, although incomplete, points to a marked complexity and non-uniformity of development over a prolonged pra-Slavic period outlined by linguists. Now that an extensive and extremely interesting dictionary of the pra-Slavic language (O. Trubachev) is being published, it would be worthwhile making a stratigraphic study of the pra-Slavic language with a view to disclosing its different chronological strata which were due to different ethnic contacts, different degrees of social development, the evolution of the economic basis of its speakers and their ideological concepts.

Archaeology can offer linguists a wealth of data for such stratification.

The historical written data yield scanty material for a study of the pra-Slavic period proper: the detailed descriptions left by Procopius and Jordanes were made at the very beginning of this period while the brief references to the 1st-2nd century Venedi, unfortunately have to do with one of the quiet periods in pra-Slavic life and cannot without substantial amendments be carried over into either the previous or the subsequent period, which were marked by an incomparably higher level and a faster rate of development.

* * *

The 1st stage of the pra-Slavic period is justly associated with the Trzciniec-Komarovo culture of the 15th-12th centuries B.C. Geographically, it stretched over a distance of 1,300 kilometres spanning the middle Dnieper (from the Seim River) and the middle Oder in a 300-400 kilometre band. Individual settlements of the Trzciniec culture indicate an area north of Kaliningrad. The southern boundary of these closely related cultures was formed by the Central European mountain barrier. Around the mountain passes (*Moravskaya Brama* and *Russkaya Brama*) relations were established with the more developed southern cultures. The Komarovo culture appears to be a slightly more developed variant of the Trzciniec, culture owing to its proximity to *Russkaya Brama* in the Carpathians and perhaps to the rich rock salt deposits which attracted the surrounding tribes (Galich—a "salt" town).

The pra-Slavs practised stock-breeding and agriculture, sowing wheat, barley, millet and flax. The majority of their tools (sickles, axes, chisels) were made of stone, but they were familiar with bronze casting. Their settlements consisted of 15-20 houses and sheds, some of the houses being 6 by 12 metres in size. The pra-Slavs had various burial rites: they buried their dead under barrow mounds and flat cemeteries, employing both inhumation and cremation and putting the ashes into urns. The inhumed bodies were buried contracted. Burials of pairs and collective tombs have been discovered. The Komarovo zone has tombs faced with stone slabs.

Small shrines with traces of the agrarian cult are found in the sites. Archaeologists have discovered beautiful symbolically patterned ritual vessels, the decorations being traceable to Aeneolithic themes. Against the general background of early primitivism and equality it is possible to discern signs of the emergence of a nobility such as gold ornaments, ritual gift weapons in tombs, collective burials of warriors with their dead chief (W. Hensel, 1973).

The division of the Trzciniec culture into an Eastern and a Western half is largely conventional. Several local groups (perhaps tribal leagues?) can be singled out within the area. In the 13th century B.C. the Western half of the Trzciniec culture formed part of the area of the broader Lusatian culture. On the Eastern half there formed in the 12th century B.C. the Belogrudovka farming culture, which was particularly widely represented along the middle Dnieper.

The least studied stage, from the standpoint of pra-Slavic history as a whole, and perhaps the most important in this sense is the second, Lusatio-Scythian stage. The Lusatian culture in the Western half of the pra-Slavic world is adequately dealt with in Czech (J. Filip) and Polish (W. Hensel, K. Jaźdźewski *et al.*) publications. The Eastern half has been viewed only as part of Scythia populated by the Scythians. That Scythia's northern areas had some bearing on Slavic ethnogeny has been acknowledged, following L. Niederle, by many researchers but there are still many unanswered questions, such as the matter of geography, concerning this subject. One reason is that archaeologists who study the origin and early history of the Slavs seldom go into the Scythian epoch, assuming that it is a field of research of little interest to them. Another reason is that Soviet Scythologists (B. Grakov, M. Artamonov and A. Terenozhkin), failing thus far to resolve the question of the exact location of the Herodotean tribes, have compiled mutually exclusive maps of the peoples of Scythia.

A clarification of the history of the Eastern half of the pra-Slavic world, which is hidden from us by the Scythian veil, as it were, calls for a synthesis of data furnished by different branches of scholarship. It is necessary to consider the historical data pertaining to the Cimmerians and Scythians and make a careful analysis of the abundant archaeological material. It is desirable to use toponymical data. It is also essential to clarify the Scythian stratum in the pra-Slavic language. The picture of the pra-Slavic world would be incomplete without the retrospective study of such a vital source as the archaic stratum of Slavic folklore. This source itself does not give historically authentic dates, but some epic situations can be regarded as the actual events in the nation's history—the first act of iron forging, the first combats with the nomads, the construction of the first fortifications, etc.

After clarification of the historic path traversed by the Eastern half of the pra-Slavic world over several centuries in the 2nd stage, it will be necessary to make a comparative study of the two halves, but such a study is outside the scope of the present article.

The Bronze Age Trzciniec culture, the epoch of calm and relatively unremarkable development of the early pra-Slavs who populated the expanse between the Dnieper and the Oder (1st stage), was replaced in the Eastern half of the Trzciniec pra-Slavic area by the Belogrudovka (12th-10th centuries B.C.) and Chyorny Les (10th-7th centuries B.C.) cultures. They constitute the first pre-Scythian phase of the 2nd stage of pra-Slavic history. Both farming cultures were located in the wooded steppes on the right side of the middle Dnieper. The Belogrudovka culture occupied the vast area that lay west of the Dnieper, extending as far as the Goryn River (J. Dąbrowski, 1972). The Chyorny Les culture covered practically the same area but in the Chyorny Les time (approximately the 8th century B.C.) its tribes also advanced in a narrow wedge to the Dnieper's left, eastern side. This distinction of the geographic configuration of the pre-Scythian Chyorny Les culture permits one to draw two conclusions that are of importance for a discussion of the present subject. First, Soviet researchers (V. Ilyinskaya, G. Kovpanenko) have noted an identical location of tribes in the Scythian period, when the Dnieper's right side was occupied by kindred cultures of one type and its left side by kindred cultures of another type, while a narrow wedge of right-side colonisation formed something like an enclave of the right-side cultures on the *left* bank along the Vorskla River, continuing the Chyorny Les tradition. Second, and this is most important, O. Trubachev has made a study of the archaic Slavic hydronymy of the middle Dnieper: his map exactly coincides with the archaeological map of the Chyorny Les culture, even mirroring its geographic distinctiveness—the left-side colonisation wedge—something not found at any other time. All this clearly shows that the Chyorny Les culture was that of the pra-Slavs while the farming tribes of the northwestern wooded steppe fringe of Scythia were direct heirs to the Chyorny Les tribes and, consequently, also pra-Slavs. Iranian hydronymy, which was left behind by the Scythian tribes (Gelons), lay *east* of pra-Slavic enveloping the Vorskla pra-Slavic "enclave".

Archaeologically, in the 500 years of the existence of the Belogrudovka and Chyorny Les cultures, the right-side section of the pra-Slavic world was marked by farming settlements and small round fortifications with homes along the inner circle. Agriculture, in all probability, was of the ploughing type combined with stock-breeding.

The burial rites included cremation alongside inhumation. In the southern part of the region the dead were buried under barrow mounds. As in Nestorian times, the cremation rests were put into small urns.

A special type of grounds covered with ash (*zolniki*) around settlements made its appearance in Belogrudovka times—this was apparently part of the agrarian cult (sheaf-burning?).

The Chyorny Les period was marked by the appearance of a local, Dnieper centre of bronze metallurgy. By the end of the Chyorny Les period the local smiths had mastered iron forging and the manufacture of iron and steel weapons.

In the 10th century B.C. the pra-Slavic farmers fell victim to the first (archaeologically established) invasion of the steppe Cimmerian tribes. A large number of settlements along the middle Dnieper was burned down by these steppe invaders (A. Terenozhkin). The next two centuries saw the construction of fortresses with wooden-and-earthen fortifications stretching along the southern fringe of the wooded steppe (notably in the Tyasmin River basin). One of the fortresses of this period—the Chyorny Les fortress—was five kilometres in circumference.

In the same period the forging of iron weapons was practised. Judging by archaeological data, the middle Dnieper farmers succeeded in preserving their independence. The chain of fortresses which skirted the pra-Slavic area's southeastern fringe survived and was even extended in Scythian times.

All these events, which abruptly changed the previous slow pace of life of the pra-Slavic tribes, were reflected in the primitive myths and epic legends, fragments of which have come down to our time and have been registered by folklorists. Some of the ancient pra-Slavic notions are reflected in fairy tales, and they have at times attracted the attention of researchers. Some of the fragments have survived without a definite folkloric form, being known only in the form of retold ancient legends. These half-forgotten ancient epics remained no more than a kind of ethnographic archives, despite two thought-provoking publications on the theme by V. Gippius (1929) and V. Petrov (1930).

The hero of these legends is the magician-smith Kuzmo-Demyan (or two smiths, Kuzmo and Demyan). Sometimes he seems to be the first man on earth. The magician-smiths forged the first plough, which weighed 300 poods, in 40 years.

This hero-smith lived at a time when the people were terrified by a dragon, which always came flying from the direction of the sea (i.e., from the south), and sometimes it was even called "Black Sea" dragon. The smiths built a forge which was made impregnable to the dragon and which provided a shelter for those who escaped from this fierce monster. They included maidens, once a king's daughter, and even a warrior on horseback. In some versions this warrior had already fought with the dragon elsewhere. The forge was protected by an iron door. The magician-smith (or smiths) caught the dragon by the tongue *with*

red-hot tongs, harnessed the monster to a huge plough and forced him to make furrows as far as the Dnieper or even as far as the sea. Sometimes the dragon held with the smith's tongs was forced to make a furrow around the town.

Of special interest is the geography of recordings concerning Kuzmo-Demyan—the lands of Kiev, Poltava, Cherkassy, Priluki, Zolotonosha, Zvenigorod, Zlatopol and Belaya Tserkov. It is easy to see that the legends about Kuzmo-Demyan (on some occasions replaced by Boris and Gleb) existed only in the ancient region of the Chyorny Les culture—the area of archaic Slavic hydronymy. The appearance in the legends of smiths, which in the Middle Ages were associated with Kuzma and Demyan, of early forged items and of the first powerful fortifications, indicates that the legends originated in the early part of the 1st millennium B.C.

In the 7th century B.C. the Black Sea steppes and part of the left-side wooded steppe were occupied by the Iranian tribes of the Scythians and the kindred Gelons. The Scythian culture spread to a number of neighbouring pra-Slavic and Baltic tribes. One can note the complete coincidence between the Herodotean "Scythian square" (700 by 700 kilometres) and the area of the spread in the 6th-4th centuries B.C. of an archaeological "Scythian triad"—weapons, harness and the animal style.

Herodotus described the Scythians as typical pastoral nomads who lived in the woodless steppes, had no ploughland or towns and moved about the steppe in wagons with felt tilts.

Alongside this, Herodotus described in detail the agricultural population of the right-side of the Dnieper and partially the left-side of the Dnieper, along the Vorskla-Panticapa (i.e., the already familiar descendants of the Chyorny Les tribes) as a separate people, calling them Borysthenites—the Dnieper people (the Borysthenes was then the name of the Dnieper) and noting that they referred to themselves as Scoloti. Following the Greek tradition of calling them Scythians, Herodotus, in mentioning them, always added words to indicate their occupation—hence "farmer" Scythians or "ploughmen" Scythians as distinguished from the nomadic Scythians.

The land of the agricultural Scythians-Borysthenites lay on the middle Dnieper 400 kilometres up from the Vorskla, reaching Kiev. On the archaeological map (A. Terenozhkin, V. Ilyinskaya, 1971) the land of Borysthenites exactly corresponds to the Kiev archaeological group. Archaeologically, there is a great similarity between this group and both the neighbouring Podolian groups, which lived along the Southern Bug and the Dniester and the Vorskla group, which occupied the left side of the Dnieper. As a whole, the land of the farmer Scoloti (which, according to Herodotus, were divided into four tribes) occupied the wooded

steppe that spread almost from the Carpathians to Poltava, coinciding with a large part of the pra-Slavic area's Eastern half. The Scoloti's neighbours were the Neuri, with whom the Milograd culture of the Scythian epoch should be identified (O. Melnikovskaya, 1967). The Neuri also lived in the pra-Slavic area—in its northeastern corner.

A historico-cultural analysis of the archaeological data of the Scythian epoch indicates that within the pra-Slavic area there were several different cultures: the Western half (several local archaeological groups) lived in the sphere of the Lusatian culture; the wooded steppe of the Eastern half lay within the sphere of the Scythian culture. The tribes of the forest zone, which lived on the lower Pripet, the Berezina and the Sozh, remained outside the horseman culture area.

The tribes of the upper Dniester (the former zone of the Komarovo culture and later the zone of the Noa culture and partly of the Vysotskoye culture) were isolated from other tribes. Was this south, Carpathian wedge of pra-Slavic territory not the site of formation of the tribal league of Croatians—semi-Slavs and semi-Dacians?

With the Dnieper Scoloti, who lived along the Borysthenes and the Hypanis (the Bug), one observes a considerable cultural upsurge, and the emergence of horsemen warriors who were equipped in the Scythian style, and "kings" whose burials were crowned by huge barrow mounds like the royal Scythian ones, with rich arms and paraphernalia.

Unlike the real Scythians, the Borysthenite Scythians had a large number of fortified towns. Judging by their location on the southern fringe of the wooded steppe, these fortresses were designed to protect the agricultural land of the Scoloti from raids by the steppe Scythians.

Agriculture became so important that its products were the chief export items. Herodotus wrote about grain export from the Dnieper area. The archaeological map of Greek imports in Eastern Europe (N. Onaiko) shows that undoubtedly the main area that imported Greek luxury items was the middle Dnieper, along which stretched archaeological monuments of the Scoloti.

Socio-economically, the middle Dnieper pra-Slavs apparently stood between primitivism and statehood. Possibly, that was the stage of military democracy with a rich commercial-military nobility.

Their northern neighbours—the Neuri—led a more primitive life, and their clan-tribal system flourished. The contrast between the primitivism of the forest Milograd Neuri and the wooded steppe Scoloti reminds one of Nestor's story about the wise Polyane (geographically coincidental with the Kiev group) and the

Drevlyane and Radimichi, forest people who were counterposed to them and whose territory overlapped that of the Milograd culture.

Despite the considerable differences in the cultural level and outlook of the Polyane and Radimichi, they were both Slavs. The same applies to the Scoloti (Scythians) and the Neuri.

The writings of Herodotus, who must have visited the land of the "ploughmen" Scythians on the Dnieper's right side, enable us to broaden the concepts of pra-Slavic history that are constructed on the basis of archaeological data.

About the Neuri Herodotus not only recorded a curious ethnographic detail concerning their annual change into wolves (New Year mummers?); he also told about an attack on the Neuri by some "dragons", which, according to some researchers, were the northern Baltic tribes. In the mid-6th century B.C. the Neuri advanced northeastwards to the Budini land (the Yukhnovo culture). This territorial advance of the Milograd Neuri is well documented archaeologically (O. Melnikovskaya, 1967). In their new seat, already east of the Dnieper, the Neuri intensively fortified their settlements. The Scoloti farmers, in all probability, formed part of the Scythian political association and, alongside all Scythians, took part in the Scytho-Persian war of 512 against Darius Hystaspis: they are not mentioned among the tribes which rejected an alliance with the Scythians.

Without question, the pra-Slavs were greatly influenced by the Scythian culture, which left its mark on both the forms of their military life and their language (V. Abayev). The same period brought the replacement of Indo-European "*deiwas*" by Iranian "*bog*" (V. Georgiyev).

Scythian features, which were particularly noticeable among the pra-Slavic nobility, led the Greeks to name the Slavs "Scythians", although Herodotus noted their autonym Scoloti.

Herodotus recorded the ethnogenic legends of both the Scythian nomads (Heracles' sons Scyth, Agathirs and Gelon) and the Scoloti. The Scoloti's progenitor was Targitai, who lived not more than a thousand years before Darius, i.e., approximately in the epoch of the birth of the Belogrudovka farming culture. When Targitai's three sons were grown up, sacred golden objects—a plough with a yoke, an axe and a bowl—fell from the sky. The one who could gain possession of the sacred gold would become king of the tribes which worshipped the sacred plough. This fate befell Targitai's youngest son Kolaksai, who later divided his kingdom between his own three sons. The sacred gold was kept in the largest kingdom and annual festivities were held in honour of the sacred objects. Kolaksai's name was familiar to the Greeks almost 200 years before Herodotus (Alkmen, 7th century B.C.).

In Ukrainian folklore legends about a giant plough forged by divine smiths are interwoven with the story of a great victory over the dragon (the Cimmerians?) and of the construction of majestic fortifications—an indication of the Chyorny Les epoch, with its anti-nomad struggle and construction of the first large fortification.

In East Slavic folklore (fairy tales) there are preserved many stories about a contest between three brothers which was invariably won by the youngest brother (as in the legend told by Herodotus), who gained possession of the "kingdom of gold". Of great interest is the semantic coincidence of the name of the victorious king's son (the youngest brother). Specialists in Iranian studies interpret the name "Kolaksai" as "the sun-king". In Russian fairy tales he is frequently referred to as *Svetovik* (from *svet* meaning "light"), *Zorevik* (from *zarya* meaning "dawn") or *Svetozar* (from *svet* and *zarya*). An intermediate link is furnished by Russian mediaeval glosses, recorded by a contemporary of Nestor, about the first king Svarog-Hephaestus, under whom tongs fell from the sky and people began to forge weapons, and about his son the Sun-Dazhbog, under whom people began to pay tribute to the king.

All these asynchronous data echo the pra-Slavic epic legends about tribal chiefs, the first smiths, the sacred plough and Kolaksai-Sun-*Svetovik (Svyatovit?)*, the mythical possessor of the "kingdom of gold".

A glance at the whole pra-Slavic world of the Lusatian-Scythian epoch will show that at this stage (notably in its second phase—the 7th-3rd centuries B.C.) both of its two halves underwent a substantial upsurge; all institutions of the highest and last stage of the clan-tribal system developed fully. In both halves warriors emerged as a special social group, many fortresses were built, iron and steel weapons and armour were made and important quantitative distinctions of property ownership and burial honours appeared. Possibly, in those days the pra-Slavic area slightly expanded owing to the migration of the Neuri northeastwards and of the Baltic Pomorye's population eastwards and predominantly westwards of the mouth of the Vistula.

The relations between the pra-Slavs of the Lusatian and Scythian zones have not been sufficiently studied. The impact of the Lusatian culture can be definitely traced as far as the Western Bug. But individual items of Lusatian origin have been discovered on the upper Dniester and the Dnieper, in the land of the Boristhenites (J. Dąbrowski, 1972).

The reverse movement is also familiar: Scythian arrows, weapons and ornaments have been found on the territory of the Lusatian tribes as far as the Oder and the Danube bend. With complete identity of the material culture of the Scythians proper

(nomads) and the wooded steppe pra-Slavs who were called Scythians conventionally (farmers), it is difficult to say to which half of the Scythian world these Scythian objects belonged, the subject calls for further investigation. One thing is obvious: everyday life objects from the Western half reached the extreme eastern pra-Slavic boundary while objects from the Eastern half reached the western boundary.

Those profound social changes in pra-Slavic society which, as archaeologists have demonstrated, occurred in the 1st millennium B.C., lead us back to the important problem of ancient tribal leagues. The fact that within the pra-Slavic area there matured a stable (until the 12th century A.D.) an all-Slavic form of referring to major tribal leagues, which was, however, different from the names of the later epoch of migration, means that scholars must consider the local archaeological groups of the Scytho-Lusatian epoch in comparison with the Slavic tribal leagues which are known by name and location.

Such a comparison shows that all major local groups which have been identified by archaeologists (J. Kostrzewski, W. Chmielewski, K. Jaźdźewski, 1965; A. Terenozhkin, V. Ilyinskaya, 1972) exactly correspond to the tribal leagues with archaic-type names. The Nestorian list is enough to put tribal classification on a unified basis:

Polyane (lechity).....	central group of the Lusatian culture
Pomeranians	east-Pomeranian group of the Lusatian culture
Lusatians	Byalovitsky group of the Lusatian culture
Mazovshane	Mazovian group of the Lusatian culture
Polyane	Kiev and Vorskla groups of the Scythian culture
Buzhane.....	Podolian group of the Scythian culture
Drevlyane	Volhynian group of the Scythian culture
Volhynyane	Vysotskoye group of the Scythian culture

With regard to the major tribal leagues not named by Nestor, mention should be made of the complete correspondence between the mid-Silesian Lusatian group and the Slezyane and between the Little Polish group and the Vislyane.

The initial formation of large stable tribal leagues is an indicator of the high level of development of pra-Slavic society.

By the time early written evidence appeared about the Venedi (Tacitus, Pliny) many Slavic tribes had already had a 1,500-year history, which included more significant stages than the stage at which they were found by the Roman writers.

The joint efforts of archaeologists and linguists can give us a broader picture of the history of the pra-Slavs.

How the Unconscious Is Manifested in Creativity

FILIPP BASSIN,
ALEXANDER PRANGISHVILI,
APOLLON SHEROZIA

The question of the unconscious, namely, the existence of and the part played by unreportable mental activity, the forms in which the brain operates in connection with the complex processing of information, creative efforts, the regulation of behaviour (i.e., the forms that the subject is unaware of) has become focal in psychology over the past few decades. This problem has also attracted attention beyond the confines of psychology proper: on the one hand, in the humanities, such as literary studies, pedagogy, the theory of heuristics, linguistics, the theory of arts, and the like, and on the other, in medicine, neurophysiology, and cybernetics. Research into this problem has come up against considerable difficulties in view of the insufficiency of knowledge as how it is to be analysed, the complexity of the very category of the unconscious, and the lack of guidelines for its methodological and philosophical understanding. At the same time, disregard of the fundamental fact that unreportable mental activity is an important component of the brain's active functioning in the broad sense has had a negative effect on the further development of a number of areas of scientific knowledge, especially the theory of intellectual creativity.

We would like to set forth some considerations bearing upon the present-day understanding of the part played by unreportable mental activity in the creation and perception of works of art.

* * *

The link between the activity of the unconscious, on the one hand, and artistic perception and creativity, on the other hand, has produced a vast literature, since research into such questions has been conducted simultaneously from the viewpoint, not only of various schools and trends but also of different disciplines and sciences. It may well be said that the psychology of art has proved to be an area of knowledge which, despite the undeveloped state of the idea of the unconscious, and despite the lack of any generally accepted ideas on the functioning of the unconscious and its role in man's spiritual life has for decades striven with amazing insistence to get that idea included in its system of categories and to get it utilised as a fundamental explanatory concept.

In some instances, this appeal to the unconscious has acquired so extreme a form that it has been declared a factor determining the entire emergence of an artistic image, one that alone makes possible an understanding of the laws and psychological mechanisms on whose basis that image is created. It has even been said that if the artist is able to verbalise the intention in his work, define its meaning, and consequently, become aware of it, he thereby either destroys that work (if awareness of the intention has appeared during the moulding of the image) or else (if the work has been completed) ascertains its false and "pseudo-artistic" nature.[1]

Starting with the relatively vague opinions expressed by 19th century decadents and modernists, opinions revealing considerable restraint as compared with certain present-day trends; continuing with raucous statements made at the turn of the century by Benedetto Croce regarding the "irrationality", in principle, of art, and ending with the wide range of manifestations, during the past few decades, of what has been called "anti-art" (such as the "theatre of the absurd", pop art, or "escapism")—this trend towards this blending of ideas on the mechanisms, norms and aims of artistic creativity, and the area of the subconscious, far from disappearing, is becoming ever more outspoken and repulsive with the further deepening of the spiritual crisis in Western aesthetics.

Thus, the problem of the unconscious proved involved in the arguments on the nature of art long before it established a rigorous psychological theory; this has been by far not the only paradox in the fate of that problem. In the opinion of Maeterlinck, Bergson and, later, H. Read and many other authors, that problem has even proved focal in such arguments.[2] That was why when psychoanalysis, with its built-in striving to stress the role of the unconscious in the most varied forms of mental activity, also linked artistic creativity with the area of

unconscious motivations, inhibited emotions and the like, it was not thereby taking any kind of radically new step. It was rather providing fresh arguments to bolster an interpretation of the nature of art which had emerged previously and had for a long time developed independently of it.

One cannot reply in single terms to the question whether the growing closeness between the idea of the unconscious and the concepts of artistic creativity has been productive.

On the one hand, one cannot deny that such growing closeness has emphasised the specific participation of unreported forms of mental activity in the creation of artistic images. This is not merely an actual fact but one of such importance that, were we to disregard it, we would totally preclude any possibility of revealing both the psychological processes leading up to the creation of an artistic image, and the psychologically understood functional structure of that image. On the other hand, the penetration into aesthetic theories of the idea of the unconscious far ahead of any evolution of a scientific interpretation of that idea has hampered the proper utilisation of the latter, which it has converted from an efficacious means for the further advancement of the psychology of art, which it potentially is, into a formidable obstacle to any genuine advance of thought into the departments of knowledge affected by such penetration. It is worth while to dwell on both of these contradictory theses.

When the question arises of the participation of the unconscious in the *genesis* of a work of art, we are dealing with a problem which has been sufficiently studied in the psychological sense. When the need arises for the artist to choose certain lines, figures, chromatic or sound tonalities, the structure of melodies or harmonies, the specific features in the composition of the most varied ensembles perceived by the eye or the ear, or even the nature of the literary subjects or people depicted, he bases himself in the main on something that is not *formalised*, that is to say, on psychological processes and motivations which he has not "verbalised" and of which he is hardly or not at all aware of. This is so frequent and evident a phenomenon that it could not have escaped notice. The dependence of a work of art on the unconscious has, in that sense, never given rise to any doubt. It pertains to facts that are considered empirically unquestionable and have long come in for research of every kind, ranging from such that are grounded in cybernetics and biophysics to psychoanalytical and philosophical studies. Concepts pertaining to this area have acquired particular depth with the growing interest shown in recent years in questions of the part played by intuition in the various forms of mental activity and adaptation.[3] Below we shall consider some writings pertaining to this trend.

Far more complex and difficult of understanding is the problem of the specific features in the *functional structure* of an artistic image as determined by the link between that image, in its emergence, and the activity of the unconscious. The problem can also be worded as follows: what is it, in an artistic image, which shows it has been born of the unconscious? What features of an artistic image can be better understood if we take account of the unconscious origins of an image? Does there exist a definite link between the engendering of an artistic image by unreportable mental activity, and the influence exerted by that image on the viewer or reader?

The idea that, like any scientific concept, an artistic image is a special form of a *generalised reflection of reality* is a basic proposition in Marxist-Leninist aesthetics. However, that "special" form itself is a generalisation which speaks a *specific language* that is not equivalent to the rational and formalised language of science. Much time was needed to achieve a proper understanding of what comprises the qualitative and indelible specificity of the language of aesthetic images.

An artistic image is a reflection of reality; at the same time, or rather, for that very reason, "Art does not require the recognition of its works as *reality*".[4] This remark by Lenin completely removes any possibility of backsliding into vulgarisations that ignore the specific nature of the language of aesthetics, its conventionality, its incompatibility, in principle, with the idea of any copyist psychological immediacy of a reflection, its hidden implication which, on the artistic plane, often comprises its genuine essence. In her monograph, E. Leontieva cites typical examples of how the hidden complexity of the language of aesthetic images is sensed, as well as its qualitative distinction from the language of rational cognition as met in the writings of some writers abroad; they expressed the idea that the truths of art are indirect, and that at the same time what is untrue in the direct sense can be highly truthful in the aesthetic sense, in the same way as what is ugly in the immediate sense may become beautiful in art.[5] The same thought is to be met in Balzac: "The truth of nature cannot be, and never will be, the truth of art."[6]

An artistic image is a special form of a generalised reflection of the world, namely, a reflection expressed in a language distinct from that of rational knowledge. Since an image is a reflection, it can and must be appraised in respect of its "truthfulness"; since, on the other hand, its language is distinct from that of science, its truthfulness should be understood in a way different from the truth of a scientific concept or a law of science.

It should not, of course, be thought that scholars who emphasise the specific nature of the language of art have

restricted themselves to that statement without attempting to reveal in greater depth what that specificity consists in. However, a deeper understanding of that specificity and a transfer of its analysis from the plane, at best, of a refined *phenomenology* of aesthetics to the plane of a genuine *psychology* of aesthetics *is impossible, in principle, without one's addressing oneself to the difficult problem of the unconscious*, without due account of the specific law-governed patterns in unreportable mental activity and the part played below the surface by the latter in processes of a cognition of the world and human contacts.

E. Leontieva has shown how the existence of a specific truth of art is explained in traditional terms. Life, reality, she emphasises, forms part of the structure of an artistic intention or image only as one of its many components. To that we shall add that the creation of a work of art, irrespective of whether it is a painting, sculpture, a melody, a drama, a novel, or a sonnet, presupposes a creative refashioning both of the abstract and the sensual material previously absorbed by the author, a selection and modification of material provided by life, on the basis of the artist's experience, thinking, feelings, tastes, and strivings. That is why objective reality seems to merge with an aesthetic ideal, with the imagination of the creator of an artistic image; it is only on that foundation that a special world of artistic truth pertaining to art alone can arise. The specificity of that world consists, on the one hand, in its being inextricably linked with the artist's emotional attitude to the phenomenon he is depicting (i.e., contains within itself, as very correctly pointed out by Leontieva, an axiological parameter), and on the other—because of its inevitable inclusion of the subjective (and at times the entire personality of the artist)—it can and must become an object of appraisal from the viewpoint of its social value, its accordance (or, on the contrary, non-accordance) with the aesthetic ideals of the society and the times in which it has been created.[7]

Here we have approached the line of demarcation between the truth of art and the truth of science. In Mendeleyev's table of the elements, or Einstein's theory of relativity there is no emotional attitude on the part of their authors to problems of atomic weight or the unity of space and time, that is why these intellectual constructions can be appraised only in a single aspect: their correspondence or non-correspondence, not to social ideals but to physical realities, to which human emotions are a matter of utter indifference. It is a different matter, in principle, and far more complex when we are dealing with artistic images.

In that case, it may well be asked: how does the artist arrive at a vision which is peculiar to him and is born of his own personality? And, what is fundamental, on the basis of what

psychological processes, so difficult of understanding, can that vision so strongly coloured in subjective (and consequently, it might seem, random and chance) tones lead, not to an exclusion of objective reality but, on the contrary, to a penetration into the innermost recesses of man's life and spirit, thanks to which a knowledge is often achieved that is more profound than that provided by science as grounded in the formalised? It is hardly possible or even advisable within the scope of this article to cite examples of how certain aspects of reality have been reflected in literature, the pictorial or depictive arts, folklore, epics, legends, myths, as well as in everyday rites that are imbued with art and the artist's creative activity long before they came into the purview of rational knowledge.

We can now formulate the fundamental idea of our anlysis. It is a most characteristic feature of unreportable mental activity that there arises, on its foundation, knowledge that cannot be won on the basis of rational, logical, verbalised and therefore conscious experience. This running ahead on the part of unreportable mental activity arises with special distinctness when we come up against the need of an awareness of the most complex aspects of reality—phenomena and events so many-sided, so multi-componental and so plurally determined that all attempts to ascertain their nature on the basis of an analytical and rational approach, through a partition of global continuums into their discrete parts, are doomed to failure. It is then, perhaps, that, given certain psychological conditions, the constantly amazing power of integral cognition can manifest itself.

A manifestation of such cognition is to be seen in the instantaneous diagnosis given by the experienced clinicist in clinical cases that present enormous difficulties, something he arrives at long before he can provide any rational argumentation for the conclusion he has drawn. The same is to be seen in the laboratory conditions of so-called physiognomic experiments, in which opinions are passed on the nature of an emotion expressed in a human portrait, without any possibility of that opinion being given any formal explanation (the objectivity of such appraisals is borne out by subsequent statistical analysis, which reveals a massive coincidence of appraisals from various sources of information). Then there are cases of attribution of authorship of the most various objects of art, as well as poetical or prosaic passages—this, not because of any concrete features but because of their overall style or manner. Then there are cases when the right word or expression has to be chosen for a definite thought—a selection so rigorous that it can be achieved only through an intuitive feeling for language, not by drawing on some formal definition. The most convincing experimental proof that such a feeling for language

cannot be substituted for in psychologically complex speech situations or replaced by any detailised formal systems of rules is provided by the almost complete discontinuation of attempts to use computers for the translation of works of literature. Similar trends are also to be seen in many other instances which invariably bear the imprints of something that relates them to art.

These examples alone will show that integral, intuitive cognition, which is grounded in unreportable mental activity is extremely widespread in our intellectual life. It makes itself felt even in the most rationalised analytical and logically differentiated forms of thought activities (one need only to recall the classical arguments of the role intuition plays in mathematics). However, it holds a really special place in artistic creativity. We shall in no way be distorting the creation of any aesthetic image if we say that the process consists in an unbroken series of decisions which the artist must make so as to give material shape to his artistic intention. Such decisions, which consist in the correct choice of aesthetically justified forms, movements, colours, sounds or words are always grounded in a complex blending of that which the artist is aware of and of that whose motivation he realises little or not at all.

That unconscious motivation of a particular choice is consequently *invariably* present in any act of genuinely artistic creativity, unless it has been ousted in such a way that the decision has fully become a rational act, fully conscious and logically grounded, in which case the *very essence of the artistic process is undermined*, its intimate structure is infringed, and, together with the latter, *that force of penetrative vision*, that ability to comprehend something that cannot be split up into its discrete parts, that essence which is the prerogative and foundation of the cultural significance of any genuine art must fall apart.

Let us assume, for instance, that the fantastic possibility can exist of the elimination of the unconscious from the act of artistic creativity. That would mean the utter destruction of such creativity. On the other hand, the demand that the processes of the creation of an aesthetic image should be reduced *exclusively* to unreportable activity—something which has often been proclaimed as a credo in the history of the arts—is possible only in cases of a complete failure to understand the unconscious. It is possible only in conditions of an impermissible abstraction of two directional links (direct and as feedback) which cannot but manifest themselves in a "conscious-subconscious" system, i.e., where one of the cardinal psychological patterns is ignored, which consists in *the formation of whatever is below the level of awareness depending on the activity of the conscious in no less degree than the possibility and the functioning of the latter depend on the features of the unconscious.*

Thus, in some of its area, artistic creativity is determined by the activity of the unconscious and, in that sense, is rooted in the irrational. It develops in such a way that its motive forces, the reasons underlying any particular choice (the motivations of choice not the choice itself!) do not always enter the artist's awareness of the artistic decisions he is continually making. Yet it is those motive forces that enable the artist to discern and reflect in his works relations that are determined in so complex a manner that an understanding of those relations cannot be achieved in any other way. Therein lies that power of art which explains its invariable presence in any culture created by mankind in the course of its historical development.

However, as we have already said, the artist brings into the creation of an aesthetic image his penetrating vision, his emotional attitude to what he is depicting. Here his vision cannot but remain profoundly subjective and bear the imprint of his own personality, so that, like any other expression of the individual's spiritual make-up, it can be in or out of harmony with society's aesthetic ideals. It can be either progressive and truthful, or reactionary and false. The unconscious within the artist provides him with a specific keenness of vision, yet it is his *personality* which determines the *interpretation* which he gives to what he sees, and the *meaning* he gives to his works. That is why artistic truth in works of art is in no way guaranteed by the opportunities created by basing oneself on the unconscious. That truthfulness is a function, *not of the specific features in the psychological process of the creation of an aesthetic image but by the place* held by that image and the role it performs in the system of the aesthetic values of the times.

As we see it, it is only due account of this circumstance that will permit a methodologically justified interpretation of the presence of the irrational in art, and make it possible to understand the impossibility of any abstract departure from that irrationality in an examination of the psychological process of the moulding of an aesthetic image and, at the same time, the non-determination of that irrationality by the social values of a work of art created by the artist.

We have attempted to emphasise the intimate links between artistic creativity and the activity of the unconscious. We have also noted that the role performed by the latter on this plane could be approached only after the development of more rigorous psychological ideas on the functions of the unconscious. For many decades, work on the latter concept has been associated with the name of D. Uznadze and the work done by him and his school in substantiating the idea of the psychological set. It is the latter theory that has made it possible to introduce the spirit of

experiment into the difficult area of ideas of the unconscious and to subordinate a consideration and an interpretation of those ideas to the principles and logic of the cognitive process in its rigorously scientific interpretation. We cannot dwell here on an overall characteristic of that conceptual approach but shall take not only of two aspects of the concept of unreportable mental activity which have a direct bearing on the idea of a psychological set and are distinctly discernible whenever the link between the unconscious and art is under examination.

In the first place, we are referring to the possibility of the simultaneous existence, within the artist, of a number of varying and even contrary psychological sets—a circumstance without consideration of which one cannot understand either the origin or the functional structure of the aesthetic image the artist has created. In the second place, the reference is to the possibility of the unconscious manifesting itself at various levels of the organisation of the artistic process—this in connection with the varying nature of the psychological sets—both at the highest levels (at which the content of the aesthetic images created is formed by man's mental activity in all the complexity of its individual and social manifestations), and also at the more elementary (at which the aesthetic value of an image is determined mostly by its physical features: the geometrical structure, its chromatic range, and so on).

The involvement of the unconscious in creative activity as developed at each of these various levels is in considerable measure conditioned by the polymorphous nature of the psychological sets and their representation at all levels of the hierarchy of states of the mind, ranging from those that express purely individual features to others that are determined directly by physiological impacts. Disregard of these two features in the activities of the unconscious can easily lead up to a one-sided and therefore oversimplified understanding of its manifestations. Let us begin with the first of these two aspects.

The most various aspects of this highly complex subject were touched upon at a symposium held in France over ten years ago on the problem of the relations between art and psychoanalysis.[8] One of those aspects, which evoked a lively discussion, had a direct bearing on the questions under discussion here.

In his report on "*La créativité de l'artiste psychanalysé*" Nicolas Dracoulides posed and dealt in a very direct manner with a question that returns us to Freud's initial ideas. Dracoulides defended the thesis which asserts that the artist's creativity is stimulated by the bitter experiences he has gone through. In this he followed the well-known thought expressed by Stendhal which says that studies into the life-stories of artists and their creativity

lead us to consider that frustrations and all kinds of privations, particularly those which inflict deep psychological wounds, affect the artist's talent as a kind of catalyst that intensifies his gifts.

In his formulation of this idea, Dracoulides arrived at the following conclusion: if frustration fosters creativity, then anything that eliminates such frustration cannot but sap creativity. Since psychoanalysis, or any other kind of psychotherapy, is a means of eliminating frustration (to maintain our line of argument we shall not deal here with the question of the therapeutic value of psychoanalysis), its use can have only negative consequences for the artist's creative activities, which it can only weaken or even paralyse. To bear out this concept, Dracoulides quoted a number of concrete instances of a decline in artist's creative potentials after they had undergone psychoanalytical treatment, and sums up as follows: "The *artist is one who* has become disadapted to reality and finds a compensatory modus vivendi through art. Psychoanalysis readapts him to reality and, consequently, makes him incapable of artistic creation."[9]

This scheme presents interest for several reasons: first, because it shows the kind of false conclusions that follow from a formalism in logical conclusions grounded in a literal interpretation of an idea and not from its genuine meaning (genuine not in a general sense but only at times when certain infrequent conditions coincide). Secondly, because the sharply voiced negative reaction of the members of the symposium to Dracoulides' statements revealed the complexity in the development of the theory of psychoanalysis during the past few decades. That development has substantially shifted psychoanalytical theory away from Freud's initial ideas, giving its interpretations a greater degree of freedom and flexibility, and removing or at least weakening the dogmatism that marked it in the past.

The attitude of the symposium's participants to Dracoulides' scheme was on the whole negative. The speakers at the symposium pointed out that the idea that the artist creates because he is miserable was a romantic flight of fancy peculiar more to the 19th than to the 20th centuries. Many instances were quoted of artists of whom it was said that they produced their works with the ease with which birds sing: Velazquez, Rubens, Corot, Matisse, and Claude Monet, to name but a few. Mention was made of the frequent instances of artistic endowment flowering, not ceasing, in periods of great professional and family prosperity and peace of mind. It was pointed out—and this would seem highly important on the theoretical plane—that the elimination of some particular frustration does not lead to the disappearance of whatever has been eliminated, and that the unconscious can affect artistic creativity both in an inhibitory and a stimulating fashion. The

opinion was sharply expressed that it is unethical to link artistic creativity with mental traumata or with privations, since such an understanding would lead one to see a kind of road towards the creation of social values and the like in an ignoring of the artist's spiritual needs.

A generalising of the theoretical implications of all the above statements should not lead to a denial of the well-known psychoanalytical concept of sublimation, which in principle was not denied by any of the members of the symposium, as far as can be judged from the published texts. However, Dracoulides' opponents were implicitly united, it would seem, in the idea that, irrespective of whether sublimation arises in art or not, that depends on numerous accompanying circumstances, the features of the overall psychological situation in which there does or does not take place a suppression of oppressive emotions through a concentration on creativity. In the light of such criticism, Dracoulides' error consisted, not so much in the linkage between frustration and the act of creativity (a denial of which linkage would mean a rejection of the foundations on which the idea of sublimation is built) as in his idea of the non-mediatorial and inescapable nature of that link, and its significance as the only stimulator of creativity. To that grossly simplified and mechanistic scheme was contraposed a broader understanding that took account of the complexity in the organisation of man's spiritual life and the impossibility of prognosticating its course if some particular factor alone is taken into account, even if it is formative in principle.

We are taking note of this latter approach because in many respects it stands close to the idea of the organisation of spiritual life as prompted by the theory of psychological sets advanced by Uznadze and long taken up in Soviet literature. When Uznadze brought forward his idea of psychological sets as an important element of man's mental activities, he never considered that such activities can be limited, even briefly, to some particular set. A single set can be an object of analysis in a specialised experiment, but when we have to deal with man's spiritual life we always come up against complex *systems* of sets. The interrelations between such sets, their transformations and links, and their expression in activities, such is the psychological tissue we meet, first and foremost, when we undertake an analysis of human experiences marked by some degree of emotional significance.

Hence the complexity of defining any human behaviour, the impossibility, as a rule, of restricting that definition to some particular motivation or tendency, even if marked by a high degree of affective tension. Hence the impossibility of seeing relations between sets as a functionally rigid and predetermined

system, and shifts in that system as foreseeable. Such rigid system cannot in any way serve as a model of man's spiritual life.

In the light of this kind of understanding the weaknesses in Dracoulides' scheme are obvious. Of course, frustration can, *in principle,* stimulate creativity. This is a truism which appeared in fictional writings as the "truth of art" centuries before it became a "truth of science" in the concept of sublimation. We can refer, for instance, to some of Petrarca's sonnets on unrequited love, the well-known Greek myth of the aid Aphrodite gave to the rejected youth, and Romain Rolland's interpretation of the part played in Beethoven's music by his unrewarded love for Giulietta Gviccardi. Whether such frustration will stimulate creativity in a *concrete instance* depends on numerous attendant circumstances, and is therefore most usually unpredictable. Here we are in the region of what are known as "super-complex" systems, in which prognostications can only be probable but cannot be predicted in advance in any single terms.

All these circumstances are important, in principle, for a proper understanding of the unconscious in man's spiritual life. The unconscious is a highly important factor in that life, but it operates within a framework of the "*supercomplex*" *system formed by the relation between simultaneously existing conscious and unconscious psychological sets.* This refers to manifestations of the unconscious in conditions of any purposeful activities, but it has to be taken into particular account in attempts to study the role and place of the unconscious in the conditions of artistic creativity, where the effects of the unconscious almost always express themselves as a highly complex *correlation* between preformed and unconscious psychological sets of the artist. That is why any act of artistic creativity, even one linked with some particular and narrow content, usually bears the imprint of the artist's entire personality and reflects it more tangibly than any behaviour or utterance.

That is why, when we note the invariable presence of the unconscious in artistic creativity, we must, as the next step, stress its *systemic* character. It is absolutely wrong to see the unconscious as some isolated and independently existing factor. Concealed within the term "unconscious" are only systemic and global effects brought about by a definite *correlation* between unconscious psychological sets that can be ultimately ascertained only through an analysis of the unconscious in art.

As we see it, it is only from the viewpoint of such a general understanding that we can correctly examine the problem of the unconscious in artistic creativity, without falling either into a false rationalism which would paralyse that problem, or into an apologia for the unconscious—characteristic of many trends in aesthetics abroad—as an independent principle, i.e., a stand

testifying only to a failure to understand the genuine nature of unconscious mental activity.

At this point, we would like to touch upon another general idea prompted by the theory of psychological sets and facilitating an understanding of the peculiar and varied manifestations of the unconscious in art.

Psychological sets may, as we have already said, arise in conditions of the most varying forms of man's activity, from the most complex, as expressing his emotions, aspirations, ideals, and flights of fancy, to those that are immediate reactions to physical signals. Accordingly, the unconscious can also manifest itself at *various levels* of artistic creativity. We have already tried to trace these manifestations in their complex forms, so that we shall dwell here on how the unconscious operates when the artist addresses himself to the world of elementary spatial structures.

The existence of the aesthetic aspect in any visual perception of such structures cannot be doubted. When that aspect is absent, all the boundless area of depictions such as ornamentation, coloured mosaic, and the architecture of geometrical forms with no particular subject-matter could evidently not exist. Neither is proof required of the mental unreportability of factors under whose influence the perception of such images acquires an aesthetic tonality: there are certain forms or colours that we perceive as more effective but cannot always logically explain our preference: we may like them without being able to explain the reason why. However, experimental research in recent years has brought some clarity into an understanding of the factors giving rise to such aesthetic effects.

An example of such research is provided by the highly interesting experiments conducted by D. E. Berlyne into an analysis of the aesthetic impact of certain geometrical forms in unorganised and structuralised combinations.[10] In these experiments Berlyne was able to establish what it is that stimulates aesthetic experiences in the correlation of geometrical images. Such impressions arise in close connection with psychological sets that orientate perception towards *a search for a definite internal order*, a definite law in the organisation of images presented for aesthetic appraisal. An aesthetic preference appears when that specific order is *discerned*. Such correlations are ascertained when images are tachistoscopically presented at microintervals of time. Such experiments show the link between aesthetic preferences and sets designed for an unconscious reception of information.

Another line of research that analyses the relations between unconscious mental processes and art is linked with the problem of subliminal visual sensations, which has come in for study in the Soviet Union by T. Khachapuridze *et al.* In experiments con-

ducted abroad Ch.Fisher has presented tachistoscopical depictions to subjects for such brief intervals of time that they have not been consciously perceived. However, when the subjects were asked to make any fanciful drawings they wished to, such drawings often showed the influence of the images previously presented without any set towards their conscious perception.[11]

These and similar facts have led some researchers (P. Klee *et al.*) to link artist's works and their specific vision with *various unconscious features of their visual images*, their "inner optical world" (the ability to cast off the differentiation, obligatory in a visual image, into "figure and background", and therefore the possibility, for instance, to simultaneously see two faces in the well-known Kubie profile, the ability to subconsciously discern the proportions in a so-called "golden section" and to subordinate the proportions in architectural groups and the like to an achievement of some aesthetic effect).

The literature also contains other facts testifying to the special role played in the emergence of aesthetic effects by relatively simple and unconscious forms of mental activity which often pertain more to psychophysiology than psychology. Even if we again recall the influence exerted on the shaping of artistic images by unconscious urges, inhibited motivations of behaviour, and vague emotions in the artist, it will hardly seem an exaggeration to say that art is literally *imbued* with unconscious activities at all levels—from the most elementary to the highest.

We shall say in conclusion that one should avoid falling into erroneous ideas of the nature of the unconscious and should try to understand its actual role in artistic creativity, that of an unquestionable participant in the creation of a work of art, and least of all as a factor that determines the meaning and aesthetic value of such works. The meaning of an aesthetic image—that which that image speaks of and asserts—is indissolubly linked up with the artist's personality, which includes the conscious and the unconscious in him, and the world of his values in all their psychological complexity. It is that personality which determines the meaning of a work of art, even if the activity of the unconscious has played a very important part in the formation of that work.

Any other interpretation of the role of the unconscious in art is incompatible with its present-day scientific interpretation and can only slow down the difficult process of gradual penetration into the depths of the theory of artistic creativity, a process that is today proceeding on the foundation of closer links between it and the idea of unconscious mental activities.

We have tried to give a definite interpretation of the functions performed by the unconscious in processes of artistic creativity

and perception. It is not only to the psychology of art that such functions present interest; they can be regarded as a kind of model of unconscious mental activity in general and of the place that such activities occupy in the activity of consciousness in general. That is because, as already mentioned, the accomplishment of the tasks man comes up against in his everyday activities, at home and in his various occupations—in scientific research, at the clinic, in educative work, and in the legal profession—all this within larger or smaller collectives—must address itself to the activity of the unconscious in no less measure than in the creation of artistic images.

In the area of art, the activity of the unconscious operates in a more open and less concealed form than, for example, in processes of abstract intellectual creativity. Yet it never ceases from being an indispensable component of the psychological structure of man's relations with the reality about him, irrespective of the form that relation takes. In analysing the role of the subconscious in art, we therefore study only a particular form of the manifestation of that factor, a form that is a prototype of many others. That is why, for many reasons, it is impossible in principle, to understand the nature of man's consciousness without due regard of those forms.

NOTES

[1] F. Fröhlich, "Aesthetic Paradoxes of Abstract Expressionism and Pop Art", *British Journal of Aesthetics*, 1966, Vol. 6, No. 1, pp. 17, 25.

[2] "The Irrational as the Constant Aim of Art", *Actes du IV Congrès International d'Esthetique*, Athens, 1962.

[3] Considerable material vividly illustrating the link between processes of artistic creativity and the activity of the unconscious is to be found, in particular, in a detailed monograph by M. Arnaudov of Bulgaria entitled *The Psychology of Literary Creativity*, Moscow, 1970 (in Russian).

[4] V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Moscow, Vol. 38, p. 73.

[5] E. Leontieva, *Art and Reality*, Leningrad, 1972, pp. 42-43 (in Russian).

[6] *Balzac on Art*, Moscow-Leningrad, 1941, p. 145 (in Russian).

[7] E. Leontieva, op. cit., p. 218 and elsewhere.

[8] *Entretiens sur l'art et la psychanalyse*, Paris-The Hague, 1968.

[9] Ibid., p. 158.

[10] D. E. Berlyne, "Measures of Aesthetic Preference", *Psychology and the Visual Arts*, London, 1970.

[11] We have borrowed the description of this highly interesting experiment from the article by A. Ehrenzweig, "Nouvelle approche psychanalytique de l'esthétique", published in the above-mentioned *Entretiens*. We are indebted by S. Leclaire (France) for the opportunity to acquaint ourselves with this work, for which we would like to thank him sincerely.

DISCUSSIONS

The Comprehensive Development of Western Siberia

From the Editors: In June 1978, the journals *Voprosy filosofii* (Problems of Philosophy), *Voprosy ekonomiki* (Problems of Economics), *Planovoye khozyaistvo* (Planned Economy), *Sovetskoye gosudarstvo i pravo* (Soviet State and Law), and *EKO* (The Economics and Organisation of Industrial Production) with the active collaboration of the Tyumen regional committee of the CPSU, sponsored a round-table conference in Tyumen, Siberia. Philosophers, economists, legal experts, sociologists, Party functionaries and business managers from many cities discussed the economic, social and cultural problems of the comprehensive development of the region.

Speaking of the scope of economic construction in the Soviet Union, which embraces vast geographic regions, L. I. Brezhnev said in his speech at the 18th Congress of the All-Union Lenin Young Communist League: "Let me take one such area here. Its importance for the country's future is increasing from day to day. I mean Western Siberia or, more precisely, the Tyumen region... One million square kilometres on the Ob River are being economically developed and settled. This approximately equals the combined area of Spain, Italy and Britain."

Below we offer a review of the round-table conference contributed by B. Oreshin, and R. Sadov of the *Voprosy filosofii* editorial staff.

* * *

R. Kosolapov (Editor-in Chief, *Kommunist* journal): Comprehensive development of the eastern areas, including Western Siberia, is of tremendous importance. Two aspects of the problem should be singled out: our energy reserves and the possibility of their utilisation; and rendering new areas habitable.

We continue to be faced, for example, with a task of tremendous economic and social significance. We want to mechanise arduous manual labour. From this point of view, the opportunities to be found in the Tyumen area, its energy resources, are of truly historic importance. Their full-scale utilisation, with maximum efficiency, will enable rapid progress. Of course, energy associated with the burning up of natural

products can hardly be regarded as energy of the future. At the same time, with energy consumption increasing, oil and oil products will have to be used for a long time to come.

The energy issue is directly linked with a whole set of problems of the development of our society as a whole.

Developed socialist society is currently undergoing important changes due to four principal processes. The first is allround industrialisation, based on total electrification, which is currently also involving the consumer sphere.

The second is the intensified urbanisation. Rural life styles are being replaced by urban, progressive forms based on industrial methods of construction and electrification.

The third is social integration, that is, the elimination of significant class differences between workers and peasants, which is especially noticeable in conditions of continued specialisation and cooperation of production in the countryside and the overcoming of the major differences between mental and manual labour. Social diffusion is taking place on the basis of acceptance of the basic values of the working class and the tendencies of industrial production. All this creates conditions for the formation of the prerequisites of the future classless society.

Finally, the fourth process is the internationalisation of social life, which is conditioned by complete industrialisation as the material basis of the changes in human life.

Referring to the second aspect of the problem—rendering of new territories habitable—Kosolapov has emphasised the natural character of the interrelationship of economic, social, and cultural processes in the development of regions, especially in pioneering conditions, which, though being law-governed, does not preclude difficulties and contradictions.

The integrated approach to the development of a separate region presumes a concrete historical analysis of existing conditions and opportunities and the requirements of the society as a whole and envisages the selection of the main directions in the development of new territories, decisive from the point of view of the national interest.

V. Semyonov (Editor-in-Chief, *Voprosy filosofii* journal): In speaking of the dialectics of the development of the country as a whole and individual regions and large territories in particular, two things must be taken into account. Firstly, the specifics of each part of the country, of each region, and the importance of that region for the whole. Secondly, there is the problem of evening out the social, economic, cultural and living standards of different territories and the evolution of a uniform development level of all parts and regions of the country, all its areas. Of course such

levelling out involves the main things; the specifics of different regions remain.

When we speak of the development of such complexes as Tyumen, the Baikal-Amur Railway, etc., the problem that arises is how to develop and settle new territories. In the development of such a major area as Western Siberia, of key importance is close interaction of the region with neighbouring territories and the strengthening of ties with them. The development of new territories is effected not by local means but by the concerted efforts of the whole society, the whole country. This is one of the advantages of socialism.

As regards Western Siberia, the issue is not just taking resources, but of intelligently and rationally settling that vast territory. Hence the approach should not be utilitarian, it should be a civilising approach assuring the highest cultural standards of development. It is from this approach that the prospects of the overall social policy concerning the area should be viewed.

First of all, it is of methodological importance to establish the correlation between integrality and comprehensiveness. Do these two concepts mean the same thing? I think not. Integrality is a stage in the advance to comprehensiveness. It is also a mode of social development inherent in developed socialism, and as such it also goes through certain stages with specific levels of manifestation. One level is the proportional development of the economy, the social structure, the political and cultural life of the country. The second level is the growing proportionality of development within each of the main spheres of public life. The third level is more balanced development within each specific branch of the national economy.

Soviet scientists and practical workers give close attention to the following aspects in ensuring the integrated development of the social organism. Firstly, integrality is best assured when its basis—labour economics—is developed. There are still many problems here, for example, shortages of skilled personnel in various branches of the national economy. Secondly, of great importance for integrality is assuring a correct balance between the productive and non-productive spheres. In the initial stages of development of a number of new regions there were difficulties in assuring an optimum balance. Finally, there is the problem of assuring the best possible integrated development of large areas.

By now a vast body of experience has been accumulated in the planned, scientific substantiation of the development of new territories. The issue now is to assure the best development of Western Siberia. This implies not only proportional economic, socio-political and cultural development, but also the intelligent utilisation of natural resources.

Academician A. Aganbegyan (Editor-in-Chief, *EKO* journal): Tyumen region is an area where a major regional economic programme—development of the West Siberian oil-and-gas complex (WSOC)—is being carried out. This amibitious programme clearly displays the traits of succession. The first regional programme of the development of the Urals-Kuznetsk Combine was initiated by Lenin himself who expressed the idea in April 1918. As a result of its implementation, the first industrial complex of Western Siberia was built up. Then there was the Angara-Yenisei project the purpose of which was to group energy-industrial complexes around large hydroelectric stations and, subsequently, the Kansk-Achinsk thermal stations. Under the Tenth Five-Year Plan, another project was launched: the Baikal-Amur Railway and the economic development of adjoining areas. The WSOC project is distinguished by its being a multi-purpose project not restricted to the extraction of oil and gas.

Firstly, it envisages the creation of the country's main fuel base which will contribute to a considerable increase in the output of oil, compensate for the decline in oil production in the old oil-bearing regions, and account for most of the increase in gas production. Thus, over the next 10 or 15 years the Soviet Union's energy programme will be primarily realised in the framework of the WSOC. Extensive work is going on in other regions as well. Thus, the Ekibastuz and Kansk-Achinsk coal-fields are tremendous projects even on a world scale.

Secondly, the WSOC project provides for the development of the Soviet Union's main petrochemical base. The very first section of the Tobol petrochemical works, currently in construction, will produce, in terms of cash, more than the KAMAZ autoworks at full output. Also in construction are the huge Tomsk petrochemical complex, the Archinsk oil refineries, etc.

Thirdly, a key purpose of the WSOC project is the creation of a major base of energy producing and consuming industries of national significance. Prominent among them is the Surgut hydroelectric power-station. A highly efficient complex of large electric stations working on natural gas can be built in the Tyumen region. It can provide the energy base for the development of some of the country's largest complexes for the manufacture of methanol, ammonia and other gas derivatives. The question is thus of creating a large new energy-industrial region comparable with the energy complexes on the Angara and Yenisei, at Ekibastuz and in the Kansk-Achinsk area.

Fourthly, an essential component of the WSOC project is the export of natural gas to other regions of Siberia, in particular, the Kuzbass, which will make it possible to increase industrial efficiency and improve living conditions.

And fifthly, an important aspect of the multi-purpose project is the export of gas, oil and their derivatives.

The first stage of the WSOC project has been completed and a new one is beginning. This confronts science with the task of assessing various aspects of the new stage. In the first stage the main task was the extraction of oil. In the new stage, over the next five-year period, the increase in natural gas will be far ahead of the increase in oil, and investments in the Tyumen gas industry will be higher than in oil. Another aspect of the present stage is the changing conditions for the development of oilfields. Till now the rise in oil extraction was concentrated over a comparatively small number of fields. Samotlor accounted for almost three-quarters of the oil extracted in the Ninth Five-Year Plan period. Now it is necessary every year to develop not two or three deposits as before, but eight. Also, gusher extraction is being replaced by pumping, which will require much more efforts. Another aspect of this stage is the development of processing. And the last feature is the emphasis on intensification, on accelerating the growth of labour efficiency, a matter of major importance in view of the declining influx into the workforce expected in the next five-year plan period.

The previous development of the West Siberian oil and gas fields prompts the following conclusions:

— the long-term approach was correct. New large areas can be developed only on the basis of such an approach;

— the advantages of the integrated approach have become apparent. It would have been impossible to develop this region so effectively without building railways, power transmission lines, concentrating transport facilities, and involving many ministries in the project:

— this region has demonstrated the importance of scientific and technological progress. It would have been impossible to develop such a vast area in so short a time using traditional technology and traditional approaches. Here prefabricated panel and 3-D section construction began on a large scale, a new approach was taken to multiple drilling, for the first time helicopters were extensively used in construction, etc. There are, of course, still many problems, but very much has already been done;

— further elaboration of the problem of dovetailing branch and territorial planning is required. Tyumen may become a proving ground for refining the ways and means of dovetailing branch and territorial planning as called for by the 25h Congress of the CPSU.

Ya. Mazover (sector chief, USSR State Planning Committee): Integrated planning of the development of the West Siberian oil

region requires allround consideration of the place of the fuel and energy industries in the overall structure of a modern economy, and of the influence the development of other branches of the economy, scientific and technological progress, and the fluctuations of domestic and external economic priorities have on the fuel and energy complex.

Current changes in the development trends of the fuel and energy complex and its structure generate a number of important consequences which must be taken into account in defining the prospects of oil and gas development in Western Siberia and the strategy of their utilisation in the national economy.

The first of these problems is connected with the steeply climbing energy requirements of the national economy. Even with the rapid development of nuclear power, the demand for organic fuels is increasing sharply.

The second problem is that the growing motorisation of the economy, combined with rising oil exports (in conditions of its rising export value), comes into contradiction with the relatively limited resources for increasing output. This requires an intensification of oil extraction, on the one hand, and, better oil processing aimed at increasing the output of light products, and the replacement of fuel oil with gas and coal, on the other.

This, in turn, leads to the third problem facing the national fuel and energy complex: the accelerated priority growth of gas production.

By the end of the century, the extraction of gas will apparently stabilise (though somewhat later than oil extraction) and the share of gas and oil in the country's fuel-and-energy balance will decline. Hence, the fourth problem of intensive development of the coal industry, the eastern coal-fields in the first place.

Fifthly, we cannot overlook the problem of the general rise in the costs of fuel extraction, especially oil. The reason is that new fields are being developed in regions with harsh natural and climatic conditions, the distances over which fuel has to be hauled are growing, and ecological requirements should be met.

Finally, a serious problem in the development of the national fuel and energy complex is the one caused by the growing distances between the areas of fuel extraction and those of its consumption.

B. Vainshtein (sector chief, Oil and Gas Construction Ministry of the USSR): It is common knowledge that an economy cannot exist without internal strains. Just as works of art and literature are of value when they reveal major conflicts in social life and point out the ways of resolving them, so in economic science the significance and effectiveness of research is determined by the scale of controversial situations revealed within the framework of

economic analyses and the scientists' ability to find optimum solutions for them according to the criteria of developed socialism.

The economy of social production as a whole and that of Western Siberia in particular is characterised by three typical situations of conflict.

The first I should like to note here is the contradiction between man and nature, between our society's desire to utilise the natural riches of an area as quickly and fully as possible and the uncompromising forces of nature which stand in the way of achieving social objectives. Nature has done its best to hide away its resources beneath swamps, to exacerbate the difficulties of extracting oil and gas with harsh environmental conditions.

This contradiction can be resolved on the basis of optimum technological policies. The main thing is that technological policy should not to be localised; it should fully reflect the economic and social aspects and set the guidelines for achieving high efficiency in the complex and the industries. They include the rapid development of fields and the fullest extraction of oil; accelerated commissioning of production capacities and projects; discovery of new resources.

Secondly, there is the contradiction between purposes and means in conditions when the multiplicity of purposes is restricted by actually existing reserves. Underestimation or failure to understand this consideration occasionally leads to the scattering of resources and lower efficiency. Balanced plans can be developed through concentration of resources and alignment of purposes. And besides, for Siberia, reserves of labour and material resources, as well as construction capacities are essential.

As we see it, in the Tyumen region it is essential to clearly formulate the objectives and fully back them up with resources. The importance of the Tyumen complex for the national economy is so great, the problem of assuring all the necessary resources is so important, that it would perhaps be right to first draw up a balanced economic plan for the Tyumen oil-and-gas complex before finilising the economic plans for the USSR as a whole.

Pointing out to one more contradiction—the one between the high rates of technological progress in the oil-and-gas complex and the relatively slow rates of change in the established economic mechanism—Vainshtein noted the need of resolving it as quickly as possible.

V. Krasovsky, (Editorial Board member, *Voprosy ekonomiki* journal): Some new interesting solutions have been found by teams of scientists and workers within the Tyumen oil-and-gas complex. For example, S. Byzov, a worker of the Tyumen Department of the Institute of Industrial Economics and Organisation of the Siberian Division of the USSR Academy of Sciences,

analysed interesting experience in the utilisation of inland waterways not only for cargo and passenger transport but also for setting up mobile electric stations, floating concrete-producing plants, hostels, hotels and clubs. This is something new which takes into account the geographic specifics of the region and its extensive inland waterways system.

I would like to raise several questions as a matter of discussion.

Is there any need to build established communities at the fields, as was done in Bashkiria and the Volga area, especially around minor deposits which may soon be exhausted?

Would it not be better to build houses with all conveniences that could later be dismantled?

Another debatable issue involves the policy of capital investment. I believe that in the Tyumen region it would be expedient to give up the practice of overall utilisation of reinforced concrete. In a region which lacks inert materials and everything has to be hauled 900 km, it is clearly wrong to base construction solely on reinforced concrete. There is some interesting experience of using special impregnated wood which could be widely applied in the Tyumen region.

An exceedingly important question is that of the social infrastructure. There is a place in Siberia where it is very well developed: Norilsk. It is not for nothing called the Eighth Wonder of the World, and this is thanks to its infrastructure. However, Norilsk is a relatively small construction site and it is comparatively easy to develop the infrastructure there. On the vast territory occupied by the Tyumen region this is immeasurably more difficult. Hence, other technological, organisational and constructional solutions are apparently called for.

I. Nesterov, Corresponding Member of the USSR Academy of Sciences (Director, West-Siberian Geological Oil Survey Research Institute): Assessments of the potentialities of the Tyumen region have increased many times over in the last 15 or 18 years. In the late 1950s, the current levels achieved in Tyumen would have seemed unrealistic.

Only five years ago it was thought that the geology of the Tyumen region was so well known that no surprising discoveries could be expected. However, the last two years have revealed that the geology of the area remains insufficiently explored. For example, it was held that there could be no oil in clays. But today scientists have demonstrated the possibilities of finding oil within large areas of clay strata. The exploration of these strata is only beginning.

Nesterov went on to emphasise that in present-day conditions the region's share in the country's economic life could increase substantially if it was supported by a higher rate of development

in scientific research, experimental construction and design, the training of skilled personnel, and the application of scientific and technological achievements in industry.

The question of establishing a regional academic centre in Tyumen, the further development of the system of higher educational establishments and their role in the development of Western Siberia were discussed by *V. Kopylov*, Director of the Tyumen Industrial Institute, Professor *L. Ragozin*, and other participants in the conference.

Ya. Kagan (Director, Tyumen Oil and Gas Institute): Considering the prospects of developing oil and gas production in the Tyumen region, the number of workers in these industries should in the foreseeable future (taking into account the changing geological conditions of extraction) more than treble. This huge workforce must be adequately settled. New cities, kindergartens, schools and cultural establishments must be built. This is a very difficult problem in the conditions of the North. It therefore seems reasonable to restrict the size of northern cities and make the greatest use of the possibilities provided by scientific and technological progress for building fully automated enterprises employing a minimum of manpower. This would make it possible to assure the best living conditions.

Scientific and technological progress with total automation, resulting in a general reduction of the workforce making it possible to restrict the local population, was, in his view, the solution that would make it possible to cut the Gordian knot of complex demographic problems of Western Siberia and assure adequate manpower for the rapidly expanding industry.

D. Khodjaev (deputy department chief, USSR State Planning Committee): When, by the middle of the Tenth Five-Year Plan period the new 1980 targets for oil and gas production in Western Siberia were determined, the regional party and government organisations, in collaboration with the USSR State Planning Committee, prepared proposals for improving housing, social and living conditions.

Despite difficult conditions, many new communities have appeared in formerly unpopulated areas. Today some 80,000 people live in Surgut and Nizhnevartovsk, residential neighbourhoods have gone up, house-building enterprises have been built, and housing design takes local natural and living conditions into account. However, we are still lagging behind the rate of industrial construction; the quality of construction, architectural design and city planning are sometimes inadequate. There are other shortcomings in public utilities, cultural and other services.

Rational planning requires looking forward at least 25 or 30 years in considering the possible locations of future communities

and their scale of development. The minimum workforce required to carry out the plans of developing the mineral wealth of Tyumen region must be determined. Surgut will evidently be the largest city in the oil and gas producing areas. The situation is more difficult at the locations of the oil and gas fields. It is suggested that shift work be employed there, in which the oil workers, builders and others would be flown from permanent communities for work stretches of up to three weeks in temporary communities. However, this method should be used very flexibly. Shift work is all right when living conditions are assured at the base community and workers can be ferried back and forth easily.

Another question that arises in considering the prospects for the development of communities in northern oil and gas areas is what kind of houses, cultural services and utilities should be built. It would be wrong to mechanically transform the forms of establishing new communities suitable for settled areas, such as Togliatti or Naberezhniye Chelny, to areas of new settlement. Here, unfortunately, it is impossible to build a fundamental, well-appointed urban community in a short time simultaneously with large-scale industrial construction and assembly work. That is why, during the initial preparatory stage, we should start by building less fundamental but well-appointed houses, which will make it possible to save time for setting up a base for industrial housing construction.

A. Sharapov (Deputy Chief, Tyumen Oil and Gas Administration): Several variants of the shift method have evolved in the Tyumen region. First of all, there is the team method widely employed in drilling: a drilling team lives in a shift camp not far from the drilling site and consisting of several caravan homes (living quarters, clothes dryer, canteen) providing necessary living conditions. Some 60 to 100 people may live in such a camp. Another variant is community, the construction of which begins with the assembly of several prefabricated houses which can be delivered to any spot by helicopter or other transport; then two-storey wooden hostels are built, as well as a medical aid post, shop and canteens. Such communities may be up to 30 kilometres from the place of work and have populations of up to 1,000. The third type of community has a population between 2,000 and 6,000. This is a transitional type from the shift camp to workers' township.

A. Khaitun (sector chief, Oil and Gas Construction Ministry of the USSR): Our Ministry has suggested developing the territories by the expedition-shift method. It provides for mobile work units from settled areas regularly travelling for spells of work to develop remote, newly settled territory. It involves the use of manpower and infrastructure resources from several regions, or the distribution of these resources between zones of the region (in the

Tyumen region, between the settled areas of the south and the sub-Arctic and Far North areas).

Besides purely economic considerations (reduction of housing construction in the North, etc.), this method makes it possible to utilise skilled personnel from old oil-producing regions.

To a degree, the expedition-shift method removes the contradiction between temporary and permanent manpower: those residing in other areas and regularly coming to work in Siberia are not chance people but permanent workers possessing certain skills.

The following concept for development of the oil and gas areas of Tyumen seems rational: the use of traditional shift and expedition-shift methods; the growing role of the expedition-shift method as the development moves north; utilisation of the southern areas of Western Siberia and settled regions of the country (the old oil regions in the first place) as a base for developing the North; development of cities in the south of Western Siberia (Tyumen region) as basic for the northern areas. The Far North should apparently be developed by the expedition-shift method with a network of shift camps.

The basic conflict in developing the oil and gas areas of the North is: development or settlement, constant or temporary personnel. The expedition-shift method may be suitable for removing this contradiction while preserving the high rate of industrial development.

V. Osipov (chair head, Tyumen University): the Tyumen territorial-industrial complex is the largest area to be developed in the USSR. However, it has a number of shortcomings which lead to a waste of means and disturb the balance between territorial subsystems. One of them is the extreme concentration of production and population in the north of the region. Every concentration, territorial included, has certain limits beyond which it loses economic and technological meaning. The desire of some ministries and departments to locate auxiliary and service units in gas and oil development areas and develop a comprehensive production infrastructure leads to rapid population growth. But the cost of settling people is three or four times higher than in settled areas, and wage payments increase sharply.

What could improve the demographic and social situation in the north of the region? Firstly, everything should be done to assure the high rate of replacement of live labour by materialised labour. This can be achieved by developing machine building for oil and gas extraction, which should of course be located in settled areas. Secondly, by assuring employment opportunities for all family members. For this it is necessary to develop the social infrastructure. Thirdly, improvement of territorial division of labour.

The southern areas of Tyumen region will apparently not be able to resolve all problems of providing for the northern gas and oil areas, in so far as they belong to an agricultural area and should provide the region with food. In this connection attention should be given to the Urals, where there are enterprises which could be reconstructed and targeted on solving the problems of Tyumen region and, most important, where there are skilled manpower reserves.

M. Piskotin (Editor-in-Chief, *Sovetskoye gosudarstvo i pravo* journal): As I see it, the question of combining branch and territorial management is a highly topical issue. The level of coordination of the activities of various organisations of all-Union and republican subordination in the localities is still insufficient. Territorial management is on the whole fairly efficiently exercised by the local Soviets, their executive and managerial bodies. However, the boundaries of territorial administrative units and economic regions do not necessarily coincide, and here problems arise which local bodies cannot solve.

The Constitution of the USSR (Art. 16) emphasises the need to take into account the sectoral and territorial principles in economic management. Articles 74, 79, and 89 define the prerogatives of the Union Republics, Autonomous Republics and Soviets of People's Deputies in assuring the integrated economic and social development of their areas.

Much has to be done. Firstly, the activities of ministries and departments are inadequately coordinated in solving arising questions; secondly, local Soviets and their executive committees have inadequate rights and opportunities for assuring the comprehensive development of their territories; thirdly, there are no specialised bodies of state administration dealing solely with the management of territorial complexes; fourthly, the mechanism for the management of territorial-production complexes is very complicated. The existing approach to local government probably requires some revision or clarification.

Who should supervise the realisation of integrated projects? The question has not yet been fully answered. Different variants can be envisaged. A special office could be set up. Supervision of a project could be assigned to the existing system of organisations, or an intermediate variant is possible in which existing bodies are responsible for the work but special auxiliary services are set up to handle the project. I think the latter variant is preferable.

Of importance is due coordination of the work of different departments as applied to the Tyumen complex, and an effective project management service. Of course, there is also the problem of pooling resources. At present, the needs of the territorial production complex are financed from the all-Union, republican

and local budgets. The utilisation of these resources is not always coordinated. In the first place the project assumes long-term planning, while financial planning is restricted to one year. Hence it is first necessary to assure long-term financial planning.

V. Varlamov (deputy sub-section chief, USSR State Planning Committee): The achievements in the development of territorial production complexes in the Soviet Union are well known. At the same time, there are certain shortcomings. Principal among these are: the commissioning of capacities of technologically and economically interdependent manufactures is not always duly synchronised or has the right sequence; there is overlapping in the establishment of units of the industrial and social infrastructure; the non-productive sphere lags, and this is often aggravated by disproportions within it (for example, between housing construction and the development of public utilities and services), which results in higher manpower fluctuations; the construction base lags behind the needs of the expanding complex.

A territorial-production complex begins with scientific preplanning preparation. The USSR State Planning Committee has elaborated development schemes up to 1990 for every territorial production complex, including the West Siberian one. It would appear that the problems of the preplanning stage have been resolved. However, there are still gaps and omissions, especially in the content of schemes. Planned parameters are inadequately substantiated by technical-economic calculations. The additional economic effect, for whose sake territorial-production complexes are being organised, has not been fully revealed, insufficient attention is devoted to questions of the practical implementation of this complex. The efficacy of schemes is obstructed apparently by the fact that their legal status has not been established (for example, the obligations of ministries deriving from the schemes have not been defined).

Since the Ninth Five-Year Plan period, the USSR State Planning Committee has been preparing "Basic Guidelines for the Development of the Economy of Tyumen Region" as a special addendum to the national economic plan endorsed by the Government. It is an integrated plan containing production quota for every industry in terms of cash and kind broken down according to prime types of output, capital investment quotas, construction and assembly quotas, general geological exploration quotas, indices of living standards, housing construction, the building of children's establishments and hospitals. Of course, this form of planning is not ideal and should be perfected.

N. Feitelman (senior researcher, Institute of Ecology, the USSR Academy of Sciences): The industrial development of Western Siberia, and especially its northern areas, requires certain nature

protection measures. The problem is especially urgent for the area of new industrial development. This is because until how the environment has remained uninfluenced, or practically uninfluenced, by human activity. Consequently, nature could not, as in the centre of the European part of the USSR, gradually adapt to technological progress. Furthermore, the soils in the northern regions are especially vulnerable and their resistance to external action is very low.

Due to the lower content of oxygen dissolved in the water and the longer frozen season, the rivers of Western Siberia are less capable of self-cleaning than the rivers of the centre of the European part of the USSR. As a consequence, given the same composition and degree of pollution, West Siberian rivers achieve self-cleaning only after no less than two thousand kilometres from the place of pollution, as compared with 200 or 300 km on rivers in the centre of the European part of the USSR.

The forests in the forest-tundra zone are easily affected and restore with difficulty.

Western Siberia has not only oil and gas. There are many other natural resources: forests, peat, furs, valuable species of fish, herds of reindeer, geothermal artesian waters. The task is to assure environmental protection in the comprehensive rational development and utilisation of all the natural riches of Western Siberia.

However, the development of the oil and gas industry there is not yet always accompanied by effective nature protection measures.

The extraction of oil and pumping out of accompanying ground waters results in the lowering of the level and pressure of ground waters and subsequent settling of the earth's surface. The strata density of the rock decreases. Also, the development of the oil industry requires considerable expenditure of water reserves.

Oil is one of the major pollutors of water. According to Academician S. Kolesnik, one litre of oil is capable of polluting a million litres of water.

All this is indicative of the need to elaborate a programme of comprehensive utilisation of the natural resources of Western Siberia, to carry on research and development aimed at producing wasteless technologies, to develop effective legal measures and economic incentives for environmental protection. The protection and rational utilisation of nature has already become an inalienable part of technological projects for the development of deposits, building of factories and laying of pipelines.

But it is also necessary to take into account the economic possibilities to carry out the environmental protection measures. It

would be wrong either to exaggerate or to ignore environmental protection.

In essence, the problem is that of evaluating natural resources. Such an assessment, geared to the existing economic mechanism and brought up to the level of traditional economic relations, should become a tool for stimulating careful treatment of the environment. A necessary prerequisite of rational utilisation of nature should be the alternative: special payment for damaging natural resources or the construction of cleaning equipment (the introduction of "cleaner" technologies), the expected economic gain from the operation of such installations being the stimulus.

* * *

The discussion of the comprehensive development of Western Siberia also involved other important problems associated with the peculiarities of the economic and social development of new territories, such as the interrelation and interaction of economic, social and cultural processes at various stages of development of new territorial complexes; the social, sanitary and hygiene aspects of work and life in the difficult climatic conditions of the North; rational demographic policy; ensuring manpower reserves for industry and incentives to assure the influx and settlement of manpower; wage payments and an effective system of benefits for workers in the northern areas of the country; the socio-cultural and socio-psychological aspects of life of new settlers; the role of young people in the development of new territories; improvement of cultural services, utilities and other amenities, the organisation of rest and recreation, etc.

On the whole, the discussion made it possible to clarify the main directions of investigation of the practical and scientific problems of regional development in Western Siberia and establish their integrated character, which require joint efforts by experts representing different branches of the economy and management, of the natural, engineering and social sciences to solve them.

CRITICAL STUDIES AND COMMENT

The Search for a "New Society" and "Paternalistic Capitalism"

IVAN ANTONOVICH

In the mid-1970s world capitalism went through major social and economic upheavals which once again revealed the irreversible character of the crisis phenomena inherent in it. The time was also characterised by mounting social pessimism and the disintegration of ideological and ethical values.

Since the early 1970s representatives of different Western sociological schools have been feverishly seeking potential reserves of their system, striving to find new mechanisms of social regulation more compatible with the contemporary rhythm of change and capable of withstanding its ever accelerating rate.

This quest for new forms is most fully expressed in the new society concept. It effectively closes the circle of socio-economic theories that appeared in the 1960s and continued to evolve in the 1970s. Their basic postulate is the claim that capitalism is evolving into a new socio-economic stereotype allegedly free of the traditional evils of the capitalist system. As a rule, the authors of these theories do not specify whether the stereotype is capitalism or some new social system. Their numerous statements on this score are equivocal. But unlike the authors of crisis of society concepts who see all new socio-economic developments as the beginning of the end of Western civilisation (linking the crisis itself, as well as its possible fatal outcome, with mankind as a whole), the authors of the new society concept regard their model as designed specifically for capitalism.

They claim that it is a step forward along the road of the ideals of social equality and justice[1] and declare that the transition from traditional capitalism to new society will be in the form of a social

revolution, albeit gradual and spread out over decades. "We believe," write American sociologists Joseph Bensman and Arthur Vidič, "that the net effect of social changes in American society over the past forty years is no less than another social and cultural revolution. In the course of this latest revolution, responses to it by newly emerging groups have caused a qualitative change in the institutions and life styles of American society."[2]

Summing up the important changes that have already occurred and as yet barely perceptible trends, Bensman and Vidič list the following specifics of American social life, which they regard as significant characteristics of the new society: 1. American business has been organised into stabilised giant corporate bureaucracies which have replaced the earlier and more primitive forms of entrepreneurial business organisations. 2. The federal budget (as a rule it is considered separately from the sphere of private enterprise) has grown to a size which serves as a means of stabilising American prosperity. 3. The emergence of a new middle class reflects a fundamental transformation in the occupational structure. 4. The emergence of the new middle class has had varying effects, especially with respect to youth. Clustered around class culture are new forms of youth and adult cultures. This has produced not only whole new cultural styles but also a conflict of generations. 5. The intensity of this conflict reveals the inability of established institutions to motivate and channel the activities of large sections of youth. The rejection of economic rewards is a problem. 6. The failure of these mechanisms and rewards has raised a number of new issues. 7. Recent immigrants find it difficult to adapt to the American way of life. Some absorb, others reject American systems of values. Most of them experience a serious psychological trauma. 8. As a result of all these factors entirely new institutions and social forces are at work, fundamentally transforming present-day American life.[3]

Bensman and Vidič see the prime motive force of change in the new society as the growth of labour efficiency due to the scientific and technological revolution and the appearance of such large-scale management forms as giant corporations, and Keynesian methods of stimulating production and employment through increasing state financing of low-profit industries. They conclude on this basis that capitalism possesses an inherent ability to transform its social institutions and public relations in a way as to digest new phenomena, new historical realities. They note that industrial-financial corporations have set up special services, divisions and subdivisions of the administrative-managerial apparatus which not only study the social consequences or significance of various factors of social progress but are themselves a sphere for revealing new opportunities, in particular vacancies, for

absorbing the manpower released and made redundant as a consequence of mechanisation and automation.[4]

Marxist literature offers a sufficiently detailed investigation of the growth processes of the new administrative-managerial structures of industrial-financial corporations, and of the growing role of the bourgeois state in supervising the industrial process. It reveals causes of the expansion of sections of the administrative-managerial apparatus entrusted with long-term social policy planning and development with the purpose of attempting to avert or remove the most negative phenomena in the distribution of the national product.

The insolvency of bourgeois interpretations of these processes has been convincingly shown in Marxist literature.

Bourgeois sociologists, clearly exaggerating the significance of concessions wrested from the capitalists by the labour movement in the first place, present the relative rise in the living standards of the masses as the main feature of the new society. "The fundamental aspect of the New Society is an ever increasing flood of new productivity.... Simultaneously the working classes have been provided with growing income levels which, compared with their past expectations, are almost inconceivable."[5]

According to Bensman and Vidič, the change in living standards as an aspect of the new society is associated with better distribution of produce and is dependent upon the steady, continuous economic growth of the whole society. However, it is well known that capitalist economy cannot expand continuously through rising productivity. Although productivity has increased, the process has never been continuous; capitalist production develops spasmodically, and growth is followed by recession. This was especially apparent in the 1970s, when the expansion of 1971-1974 was followed by the worst postwar crisis of 1974-1975; moreover, industrial growth is each time followed by stagnation, the living standards of the masses decline, and people live with daily fear of the future and expectations of the worst.

For more than a decade now the most popular motto in Western Europe and the United States has been achievement of social equality through the redistribution of incomes. Essentially the redistribution mechanism is one for increasing taxation of corporate incomes and a somewhat reducing the growth of wage taxation. But as a rule the increase was very small, while the reduction was effected only by slowing down growth and was purely symbolical. In 1975, for example, President Ford gave a tax rebate of 50 dollars to every American, declaring that thereby Americans had received state "aid" of more than 5 thousand million dollars. But the effect of this aid on the individual worker

was negligible and hardly made up for the increase in subway and bus fares.

Characteristically, whenever people speak in this context of the improvement of the material situation of the broad masses of the population, they usually deal only in terms of higher income and not of any growth in the real living standard of individuals, families and social groups. This is not accidental, because the increase in incomes is purely nominal since inflation eats up all wage rises and no real improvement in the material situation occurs.

Moreover, the 1970s have seen a sharp deterioration in the situation of the so-called marginal groups: ethnic minorities, immigrants, low-paid workers, unemployed, disabled, etc. This causes some Western sociologists to speak of the existence of a kind of "fourth estate", or "fourth world", comprising a large army of people living in semi-starvation, anti-sanitary conditions, deprived of elementary medical aid, losing their professional skills because they have no jobs, losing their ability to social adaptation, etc.[6]

In his time Lenin wrote: "An entire social stratum consisting of parliamentarians, journalists, labour officials, privileged office personnel, and certain strata of the proletariat, has sprung up and has become *amalgamated* with its own national bourgeoisie, which has proved fully capable of appreciating and 'adapting' it."[7] The new social group—the above-mentioned "fourth world"—is the antipode of that stratum of protectors of the class domination of the bourgeoisie. True, it has existed throughout the history of capitalism, but it is today that it poses an especial threat to the ruling class as a constant reserve of dissatisfaction with the capitalist system possessing tremendous explosive potential, as living testimony of the inhumane essence of capitalist social relations and their inability to assure real social equality.

Speaking on the redistribution of incomes in the new society, the authors of the concept deny the social class any active social role, especially political, interpreting class differences in terms of differences of interests, life styles or incomes. This interpretation closely approaches the claim that the development of the system of administrative and managerial mechanisms at different levels and in different spheres has made impossible any class influence on the policies of these mechanisms, insofar as those policies are invariably broader than the interests of any single class.

According to this reasoning, even political parties cannot exist without drawing representatives of the most diverse classes into their ranks. Hence, in the new society, not classes, but these faceless mechanisms are allegedly the decisive force. "With the development of the bureaucratic administrative state," Bensman

and Vidič write, "major decisions are also made by non-elective executive agencies and by individuals who are relatively anonymous to the public at large."[8]

Thus, they claim, in the new society, classes thinking only of their own welfare are being replaced by political cliques allegedly concerned with the good of all members of the society. To them belongs the prerogative of decision-making, as well as the totality of power: they have replaced the traditional bourgeois-democratic forms of government. And that is good, because formerly only the privileged strata held sway in the society, while now the political clique, although it makes access of broad sections of the population to the levers of power and control more difficult, allegedly thinks more of the common weal. "The power clique," Bensman and Vidič write, "is one major mechanism by which specialised class interests get translated into social and political action."[9] These actions are realised through the most diverse social institutions. Because of that, it is alleged that these institutions, the social organisation, not any class, play the leading role in the new society, arbitrate social and class contradictions, and serve as the unifying basis of social forces and processes.

It is well known, however, that the social and class affinity of the people within social institutions cannot but affect the nature of the functioning of those institutions and the development of the social processes they control.

At the end of the 19th century, Engels pointed out that transformation of the means of production "either into joint-stock companies (and trusts), or into state ownership, does not do away with the capitalistic nature of the productive forces".[10] This fundamental premise holds today. The concentration of industrial-financial capital characteristic of the imperialist stage of capitalism has given rise to a whole range of specific institutional phenomena and organisational forms which create an illusion of a fundamental restructuring of government. It has the appearance of effecting the distribution and concentration of power, creating an illusion that large-scale capitalistic organisation performs a unifying intermediary role. However, the essence of the capitalist social system has not changed.

Indeed, the merging of banking, industrial and state capital characteristic of the developed capitalist countries has led not only to the growth of a gigantic corporate-type apparatus of administration and management, but also to a separation of the functions of ownership from the functions of government, which has made for a rapid growth in the number of salaried employees performing functions of administration and control. We could note that Marx, in his time, drew attention to this process. He wrote: "Stock companies in general—developed with the credit

system—have an increasing tendency to separate this work of management as a function from the ownership of capital." [11] Employment in the administrative apparatus has increased, and representatives of the most diverse professions, people from different social classes and strata, are involved in it. Thus, the individual owner of the means of production has been replaced by groups and amalgamations of owners; the share of each individual owner in the overall volume of stocks has decreased, individual control has been replaced by collective, but, of course, it has not ceased to be capitalistic.

It is this circumstance that the authors of the new society concept attempt to turn to their benefit when they say that the collective capitalist, even if he has not ceased being a capitalist, has become more just and can no longer essentially influence the social process, distribution and exchange. These functions, it is claimed, have been assumed by managers who assure this more just solution of all questions as compared with capitalist owners. "A corporation," writes American sociologist Robert Larner, "may reach a size so great that, with a few exceptions, its control is beyond the financial means of any individual or interest group." [12]

According to Larner, only 29 per cent of a total of 290 major companies in the sphere of production and raw materials extraction; a little more than 39 per cent of 33 major commercial concerns; not more than 13 per cent of a total of 45 major transportation companies; and only 4 per cent of more than 120 concerns in the service sphere in the United States, are run by private or group capitalist interests.[13] However, Larner goes on to show that, firstly, under the present corporate structure an individual or group of individuals may own as little as 10 per cent of the total stock to assure virtual control over the concern. Characteristically, in his list he classifies under concerns controlled by individuals or groups of individuals only those with up to half the capital concentrated in their hands. Secondly, he notes the necessity of taking into account that information about the distribution of controlling stock between capitalist owners is, generally, a well-guarded secret.

American sociologist Ph. H. Burch concedes that the reason why the idea of the managerial revolution has so firmly captured professional and public opinion in America is that, since the depression of the 1930s, no one has ever gathered accurate information about the ownership of stocks or capital. He notes that it is difficult to obtain serious, systematic data regarding the volume of family control or ownership of stock (the most clear indices of the distribution of corporate power) in the majority of large American concerns.[14] Burch notes that the annual financial reports published by corporations contain no data concerning the

distribution of stock between individual holders or who is in possession of the controlling stock.

After analysing data from numerous sources, Burch comes to the conclusion that family control (meaning control by multimillionnaire families—*I.A.*) continues to play a very important part in running the affairs of big business in the United States.[15] He cites figures indicating that at least 300 of the leading 500 US giant corporations are in private hands. According to statistics for the end of 1974, 0.2 per cent of the US population owned 30 per cent of all stocks, and one per cent owned more than half.[16]

Control over a corporation can be exercised by people owning a relatively small share of the stock but holding high positions in the administrative and managerial apparatus. In such cases, too, the circle closes on ownership. The owner of a large share of stock can influence a corporation by virtue of such ownership, while the owner of a small share can do the same by virtue of performing specific administrative functions with which the owners of large shares entrust him more readily than people with no stock in their possession. Thus, ownership of capital is the basic criterion in selecting people for performing administrative and managerial functions. When highly qualified specialists manage to "make it" to the highest administrative echelons, they also become owners and acquire shares of stock of the enterprise or receive such stock as remuneration for services, whether scientific, technological or administrative.

Thus, the power clique is, in any case, not simply connected with the ownership clique (using the terminology of Western sociologists): individuals continuously pass from one clique to the other.

That is why, regardless of whether a given corporation (or the corporate structures of a capitalist state in general) is controlled by an individual or a collective capitalist, its decisions will in the first place reflect the interests of the owners and only then the interests of the rest of the population. At different times both the property clique and the power clique reckon in various ways with the interests of the broad masses. However, the more concessions to the masses they are compelled to make, the more assiduously does the official propaganda exaggerate their real significance and create myths regarding the miraculous transformations of capitalism. But the essence always remains the same: in all leading capitalist countries ownership of the national product is in the hands of the property clique. This is conceded by many sociologists from these countries.[17]

It is not accidental that professional competence does not play a great part in either the property clique or the power clique. The main thing is utter devotion to the ruling class. Sociologist and

economist E. Mandel writes that advance in the state apparatus follows a lengthy selection process in which technical knowledge does not play a decisive role. He points out that a condition for success and advance is obeying the general norms of bourgeois behaviour.[18]

It is another thing again that these norms themselves evolve. State monopoly capitalism attempts to remove the more negative elements, not only in the production sphere, but also in the sphere of consumption, especially those that nurture public discontent, which always increases sharply during depressions and crises.

In 1960s, in some capitalist countries steps, including legal measures, were taken to provide for liability, including criminal liability, for misleading the consumer, manufacturing substandard goods, illegal machinations aimed at obtaining superprofits, etc.

As could have been expected, the bourgeois press and mass media raised a loud propaganda campaign the purpose of which was to advertise the alleged consumer revolution in the West based on fair relations between merchant and consumer. However, a number of sociologists in the 1970s were forced to acknowledge that the consumer's situation far from improving, worsened, that labour is exploited in the consumption sphere as intensively as in the production sphere. American sociologist W. Withers notes, for example, that consumer complaints of unsatisfactory service are arising. These complaints, he writes, embrace a wide range of questions: dishonest weighing and packaging, manufacture of goods harmful to the health, goods dangerous in use, low quality of services, shortages of consumer goods, various forms of misleading advertisement and many cases of direct deceit. Until now efforts to prevent deceit and dishonest advertising have not been too successful.[19]

In an effort to exclude negative phenomena from the production and consumption spheres the authors of the new society concept appeal to a sense of social responsibility. Social administration in the new society, Western sociologists tell us, implies a new responsibility. It is, in their view, first of all, the responsibility of big business to the community, that is, the society as a whole, interpreted as the duty of enterprises of industrial-financial capital to pay municipal taxes in the communities where they are located, contribute to the development of public services and utilities—transport, health, cultural and sporting facilities—refrain from polluting the air and water, and damaging the environment.

It is characteristic that no other form of private cooperation with government authorities is associated with so many violations of the law and scandals as cooperation with municipal bodies. The press abounds in reports of bribery of local bosses, of transferring

competitive rivalry between industrial-financial amalgamations into local politics, regular violation of municipal ordinances, laws and regulations by these concerns, etc.

As for the social activity of the industrial-financial corporations themselves, its main purpose is to assure conditions for maximum profits. Corporate strategy and tactics is least of all prompted by the needs and requirements of the masses of the people. With the new sense of social responsibility, as without it, all attempts to overcome crisis phenomena in the capitalist mode of production are at the expense of the working people. On this the progressive American economist Victor Perlo writes: "This reveals with unusual bluntness the correctness of the charge levelled by the Communists in earlier crises—that big business was trying to climb out of the crisis on the backs of the working class. And whenever the workers refuse to take this lying down—and usually they do refuse—the result is a sharpening of class struggle."[20]

A prime feature of state-monopoly capitalism is the close intertwining of monopoly and state interests, as expressed in the creation of a number of institutions belonging simultaneously to the economic and political systems of industrial-financial capital, on the one hand, and the bourgeois state, on the other. The administrative mechanism of industrial-financial corporations is the most typical, but not the only, example of such an institution. Other institutions of a mixed nature could be cited: ministries or committees for economic forecasting, research centres for studying management theory and practice, etc.

The question of social responsibility initially confronted the whole system of state-monopoly capitalism, not just industrial-financial capital. Attempts to resolve it led to the formation of a number of new structures for stabilising the economic process and stimulating economic growth. They appeared following the Second World War, first in the United States, and were immediately dubbed the new social policy. Its purpose is to 1) reduce the depression cycle to a minimum and as far as possible cushion its descending phases; 2) increase the rate of economic growth; 3) prevent increases in prices and manufacturing costs.[21]

Although it was claimed that these objectives were to be achieved by industrial-financial capital and its organisations, here, too, the bourgeois state operates as a kind of guarantee and, among other things, it undertakes to help business maintain a high level of productivity and employment, setting this task in first place. The separation of functions of industrial-financial capital and the state in the new social policy is minimal. As a rule, it is reduced simply to rejection of the state's exclusive responsibility for the functioning of capitalist industry. Thus, the idea of social responsibility of industrial-financial capital assumes not a substitu-

tion of the existing social functions of the bourgeois state, but their supplementation. But even this highly restricted effort to promote the social responsibility of industrial-financial capital became the mainstay of the new society concept, the authors of which speak of the new, paternalistic role of state-monopoly capital.

Paternalistic capitalism is defined as a qualitatively new stage of Western society allegedly characterised by rejection of market economy and orientation of the production process primarily on social welfare: the haves help the havenots, society assumes a portion of the cost of social security, social security systems cushion the burden of expenditures for medical service, help solve the housing problem, etc.

The representation of present-day capitalism as a welfare society is not new. The "welfare state", "guaranteed society", and other concepts were extremely popular in bourgeois sociological literature in the 1950s and 1960s. Their authors also advanced the prime thesis of a radical transformation of capitalism into a society of social peace and welfare. However, by the end of the 1960s the insolvency of these concepts of social reality revealed themselves for all to see, and they virtually went out of use.

The promoters of the new society concept, and especially paternalistic capitalism as one of its variants, have the objective of filling the vacuum. A number of Western theoreticians (Papandreou, Galbraith, Bell, Horowitz, Barnet, Fourastié, Miliband, and others) hold that contemporary capitalism has managed to forge a historic alliance of industrial-financial corporations with organised labour, especially the trade-union movement. It is a contradictory, unstable, controversial, but nevertheless functioning alliance.[22] This social pair (the industrial-financial corporation and the trade union) has allegedly subordinated the bourgeois state. "For market capitalism," writes economist and sociologist A. Papandreou, "the state's role was limited to providing the legal framework for its operations as well as, of course, to assisting its expansion beyond the nation's shores, in imperialistic adventures. Paternalistic capitalism expects much more from the state."[23]

These authors claim that the administrative and managerial elite of industrial-financial corporations need the state so as to coordinate the planning of production, forecast consumer demand, marketing conditions, etc. Organised labour needs the state as a body for bringing pressure to bear on entrepreneurs, assure certain legal guarantees for hired labour, as a body promoting tax and budget policies for the country as a whole.

Hence a feature of the concept of paternalistic capitalism is its attempt to balance the role of various organisational structures, the state being assigned the role of primary among equal

institutions of management and control. "Our generation," writes Papandreou, "has witnessed the spectacular transformation that has led to the emergence of the modern state which reaches out to influence and control almost every aspect of the citizen's life. The fundamental propelling forces behind the expansionist dynamic of the state are not far to seek. They lie in the nature of social conflict among sectional interests.... And they lie also in the spectacular technological and organisational innovations which have placed at the disposal of the State power that no authority or group other than the state can challenge effectively. They lie, finally, in the state power-reinforcing character of the conflict among nations."[24]

Models reflecting social reality and ideal states are mixed in various variants of the new society concept, including paternalistic capitalism. Most of them, however, represent modern capitalism as a society undergoing a qualitative transformation, characterised by a growing ability to regulate social conflicts, solve economic problems, assure the development of the whole social and economic system. And all this, according to the authors of such variants, is achieved at low cost: through partial organisational transformations and minor reforms, owing to the moral readiness of the ruling elite to care more for the common weal.

Summing up, we can say that the Western sociological development concepts analysed here study elements which are indeed typical of the contemporary development of capitalism. This is the new level of concentration, the diversification of production, new organisational and managerial structures, new methods of exploitation and stimulation of labour productivity, new forms of merging of the state and monopoly which, doubtlessly, differ from the corresponding forms of the earlier stages of imperialism. However, the authors of these concepts fail to realise that, despite all transformations, the purpose of capitalist production remains the same: maximum profit.

The principal contradiction inherent in capitalism—the contradiction between the social character of production and the private ownership form of appropriation of its product—has not only remained but is more apparent than ever. This contradiction has been aggravated and brought to the limit by the economic activities of the industrial-financial oligarchy and the managerial bureaucracy at the present stage of state-monopoly capitalism. Thus, at each new stage in the development of state-monopoly capitalism there appear new contradictions, and old ones are aggravated; hence the steady decline in the stability of the whole system.

Attempts to exert greater influence on the social process, introduce new methods of management and planning, enhance

the corrective role of state-monopoly organisation, are of a local, partial character. They come up against the anarchy of the whole system of capitalist production and the spontaneous nature of the social evolution of capitalism. Partial rationalism in regulating these processes invariably encounters the irrationalism of the system as a whole.

All such measures result only in a slight cushioning of the effects and manifestations of the fundamental antagonisms, their shifting from one social sphere to another, and they have a purely temporary effect. Each easing of contradictions is invariably followed by an aggravation, which deepens still more the general crisis of capitalism.

NOTES

[1] G. Mandel, *Pour une autre société*, Paris, 1975, pp. 181-189.
[2] J. Bensman, A. J. Vidič, *The New American Society*, Chicago, 1971, p. V.
[3] Ibid., pp. VI-VIII.
[4] Ibid., pp. 12-13.
[5] Ibid., pp. 15-16.
[6] L. Hamalyan, F. L. Karl (eds.), *The Fourth World*, New York, 1976, pp. 52-70, 135-142, 163-171, 217-242.
[7] V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Moscow, Vol. 21, p. 250.
[8] J. Bensman, A. J. Vidič, op. cit., p. 88.
[9] Ibidem.
[10] F. Engels, *Anti-Dühring*, Moscow, 1969, p. 330.
[11] K. Marx, *Capital*, Vol. III, Moscow, 1971, pp. 387-388.
[12] R. J. Larner, *Management Control and Large Corporation*, New York, 1970, p. 20.
[13] Ibid., pp. 78-79, 84-85, 88-91.
[14] Ph. H. Burch, *The Management Revolution Reassessed*, New York, 1972, p. 10.
[15] Ibid., p. 2.
[16] Ibidem.
[17] G. W. Damhof, "State and Ruling. Class in Corporate America", *In the Pockets of a Few: The Distribution of Wealth in America*, New York, 1974, pp. 19-20; R. Miliband, *The State In Capitalist Society*, London, 1969, pp. 120-129; J. Maynaud, *La Technocratie*, Paris, 1964, p. 5.
[18] E. Mandel, *Le Troisième age du capitalisme*, Vol. III, Paris, 1976, pp. 204-205.
[19] W. Withers, *The Corruption and Social Change*, New York, 1973, pp. 30-33.
[20] Victor Perlo, *The Unstable Economy*, New York, 1973, p. 63.
[21] M. Rein, *Social Science and Public Policy*, 1976, pp. 13-37, 249-256; J.-M. Belaegy, *La politique sociale*, Paris, 1976, pp. 163-195.
[22] A. Papandreou, *Paternalistic Capitalism*, New York, 1972, pp. 80-85; D. Bell, *The Cultural Contradictions of Capitalism*, New York, 1976, pp. 220-283; J. Fourrastié, *Le grand espoir du XX-ème siècle*, Paris, 1976, pp. 269-365; J. Galbraith, *The Age of Uncertainty*, New York, 1977, pp. 193-241.
[23] A. Papandreou, *Paternalistic Capitalism*, Minneapolis, 1972, p. 90.
[24] Ibid., p. 95.

New Stage in the Youth Movement

ANDREI GRACHEV

In the past decade the youth movement in the capitalist countries has advanced from turbulent and dramatic actions, massive demonstrations and fierce clashes with the police and other repressive governmental forces to a stage of outwardly less impressive but more organised and mature struggle for the vital interests of the younger generation. As is evident from the plethora of comments and scientific papers that have recently appeared in the West, including those marking the 10th anniversary of the events of May 1968 in France, the character and orientations of youth and student actions are still the subject of discussion among representatives of various trends of social thought in the capitalist countries, with ever new interpretations of the ideological, political and social processes underlying this phenomenon.

Some Western scholars are exploiting the significant changes in the youth movement and the forms the youth struggle in the capitalist countries are assuming nowadays to call in question the democratic and anti-monopoly character of these actions, to distort their real meaning and orientation. Some of them are trying to ascribe to the rising generation a complex of "aversion for the distrust of the Left forces", and proclaim the advent of "conservatism", the coming of the era of the "New Right". Also former leaders of the so-called "New Left" and similar movements in the USA and Western Europe have recently started revising the basic conceptions of "Left" radicalism with due account of the events of the late 1960s and early 1970s and of the subsequent sharp decline of their influence among youth and students.

An analysis of the causes and character of the influence of the Left radical movement on the youth and student movement in the

capitalist countries in the late 1960s and early 1970s and their further evolution should be of interest, it seems to us, not only for studying this major social movement itself but also for characterising the current phase of the deepening general crisis of capitalism.

* * *

The student protest movement in the capitalist countries has reflected the objective expansion of the anti-monopoly struggle, caused by the intensification of the general crisis of capitalism. The spread of monopoly capital domination over new spheres of material and spiritual life, over new categories and strata of working people inevitably cause the expansion of the sphere of social protest and of the composition of the forces involved, and increases the variety of the methods and forms of struggle they resort to. Education has recently become a new arena of social clashes as it faces an array of sore problems of bourgeois society.

The growing internal contradictions of bourgeois society have sharply affected the schools and universities and, of course, young intellectuals.

The further dehumanisation of the social and private life of broad strata of the population has found in the youth, and especially students, a sort of resonator greatly amplifying its resonance. The discord between the youth and bourgeois society manifests itself in diverse fields: in education, science, culture, ideology and in what is called "life style", and sparked off the so-called youth "anti-culture" or "counter-culture".

Young men and women, who are exploited by capitalist society equally with adults and often superexploited, come out for genuine, and not illusory, equality in all spheres of social life, for their greater involvement in managing society and in determining its prospects.

Owing to objective causes, problems of youth not only as an age period but as a period of becoming socially mature, have become more pressing in modern society than before. A report of the UNESCO colloquium on the rights and responsibility of the young people noted that "the youth found itself today in a paradoxical situation. Never before were so many possibilities and chances open to it as today. At the same time never before did it find itself in a position of so many contradictory tensions, and uncertainties as it did today".[1]

While the objective requirements of social production and current scientific and technological progress put on the agenda the question of giving the young people a more important role in economic, social and political life, the system of state-monopoly

domination blocks their access to education and professional training and dooms them to discrimination, unemployment and moral degradation. The conflict between the youth and capitalist society accordingly acquires ever more pronounced social features and becomes an element of the basic social antagonisms splitting capitalist society. The significance of the youth and student actions of the 1960s lies in the fact that they sharply and dramatically drew the attention of bourgeois society to the further aggravation of the problems linked with the entry of young people in its economic and spiritual life, and emphasised that these problems must be resolved if society was able to ensure its own progress.

The conflict between the infinite potentialities of human thought and scientific and technological progress and the ever narrowing social limits, assigned to their development by the society of monopoly capital, has most strikingly manifested itself in universities in recent years.

In connection with the unavoidable expansion of the sphere of education, both higher and secondary, the policy of class differentiation and social selection penetrates into the universities and then into secondary schools. Social segregation used to take the crude but effective form of blocking access to education to young people from working-class families. Today the class character of the existing system of education manifests itself in more varied and disguised forms: in attempts to lower the level of higher education among democratically-minded youth and possibly prevent them from occupying key positions in industrial management and in the administration, and also in entrusting the educational system with the function of the social sorting of young people into first- second- and third-class citizens. Thus the social antagonisms of capitalism make themselves felt at an earlier stage of the young person's entry into conscious life. He becomes ever more aware of the class character of the system of education and professional training, which assigns the youth, sometimes while still in school, to different rungs of social ladder.

In these conditions, the struggle of university students and democratic forces for academic freedoms and the democratisation of education assumes an increasingly political character and draws young intellectuals into a fierce class struggle.

For all the peculiarities of the student movement and its maximalism and other features reflecting often a distorted idea of the real socio-economic structure of present-day capitalist society and, consequently, of the roads leading to liberation from social oppression, the mass protest of students is undoubtedly a manifestation of the objective and increasingly intensified conflict with the monopolies and the imperialist policies pursued by the governments, which, as the 1969 International Meeting of

Communist and Workers' Parties noted, involves an ever greater part of the intelligentsia.

Broad strata of the intelligentsia, and in the first place the young, are gradually beginning to realise that their vital interests and creative capabilities are incompatible with the realities of bourgeois society, that the basis is shaping for their becoming a force opposed in their mass to the capitalist system. Whereas before, when individual representatives, usually the most progressive ones, of the intelligentsia joined the working class' struggle for social liberation, this meant a break with the caste interests of their social environment, today, such a phenomenon becomes objectively conditioned and therefore quite natural because of the professional and other requirements of the broad strata of the young intelligentsia and its new socio-economic status.

The social unsettled state of a considerable part of the intelligentsia in modern capitalist society, which is vividly and sometimes hyperbolically manifested in the mass actions of students, reflects the growing inner contradictions of the scientific and technological revolution in the capitalist countries. The deepening crisis of the system, like a gigantic funnel sucks into the social vortex representatives of the strata of bourgeois society, who until recently hoped to remain on the sidelines of social life as detached, unbiased and "objective" observers.

The student movement in the industrialised capitalist countries has already shown itself as a real social force demanding first of all the democratic renovation and transformation of society; like any massive democratic movement it is a potential participant in the revolutionary process led by the working class. It has proved once again that in our epoch not only unconcealed economic oppression and an offensive against the working people's living standards but also attempts to infringe upon the democratic rights, to enslave them spiritually and deprive them of the possibility to participate in running society and in having a say in determining the prospects of its development, will spark off a new upsurge of the liberation struggle, fuel the indignation and protest of the broad strata of the working people and intelligentsia.

Thus, the youth and student actions of the 1960s-1970s have reflected the important process of the students becoming an active subject of social life and struggle, their being involved, sometimes against their own will, in fierce class battles. The broad strata of the youth and students in the industrialised capitalist countries are gradually becoming aware of their participation in the grand historical revolutionary transformations of the world and the struggle of the working class and all working people for real social liberation, for a new, advanced and democratic society. This new awareness is penetrating the consciousness of students in the

capitalist countries gradually, often painfully, overcoming objective difficulties and the artificial barriers bourgeois society is trying to put in its way.

The slow, but steady, rapprochement between students, the intelligentsia as a whole, and the working class in their struggle is proceeding in exceptionally complicated and at times very painful forms. It is not easy for young intellectuals to reach the necessary level of political maturity that would enable them to realise that the flourishing of their creative potential is connected not with the struggle for their privileges but with the consolidation, in close unity with all working people, of the powerful movement against the omnipotence of the monopolies and capitalist oppression.

The recent development of the student movement reflects the complexity and specificity of this process. The democratic movement of a considerable part of the students who have a certain degree of economic independence and are not as yet tied down by worries about their future career, well-being and providing for their families, has often reflected in a more graphic, "pure" form the conflict between the intelligentsia and the bourgeois state and, at the same time, has added a number of specific aspects to it.

Owing to certain peculiarities, a considerable part of the broad democratic movement of students in the West has found itself under the influence of "Left" radicals and extremist student leaders.

Addressing the International Meeting of Communist and Workers' Parties, held in Moscow in 1969, Leonid Brezhnev emphasised that in our epoch "fresh millions of people belonging to various social strata are being drawn into vigorous political action. Many of them enter politics with a great store of revolutionary energy, but with rather hazy ideas about how to solve the problems agitating them. Hence the vacillations, the swings from stormy political explosions to political passivity, from reformist illusions to anarchic impatience."[2]

This sector of the anti-monopoly movement has very specific features both from the point of view of the forces and groups, mostly non-proletarian, which join the struggle for their rights and against capitalist oppression and act as "recruits" of the ever growing army of revolutionary forces, and from the point of view of the specificity of the problems that are in the focus of their attention.

Not being directly connected with basic production processes and therefore not involved in the production and social relations that evolve on their basis, students spearhead their discontent and protest at first against the moral values of bourgeois society, sometimes opposing the struggle waged by the working class, its trade unions and political parties.

That is why the student protest is directed in many cases not against the primary and basic social contradictions of capitalism, but against their secondary, reflected, consequences directly affecting the intelligentsia and middle classes. This shift of the focus of attention often led student leaders to a mystified assessment of the students' social role and real possibilities and the goals of the student movement.

The predominance of petty-bourgeois elements among students from the very outset left a specific imprint on the entire movement. When analysing the sources and specific features of student revolutionism which, on the whole, has a petty-bourgeois basis, it is essential to note, as Lenin wrote, "the instability of such revolutionism, its barrenness, and its tendency to turn rapidly into submission, apathy, phantasms, and even a frenzied infatuation with one bourgeois fad or another...."[3]

Sometimes this protest, though Marxist phraseology was used, was as anti-proletarian as it was anti-capitalist. One should not forget that the protest of rebellious individualism differs fundamentally from the new consciousness that is moulded among the working class and sets as its aim the liberation and flowering of the human personality as the personality of the man of labour, not in spite of society or at its expense, but in the conditions of the complete liberation of all its members from social oppression.

Being based on the shaky foundation of individualistic consciousness, this movement, though massive, was nothing but a sum of separate individual revolts, which made it unstable, frangible and, ultimately, short-lived.

The "new students" were new not only because of their social basis, i.e., their pre-university background, but also because of their transformed future. Until recently, to become a university student was the most reliable way to escape the danger of becoming a proletarian, which hangs over ever broader strata of the contemporary petty bourgeoisie. Today, a university degree ever more often means for the student of middle-class families the disagreeable, in his opinion, prospect of integration into the anonymous and faceless army of wage labour, the prospect that borders on proletarianisation he is so afraid of. "Previous college generations were 'pre-bourgeois'; this one is 'pre-working' class"[4], the American sociologist G. Green wrote in his study of the roots of radicalism among the middle classes.

The various "Left" extremist groups and organisations had a considerable negative effect on the student struggle, limited its possibilities and became a serious obstacle in the path of rapprochement between the student actions and the struggle of the working class and broad working masses. The pedlars of "Left"-extremist ideas shamelessly exploited the romantic elation,

impatience, maximalism and other psychological and age features typical of youth. They spared no efforts to change the democratic character of the movement, to intoxicate it with the ideology of reckless revolt, to deprive it of the foundation of realistic democratic demands.

An attempt to debunk the idea of the revolutionism of the working class, this time from supposedly modern positions, was the cornerstone of the various conceptions of "Left" radicalism, which most markedly influenced the student movement in the capitalist countries in these years—from the traditional anarchist and Trotskyite trends to their various "New Left" modifications like the critical theory of society held by Marcuse and his followers. It is significant that this goal united the efforts of widely disparate Western ideologists. These and similar conceptions, many of which were elaborated hurriedly, at the height of the student actions, played the role of additional ideological conceptions which injected petty-bourgeois revolutionism into the movement, kept it in an intoxicated state of reckless revolt and thereby distracted the student protest away from the major directions of the struggle for a revolutionary transformation of society.

As events unfolded, the rivalry between the various leftist groupings fighting for leadership in the student movement, which was slipping away from them, became aggravated to the extreme. The alliance of heterogeneous political forces, which was far from being a union of like-minded people and which was based on the group individualism of the opponents of truly collective and organised actions, was bound to disintegrate and in fact did disintegrate into separate components, thus heightening the impression of the "collapse" of an outwardly impressive building lacking a firm foundation.

At the same time, though the mass student movement of the late 1960s cannot be regarded as entirely anti-capitalist and anti-imperialist in character, it cannot be called petty-bourgeois either. The student actions certainly reflected the growing understanding that it is the society of monopoly capital that is responsible for the still existing oppression of man by man, that only an advanced social system, socialism, can ensure the true emancipation of working people.

* * *

Beginning with the mid-1970s, the youth and student movement in the industrialised capitalist countries has begun to assume new features considerably changing the notions about the main forms of the social activity of the young people, which took shape under the influence of the stormy events of the late 1960s and early 1970s.

These changes have proved the untenability of the schemes offered both by bourgeois and "Left" radical sociologists to explain the sources and character of the social activity of the young people and the forecasts about the future of their movement.

In recent years, ideologists of various trends have fiercely vied for the hearts and minds of the young, in connection with "Left" radicalism's obvious decline of popularity. Doing so, they often try to present the political and ideological untenability of petty-bourgeois "Left" radicalism as defeat of the democratic and really Left youth and student movement.

True enough, by the mid-1970s various "Left" radical trends in Western Europe and the USA had entered a period of protracted recession and then a deep crisis. The differentiation of the forces that had earlier jointly participated in the activities of the "New Left" and affiliated trends was a natural result of the developments connected with the "up-dating" of the movement's character, aims and platforms. *Monde* was compelled to state in February 1973 that leftist dogmatism was losing its influence. A questionnaire sent out by the paper showed that 68 per cent of students took a negative attitude towards leftist initiatives.

The American sociologists D. Marshak and D. Wooley wrote in their report that after 1970 the mass political activity of students in the US began to diminish. Their actions became less massive, but their tone more insistent. The student movement was not dead, they wrote, but it had changed much in only a few years.[5] This, in our opinion, is even more true of Western Europe.

Life itself disproved the schematic constructions of the "Left" radicals and confirmed the untenability of their claims to have elaborated a conception of revolutionary action developing without the working class and in spite of its struggle. The glitter of the ultra-revolutionary student slogans lost its lustre and faded completely as soon as it touched the soil of reality and struggle.

In their attempts to conceal the real causes of the changes in the character of the student movement of the 1970s and the obvious loss of popularity of the "Left" radical ideology among broad segments of young people in the capitalist countries, the leftist ideologists tried to attribute it all to external factors, keeping within the narrow framework of extremist conceptions.

The Communist and Workers' parties of the capitalist countries assess the new stage in the development of the youth and student movement from principled class positions. As was pointed out in the Theses for the XXth National Convention of the Communist Party of the USA, "important changes have taken place, growing out of the upsurge of democratic and class struggles in recent

years. These developments, leading to the emergence of new levels of political consciousness have had profound effects within the youth movement. The new developments produced a crisis of petty-bourgeois radicalism."[6]

It is becoming increasingly evident to the youth movement that it is not the Left forces that suffered defeat, that what miscarried was the pseudo-Left student actions, the extremism and irresponsibility of the "revolutionaries" of slogans and the spontaneous petty-bourgeois protest which the theoreticians and practitioners of "Left" radicalism tried to thrust upon the young social movement.

Considerable sections of the youth have passed through the school of reality which enabled them to collate their illusions and hopes with reality and to check in practice whether their ideas were correct. In the 1970s, they have seen the further upsurge of the struggle of the working class and the working masses of the industrialised capitalist countries for their rights and against the domination of the monopolies and capitalist exploitation, new successes of the countries of the socialist community, the steady advance of the forces of peace, democracy and progress all over the world.

The process now under way of overcoming the "leftist complex" is an extremely important gain of the youth movement, opening up new prospects for successful struggle for the vital interests of young people.

The experience of mass struggle has taught young people to distinguish genuinely revolutionary, democratic forces from representatives of "Left" radical trends imitating revolutionaries, helped them to see that the forces that were trying to assume the role of revolutionary vanguard, are archaic and politically immature.

The past years have debunked in the eyes of young people the romantic halo which at first surrounded the pathetic phrases and provocative violence of the leftists, revealed the paucity of their conceptions, and proved correct the stand taken by representatives of the working-class movement and the Communist parties towards the leftists.

Their social experience has convinced ever broader strata of the youth that "the sentiments of discontent and protest are not enough to restructure the world on a progressive basis. The youth can achieve genuine successes in their struggle for a better future by mastering the correct understanding of the course of historical development by consolidating the unity of their democratic movement, by intensively strengthening its links with the working-class movement, with countries of the socialist community, with all revolutionary and transforming forces."[7]

Disappointment in the ideology and practice of "Left" extremism, the turn to the real socio-political problems of present-day capitalist society, the growing interest in the experience of the working class' organised struggle and its revolutionary ideology—Marxism-Leninism—have become part of this experience. Both friends and adversaries of the democratic student movement point to the especially significant growth in the last few years of the influence of the Communist parties and youth leagues, the increasing interest in Marxism among youth and students.

Students in the capitalist countries ever more actively use the forms and methods of struggle of the working class. Strikes, demonstrations, pickets, sit-ins and strike funds have been added to the arsenal of traditional forms of student protests.

The working class, too, has learnt much from the youth actions. The student demonstrations and teach-ins have drawn its attention to a number of new, previously less acute, social contradictions typical of capitalist society in the epoch of the scientific and technological revolution, have broadened the range of its actions, enriched its arsenal of methods and forms of struggle, and consolidated the mass basis it relies upon.

The number of student actions in support of the working-class struggle and major socio-economic demands is growing. In their turn, students feel a growing support on the part of working people and broad democratic forces who regard the students' demands for democratisation of education as a major goal of the democratic and anti-capitalist struggle of the working class and all working people. This constant concern for its interests helps the student movement to come out of its isolation, and opens up prospects of its demands being satisfied and of winning its struggle. By waiving their claims to exclusiveness, the students are restoring their contacts with the rest of society, which had grown weaker in the late 1960s.

A certain "weakness" on the part of a considerable section of students for theories of petty-bourgeois revolutionism and "Left" radicalism is explained by the specificity of their social composition and status. The frequent change of generations hampers the accumulation of experience gained in the social struggle and facilitates the penetration of the above views into the ranks of the youth and student movements, especially in periods of the aggravation of social conflicts. More than that, the passion for pseudo-Left theories, the tribute paid to "Left" radical views by representatives of the young intelligentsia working in the humanities and in the technical sphere and entering politics, are often an intermediate stage on the way to their joining the revolutionary struggle of the working class and working masses. The popularity of "Left"-radical ideas among the youth, and

particularly students, will, therefore, evidently be a concomitant of the important process of transition of the broad strata of the intelligentsia to democratic and anti-capitalist positions.

A resolute struggle against the theory and practice of the leaders of "Left" radicalism is all the more necessary because today ever larger numbers of young people and students are freeing themselves from their influence, are looking for new ways of expressing their protest and discontent with the realities of the capitalist world around them, are pondering on ways and forms of a really revolutionary struggle. Among them are those who considered themselves among the "New Left" in the sincere hope of contributing something new to the socio-liberation struggle and of finding new and shorter ways to the revolutionary transformation of society.

Ideologists of "Left" extremism link certain hopes of restoring and expanding their influence among the youth with the present stage of the aggravation of capitalism's social contradictions, with increased mass unemployment, particularly among young people, and the resulting mood of despair and dissatisfaction among them.

A UNESCO report on the youth states that employment and unemployment are crucial issue for today's youth. To the unemployment among young people without an education has been added the unemployment in some countries of a very considerable number of qualified specialists with a higher education.[8]

The power of monopoly capital excludes millions of young and able-bodied people from socially useful work and dooms them to an existence without rights.

The unprecedented scale of unemployment, its protracted character and unfavourable prospects turn it from a purely economic into a most acute socio-political and moral problem of modern capitalist society. As the heads of Western powers were compelled to acknowledge at their conference in London in May 1977, the mass unemployment among young people can create a whole new generation of discontent.

The specific social and age characteristics of this category of the unemployed underscore in most eloquent and dramatic form both the acuteness of the economic crisis of the capitalist system and the depth of its moral, ideological and political crisis. Having to be dependent on the family or social insurance benefits becomes the first social experience of a considerable part of young people today.

Economists, demographers and sociologists estimate that the situation with regard to youth employment is not likely to improve

at least until 1985. In other words, unemployment threatens to become a way of life for the new generations of young people who are still of school age. "We are creating a permanently deprived class. It is a bomb with a lighted fuse that could explode at any time," states *Time* magazine.[9]

The indignation and protest aroused by the problems young people have to contend with, assume the most diverse and sometimes extreme forms. According to the FRG press, for instance, the last few years have witnessed a growing influx of young extremists to semi-fascist and neo-nazi organisations.

A large part of the unfortunate youth in Western Europe has joined the ranks of "Left" extremists and anarchist organisations and groups which began to lose their influence among young people after the wave of student protest subsided in the late 1960s.

Communists also point to the great danger the current process of the "de-socialisation" of the youth is fraught with: their being kept away from socially useful work and social life. Such a situation can turn considerable strata of young people into reserves of the Right and "Left" extremist forces, oppose them to the democratic forces in society, and, especially, to the working-class and trade-union movement.

The Communist parties, trade unions, all genuinely democratic forces in the capitalist countries come out with initiatives the realisation of which would make it possible to unite the protest and struggle of the unemployed youth with the actions of the working class and broad working masses. Between 1966 and 1973 the number of young strikers increased more than three times.[10]

Signs of the movement's growing maturity are ever more clearly evident in the massive actions of working youth and students in the capitalist countries, who are fighting for their rights and for the interests of working people.

As *l'Unita* noted, a line of demarcation is being drawn between the present extremist organisations and the mass movement initiated by youth and students in 1968-1969.[11] Young people are expressing an ever greater concern for specific and real problems—conditions of work, study and life—whose solution would put the movement on a firm foundation and save it from a superficial and speculative approach to major aspects of the current class struggle. These changes in the stand taken by young people deliver the movement itself from hollow rhetoric and sectarianism, mark the end of direct attacks against the façade of bourgeois society and lay the foundations for closer unity between the student actions and the working people's struggle.

* * *

The transition from revolt to a conscious and consistent revolutionary struggle, the consolidation of the alliance with the working class, and drawing extensively on the experience of organised mass struggle—such are, in general outline, the main features of the new stage which the democratic movement of youth and students in the industrialised capitalist countries entered in the mid-1970s. This process would have been impossible without the resolute, exacting and, at the same time, friendly support of the young by the working class' revolutionary parties and organisations.

In the 1960s and 1970s, the firmness and stability of the links between the Communist parties and the youth were tested, valuable experience was gained in further expanding the communist influence on the rising generation, and the main directions of work among youth and students in the conditions of the present stage of the general crisis of capitalism were charted.

While critically analysing their work among the youth in the period preceding the student actions of the 1960s and the great upsurge of the youth movement, the Communist parties pointed to the weakness and shortcomings, which at first led to a certain discrepancy between the explosion of the social activity of young people and the degree of ideological influence exerted on them by the Communists and their youth organisations.

The intensified work by the Communist parties has made it possible in recent years, not only to considerably consolidate the positions of the Communists in the youth and student movement but also to repulse the attempts to launch new anti-communist campaigns among intellectuals and the middle classes in the capitalist countries. In working out their programmes for work among the working, and especially student, youth, the Communists have delivered a telling blow at the ideology of leftist petty-bourgeois revolutionism and anarchism, and specified the directions of their struggle with due account of the new conditions of the working people's anti-monopoly movement, the scientific and technological revolution and the considerable expansion of the social base of the anti-imperialist actions.

The active interference of the working class, of its militant trade unions and of the Communist parties has made it possible to break the vicious circle of leftist phraseology, to impart a progressive character to the youth movement with a prospect of turning it into a real participant in the revolutionary struggle.

Drawing on its rich experience, the working class of the industrialised capitalist countries facilitates the political maturity of its active ally, the youth movement, while criticising its inconsisten-

cy and narrow-mindedness. At the same time the revolutionary parties and trade unions of the working class cannot ignore either the specifics of this social groups or the students' demands.

As is generally known, the Communist parties of a number of countries have suggested detailed programmes of democratic reforms in higher and secondary education and in professional training, in short, the democratisation of education generally.

Communists consistently and patiently help the student movement and other non-proletarian strata which formed the mass base of the "New Left" movement to relinquish adventurism, to understand that a real revolutionary struggle today is inseparable from the mass struggle, from winning over the broad strata of the population that are oppressed and exploited by the monopolies.

Little wonder that today the growth of the membership of young communist leagues is particularly striking against the background of the decline of the leftist organisations.

Young Communists have always been in the van of the progressive and democratic youth, struggling against imperialism and reaction, oppression and exploitation by the monopolies, the policy of aggression and cold war.

In recent years, when the concept of organised struggle by the youth was put to the test, exposed to pressure by the advocates of spontaneity in the youth movement, the Communist youth movement has not only become stronger organisationally but has been reinforced by a number of new youth leagues.

Communists actively promote the expansion of the mass base of the youth movement, the consolidation of cooperation between its various political trends and forces, the enhancement of its independent specific role and contribution to the struggle waged by all revolutionary and democratic forces of our epoch.

The youth's active participation in the struggle for peace, detente, for the freedom and security of peoples brings the younger generation to the front line of the major political and social battles of our time, lays a firm foundation for broad cooperation of its various detachments, turns it into a notable and influential factor of contemporary socio-political life.

Their own experience teaches students that their problems can be solved in a democratic way only through struggle in close unity with the working class and the working masses, with the social forces which have expressed their solidarity with their actions in defence of their rights and rendered them the necessary support at all stages of the young people's struggle.

Choosing their future, young people choose the road of struggle for it, and it is along this road that they become politically

and ideologically mature and find themselves in the van of the fighters for peace, freedom and the independence of peoples, for democracy and social progress of all mankind.

NOTES

[1] *Colloque des ONG sur les problèmes des droits et de la responsabilité de la jeunesse*, Paris, UNESCO, June 18-20, 1975, p. 11

[2] *International Meeting of Communist and Workers' Parties. Moscow. 1969*, Prague, 1969, p. 155.

[3] V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Moscow, Vol. 31, p. 32.

[4] G. Green, *The New Radicalism*, New York, 1971, p. 111.

[5] D. Marshak, D. Wooley, *The Student Movement in the US (1963-1973)*, Rutgers University Press, p. 18.

[6] *Theses for the XXth National Convention. Communist Party of the USA*, New York, 1971, p. 46.

[7] L. I. Brezhnev, *Communism Is to Be Built by the Young*, Moscow, 1974 p. 404 (in Russian).

[8] *UNESCO. General Commission, 18th Session, October 18, 1974*, Paris, 1974, p. 28.

[9] *Time*, December 13, 1976.

[10] *World Marxist Review*, No. 7, 1974, p. 15.

[11] *L'Unita*, January 9, 1975.

VIEWS AND OPINIONS

Parents and Children: Their Unique Social Roles

YURI RYURIKOV

What do children mean to mankind?

From the biological point of view, they mean maintenance of mankind's continuity; from the viewpoint of history, they spell out the future of mankind, a new step along the road of time; from the angle of political economy, they signify future producers, while from the positions of sociology, they will provide new generations of personalities that will make up the structure of the younger and dependent layers of society so as to subsequently turn into the structure of its fundamental and creative sections.

All these aspects are vital, of decisive importance, to mankind. Yet there is another role that is no less vital, and even unique: children play an important part in humanising man. His care and concern for children, his aspiration to make them and their lives better, become fundamental in man's makeup, becoming the very core of his mentality. That concern is not merely some ethico-psychological property but a foundation stone for everything that is human, the backbone of humanism, of which Marx said so well: "The feelings and pleasures of other people have become my *own* wealth." [1]

Most people think that rearing children is a kind of one-way arrangement, the passing down of spiritual experience from one level—the adults—to another—the children. However, genuine upbringing is always a kind of self-education at the same time, so that we receive from our children no less than we give them. Their very appearance creates new levels of mentality—and reveals a new realm—parental love.

Indeed, the children exert a direct influence on grown-ups—by all their appearance and their behaviour. Communication between the closely related is a kind of exchange of particles of personality, so that by imparting particles of self to children, grown-ups, in their turn, absorb particles of the children. As the ancients put it, like produces the like, so that our children's purity, trustfulness, frankness and outgoing simplicity all go to engender and then preserve in their parents certain adult variants of these spiritual qualities.

To their parents, children are a constant source of spiritual strength and creative abilities, constantly placing the parents in quandaries and puzzling them with all kinds of unexpected questions, which make grown-up exert their intellectual capacities. That instinct of seeking and learning which we call curiosity is one of the main passions in the child's mental makeup, so that its never-ending "whys" educate the educator in those parents that are capable of that development, and evoke in those that can cope an ability to mould and fashion mentality, both in the children and themselves.

It can thus be said, together with Wordsworth, that, in this sense too "the Child is Father of the Man", therein consisting the unique role of our children as promoters of the highest ideals in man. That role, however, is a spontaneous one and, what is more important, a potential one: it manifests itself in full only when social relations are built on similar humanising, i. e., socialist, principles, and whenever the adult section of society becomes aware of this transformative role of the children and enables it to manifest itself.

That awareness is making its first steps in the world, though many knotty problems and contradictions still exist, whose solution comes up against major social processes, demographic, socio-psychological, and socio-pedagogical.

DEMOGRAPHIC CONTRADICTIONS

Our times are marked by a transition from semi-animal and semi-biological birth-rates to such that are really human, that is to say, people are having that number of children they wish to and think themselves capable of rearing. That transition, however, is proceeding unevenly, in zigzag fashion, urban dwellers now standing at an extreme marked by a swing towards small families.

Weighed on the scales of progress, that swing has two aspects to it. Its moral and psychological shortcomings are obvious: one-child families are conducive to egocentrism and egoism in the child, that

later affecting his attitude towards the family, other people and his job.[2]

The economic shortcomings in a low birth-rate were well expressed by the Soviet sociologist Perevedentsev.[3] It was with good reason that the report of the CPSU Central Committee to the Party's 25th Congress said that, in the 1980s, we shall come up against "an aggravation of the problem of labour resources. We shall have to rely, not on enlisting additional labour power but solely on increasing labour productivity."[4]

But there are also advantages in a lower birth-rate, which today is producing no less benefit than harm, both for today and tomorrow.

Patriarchy has long been on the way out in our country, yielding place to a new system of relations between man and woman, relations which have not yet acquired a specific term but which might be called "biarchy".

The step by biarchical changes in our country are part of the Communist revolution, and are proceeding on three levels: in industry, in society and in the family. Their essence lies in a radical restructuring of the entire division of labour between men and women, a radical change in all the roles women play in life. From a domestic creature woman is also becoming an immediately social creature, and her membership of the "weaker sex" is now being replaced by equality. To put it in simpler terms, she is becoming the same motive force in society—and the same kind of individual—as man.[5]

The fall in the birth-rate is an important accelerator of such biarchical shifts, an important means for women themselves to spontaneously build up their equality with their menfolk, providing them with extra months and even years to catch up with the men, and moderating the difference between patriarchate and matriarchate which has been to the disadvantage of the latter. As established by Soviet sociologists L. Gordon and E. Klopov, women's disadvantages come to the fore after the birth of the first child, such disadvantages becoming greater the greater the number of children.[6]

A decline in the birth-rate also means the social modification of the biological difference between man and woman. It reduces woman's bio-social disadvantages and evens up her present position in life.

All this is a manifestation of the worldwide spurt on the part of woman to achieve equality with man. It is also a means of eliminating the new contradictions in woman's status by weakening the conflict between her domestic duties and her place in industry, reducing the strains on her, and protecting many urban women from nervous stresses and harm to their health, thereby enabling them to directly participate in society's working life.

The number of working women in cities and towns (i. e., engaged in industry or office work) has risen from 19 million to 54 million in our country during the past 25 years.[7] At present, women comprise over one half of all the gainfully employed and we are evidently indebted to them for over a half of what our country has produced during the past quarter-century.

The advantages of these processes to our economy today and to the entire social development of our country are obvious and have, in many respects, been made possible by the decline in woman's maternal burden.

Thus, the lower birth-rate is a dual and contradictory phenomenon, producing both social detriment and social advantage. It has been marked by a reduction in the number of children born from seven or eight to two or three, thus making a transition to a new and biarchical type of births "according to needs". Women now have to devote, not 15 to 16 years to child-bearing and raising as was the case in the past, but between three and four years. This has helped women achieve social equality with men, something precluded in the old conditions.

That is why the fundamental changes in the type of birth-rate to be seen in our country during the last 50 years have marked a process that has on the whole been progressive and positive. It has been brought about by the deep-lying and law-governed patterns of socialism: the transformation of woman into an active builder of society and the change in the division of labour between man and woman.[8]

However, the zigzags in this transition, the swing of the pendulum from a maximum to a minimum number of children are a remedy that has been forced on us, so that in healing one ailment it is engendering another, a discordance which can be removed, not through more discordance but through harmony. Judging by returns obtained by demographers, women are of the same opinion: with most of them, their maternal feelings have not been satisfied. About eighty per cent of the women questioned are of the opinion that in the ideal there should be from two to three children in the family.[9]

The demographers, too, think that two to three children is the optimum, three being preferable, since that number prevents any decline in the quality of their upbringing, the narrowing of the mother's interests or detriment to the interests of society. However, most families in our country have only one or two children.[10]

The change in the type of life-activities has also affected the entire system of women's requirements and their scale of values, including much in their attitude towards children. In the patriarchal system of values, the meaning of a woman's life

consisted in her being mother, wife, and housewife, in serving her children and her husband at home. Children stood on the higher rungs in that system, woman's prestige hinging directly on the number of children in the family: the more children she had, the better she was performing her duty in life.

In the biarchical system of values, the meaning of woman's life lies in a blending of her social and domestic roles; that system makes for a variety of interests and the satisfaction of all of woman's main human requirements, engendering in her a new scale of values, the primary of which, as shown in many sociological studies, being the need to achieve independence of man, both materially and morally, in her activities outside the home—at work, meeting other people, developing spiritually and professionally and in enjoying modern forms of spending leisure time. These new needs stand side by side with the old ones (marriage, maternity, and housewifery), sometimes restricting them.

The system of women's inner needs has become highly complex, contradictory and difficult to meet. The simplicity of her needs in the past—husband, children, the home—is gradually receding into the past, children occupying a far more modest place in the new scale of needs. The growth in woman's roles in life is obviously hampering the performance of each of these roles, demanding far more nervous energy, physical strength and time. It is common knowledge that, with most working women (especially young mothers), the working day has two dimensions—one at the job and the other at home. Women's maternal mission is rivalled by her vocation and makes her housekeeping duties more burdensome, all this imposing chronic overloads on women, both in the nervous and physical senses.

It is probable that woman has replied to this double burden by halving the number of births. The same burden has prevented many women from coping in full with their maternal role. The sociologists have long said that a sharp reduction of the burden borne by women is the main road towards an improvement in this area. Today that is one of the most important social problems confronting the country at large, and on its solution hinge many of the contradictions in the development of the family, everyday life, the demographic development of the country and the course of all social progress.

THE STRUCTURE OF THE URGE TO HAVE CHILDREN

Of late the demographers have more and more often been posing the question: what human needs do children satisfy? It is to be regretted that no reply has yet been forthcoming; it will

probably have to be a complex one based on the findings of various sciences, for children meet a wide range of human needs: social, economic, psychological, intellectual, emotional and biological, aesthetic and moral.

If one would proceed from the simple to the complex, one should probably begin with the emotional and biological need to pour out one's love and tenderness on one's own child, enjoy the life-giving force of the love which induces the infant, a love of life and a humane attitude towards the world.

Standing side by side with that need is another, which is also semi-instinctive, namely, to protect and defend the weak and helpless. But it is here that their sets in a transition to the ethico-psychological aspects of this highly complex and multi-layer need to have children.

The urge to protect others is intertwined in many people with a subconscious need to rule and control. With some it is elementary and superficially selfish. With others, it is a manifestation of the creative will, which fosters life in another creature. This is an important aspect of people's creative needs and is evidently a reduced manifestation of an ability whose powerful manifestation endows man with qualities of leadership.

Another aspect of the same question is a need to be an absolute attractor to another creature, an unreasoning and boundless love of self. With some, that kind of love flatters their vanity; with others it enhances a sense of responsibility for a helpless infant.

The human baby, unlike the newborn of animals, is totally helpless and completely dependent on grown-ups. The universally met sense of one's omnipotence, in respect of a little child, is an extraordinary feeling which seems to be provided by maternity alone. Perhaps far from all people are distinctly aware of that feeling, many simply vaguely sensing their supersignificance to another life. That vague feeling, however, is sharply distinct from the habitual and probably serves as an aspect of the parental urge.

The human need of children is also, of course, of an aesthetic character born of a desire to enjoy the beauty of the child and to help create that beauty, thereby satisfying one's sense of humour and merriness by participating in the life of the child.

A higher rung in the scale of that need is a blend of aesthetic and ethical needs—a striving to enjoy the child's inner beauty, its open soul, vivid feelings and the finest human qualities living in it.

Side by side with the above stands the intellectual aspect of the parental urge—enjoyment of the child's curiosity of the surrounding world, its spontaneous talent and the rapid rhythm of its growth and its changes. A developed manifestation of that need is

a conscious interest in the child's turn of mind and thinking, which is so original and distinct from the adult modes.

Ascending higher on the scale, we see that children meet one of man's most fundamental needs, that of a varied and full life, an alternation of occupations and various types of activities. A striving to that variety is the primary cell in human psychology, one of the fundamental birthmarks in man, as pointed out by the classics of Marxism and by Feuerbach in their studies of the specific in man as distinct from the animal.[11]

Finally comes what is probably the upper rung in man's need of children, one that involves all other rungs and can be divided into them: the need of spiritual and intellectual creativity, in giving the child and oneself loving kindness, joy and an interesting life, to build up the child's personality, thus influencing one's own. In other words, it is the establishing of Man in the little creature, the creation of an interesting human life which is probably the highest of all forms of human creativity. It is a manifestation, on the individual scale, of the gigantic creative efforts to restructure and humanise the world that man's finest forces have engaged in over many centuries.

The need of that dual spiritual creativity—to develop the child and oneself—is probably the most deep-lying and most promising feature in man's need of children. With the passage of time, that feature will probably be in ever greater keeping with the current changes in man's psychological nature: the gradual burgeoning of the spiritual in him, his striving towards creativity and the gradual increase in their roles in our life.

It is to be regretted that all this is unexplored territory in the realms of psychology, pedagogy, demography and sociology. Scholars have not even set foot on the shores of these undiscovered lands but are only trying to make out their contours from afar.

The children fill our needs at all levels, from the basic—the bio-psychological to those at the top, the ideally spiritual. Their influence pervades all our lives, from the conscious to the subconscious. However, in the conditions of today, the children also prevent us from totally meeting some other important requirements: they give us much but also take away; they give us a new freedom but also fetter us with a new dependence.

What changes are required for them to give us more and take away less? What should be done so that the finest they bring us should ever more subdue the worst that they also bring in their train: excesses of stress, women's backwardness and nervous breakdowns?

To achieve the practical changes needed in this area a theoretical foundation should be found, namely, an understanding of the socio-economic role of maternity and the socio-psychological status of mothers.

Of course, we are all aware that, with human beings, maternity is not merely a biological function, and not merely a continuation of life, as is the case with animals. It is in effect a continuation of the human race as such, a biological as well as a psychological and spiritual "creation" of man.

Here the socio-psychological role of mothers is no less important than the biological. Child-bearing is not merely a physical process: the mother also gives birth in the spiritual sense, imparting to the child the fundamental human emotions, the basics of an attitude to the world—the primary framework of a mentality on which the entire edifice of that mentality will then arise.

About one month, after its birth, the child's vital need is that of emotional impression, a spiritual and psychological need.

Most of us have an inverted idea of that need. In the main, grown-ups think that the only thing the baby stands in need of is food, sleep, care and health. However what the new-born human baby hungers after is not so much physical care but a kind of psychological involvement, the main food that turns it into a human being is the emotional.

N. Shchelovanov, the well-known pediatrist, has deduced from his observations that the baby's first smile and joys appear when it is tenderly spoken to, sung to and played with, i. e., during its psychological contacts.[12]

The psychologist M. Kistyakovskaya, who has made a study of the first months of a baby's life, has established that satisfying hunger and thirst, i.e., *biological* needs merely eliminates negative emotions and paves the way for positive ones, the latter being evoked by such things as a tender voice, bright toys, or the sounds of a rattle, i. e., emotional and *psychological* impressions.[13]

A baby that has a good health, has been fed and is dry but has no intake of psychological impressions begins to feel a "sensory hunger", a keen need of such impression. It begins to scream, wail and becomes upset. Psychological hunger induces a baby with negative sensation no less than physical hunger does.

Even given the best care and good food, any constant psychological hunger is oppressive to the child's entire organism; moreover it increases infantile mortality, something that the pediatrists and psychologists are well aware of.

Since *emotional* needs come first with the baby, its very mentality creates a primary need for *spiritual* contacts with grown-ups. It is upbringing in the *educational* sense that stands in the forefront, food holding second place.

More than anybode else, the baby needs its mother. In women, the emotional is developed far more than it is in men, which is why the mother's emotional nature is so close to that of the child. It is for that reason that the mother—a normal, healthy and loving mother—can provide a child with a greatest amount of spiritual food most easily imbibed by its mind, and therefore best suited to it.

Physicians and psychologists have noted that a baby stands in particular need of its mother during the first years of its life. The love and the individual approach provided by the mother are the two main conditions for the baby to develop into a human being.

It is the mother that fosters in the baby a love of life, a striving to achievements and a confidence in its surroundings—a biological and ethico-psychological foundation of all human activities. It is she who creates the initial phases of the subconscious and the conscious on which the future development of individuality hinges.[14]

In her maternal role, woman is the main progenitor of mankind as well as the main creator both of the human race and human labour power. Therein lies the unique socio-economic role of the mother, a role that can be performed by nobody else.

The mother's social status is probably the most important of all social statuses in society: the mother is the prime creator of the human "material" society consists of. It is this unique status that is probably in keeping with society's attitude to mothers.

It is precisely in the same way that the status and prestige of fatherhood should be appraised in the measure of its genuine value. A balanced impact of mother and father is necessary for the proper psychological development of children, as has been established by psychologists and teachers. Regrettably enough, that balance does not yet exist. In large families, it was not only the father but the grandfather, uncles and various in-laws that exerted an influence on the children. In small families, the father alone is the sole source of male influence, but even he pays little attention to the children in the majority of families.[15] Men are not employed at crèches, and there are few men teachers at schools, especially primary schools.[16]

It is almost exclusively female influences that come into play during the period when character is being moulded—in childhood. Male influence on children is becoming a big social and psychological problem. Many children feel a lack of male influence, this giving rise to tangible shortcomings and dishar-

mony in their development. This refers, in the main, to boys, and it is for that reason that many youths become effeminate, while others display aggressive and distorted forms of masculinity.

This shortcoming is also having a negative effect on girls. Many of them lack any subconscious male ideal, which is very important to them. As a rule, such an ideal develops in children and juveniles in the family, and in later years influences their preferences in matters of love. Many psychologists have noted that daughters of good fathers usually choose young men resembling the latter, while daughters of bad fathers choose their opposites.

It is for such reasons that a sharply enhanced participation of fathers in the upbringing of children is one of the main needs of today's families and a prime condition for the improvement of the atmosphere therein. The establishment of "biarchy" in the sphere of upbringing would also serve to reduce the consumer attitudes of many fathers to all their families, make many mothers' lives easier and have a favourable effect on generations of children by restoring the balance of male and female influences there.

Special measures would seem to be necessary to enhance the prestige of fatherhood and the degree of men's participation in the affairs of their families. Extensive educational work among fathers is necessary so as to make them understand the importance of fathers' participation in rearing their children, which particular qualities a father is better suited to inculcate in his children, and which a mother should.

Measures of an extra-family and social nature are necessary to enhance the role of men in the upbringing the children, this should include their involvement in work at crèches and kindergartens, and restoring the balance between men and women teachers at school.

THE UNIQUE NATURE OF EARLY CHILDHOOD

In his old age, Leo Tolstoy made the following entry in his diary: "From me a new-borne baby, to me at the age of five is a vast distance, from the age of five to the me of today is a mere stone's throw."

Indeed, during the first years of life, the baby travels a tremendous route from the pre-human to the human, and acquires the main human skills and ability.

By the age of three, the weight of its brain trebles as against the moment of birth; the growth between the age of three and the rest of a human being's life equals only one quarter. Consequently, it is in early childhood that the greater part of the brain's organic development takes place, and consequently the development of the nervous system in general.

During those years, the child learns all the main kinds of movements—standing, walking and in the main, the use of its arms and body. During the same period, there is a maturing of the main emotions, human feelings and the fundamental features of character and personality.

The child also learns to use the main channels of communication between itself and other people, the world about him. It is in early childhood that almost all the main features that qualitatively distinguish man from animals take shape. No other age in man sees such a mass of gigantic leaps and changes, at no later age will he experience such a concentrated and rapid degree of maturement.

All this testifies to the unique nature of development in early childhood, which is radically distinct from adult development. The first four or five years of life see the extremely rapid growth of almost all the main human features, the rest of human life being marked by a far slower development of those features and their augmentation by certain other basic features.

This was well expressed by Anton Makarenko, the world-known Soviet teacher and writer, who, in full agreement with Tolstoy, wrote the following: "The foundations of the upbringing are laid down before the age of five. What you have done until that age is ninety per cent of the entire process of upbringing. What follows is merely a continuation of the process, the refinement of what goes to make up a man. On the whole, you then begin to reap the harvest, the preparatory work being done up to the age of five." [17]

Incidentally, there is nothing new in these words. Jan Amos Komensky and Jean-Jacques Rousseau wrote in much the same vein.

This truth was finally established by the science of psychology in the 20th century. Of late, psychologists and teachers have been speaking more and more of the exceptional importance of children's early development. As they see it, the child accumulated by the age of five about half of all the basic information about the world about him and travels half the distance towards imbibing its intellectual stock.

In his book *The Scientific and Technological Revolution and the Revolution in Education* (Moscow, Politizdat Publishers, 1973), V. Turchenko, a Novosibirsk scholar, writes that the experience of numerous psychologists and teachers of many countries has shown that it is the pre-school age, and not the school age, that is of decisive importance in character-building.

Early childhood is man's most receptive period, which is why the potential role of both parents is so vital.

Of course, the brain of the new-borne child contains hereditary predispositions and reflexes formed in the uterine period. Otherwise, his brain is a *tabula rasa*, ready to eagerly absorb a spate of impressions. It is those impressions that create the child's mind.

These first impressions are the most fundamental in life and remain embedded in the mind throughout one's life. They become deep-rooted in the mind, laying down its fundamentals and therefore performing a highly formative function in character-building. Indeed, it is the first impressions of childhood which, together with the congenital nervous characteristics, go to make up the backbone of character and individuality and are the point of departure in the child's perception of the world and its attitude to it.

That is why the first months and years of childhood are an age which sees the formation of the lasting qualities of the mentality, which they will pervade until the end, providing the basis for all other psychological additions, whose fate will depend greatly upon early and primary layers of mentality.

THE PHYSICAL AND SPIRITUAL CARE

It is far more difficult nowadays to bring up children than was the case in the past, when that consisted in the main in physical care. The spiritual aspect used to proceed without any guidance, in the very course of life.

The need for guidance of the child's intellectual and spiritual development has grown immensely, this making the process of upbringing far more complicated, particularly in view of the advance of the scientific and technological revolution and the demands it will present to the family in the rearing children.

Most parents are not prepared for such activities, the lack of knowledge in this area comprising an acute social problem. Doctors have noted that more than 50 per cent of young parents who are college graduates have no idea of how an infant's life should be ordered. Things are far worse in the area of infants' moral, emotional and intellectual upbringing. Such ignorance is intolerable, and extensive work is necessary to make it yield place to genuine educative culture based in the latest knowledge in many sciences, such as the physiology of child development, biology, child psychology, pedagogy, social psychology, sociology, demography, ethics and aesthetics.

Radical changes are being brought about in the theory and practice of child upbringing as a result of the scientific and technological revolution. In the new conditions of urbanisation,

with its lower demands on physical development and the ever greater intellectual and nervous strains, there must be an entirely new approach to children's development, especially in view of the necessity, created by the scientific and technological revolution, of rearing children with an allround development.

It is for all these reasons that pedagogical enlightenment is becoming a most important means of improving the entire family situation and the socialisation of each new generation. Consideration should evidently be given to setting up a nation-wide network of such educational facilities and the inclusion of that discipline in the curricula of higher schools, as well as to the organisation of training courses for young parents, and similar measures.

Genuine parenthood implies, not only physical effort but a great deal of spiritual and intellectual involvement. It is to be regretted that many parents still confine themselves to purely physical care, nursing, washing and the other such services required. They consider the educative aspect the concern of the crèches, the kindergartens and the schools, thereby denying themselves the most engrossing aspect of parenthood, undeniably the most complex and difficult but yet the most rewarding. They turn parenthood into an arduous burden and themselves into servants of their children; they also forfeit a most powerful instrument of self-development, particularly moral and humanistic, and hold back that creative potential.

However, the correct upbringing of children demands that the parents themselves do all they can to educate themselves and improve their parental qualification, intellectually, morally and emotionally. It is only along that road that success can be achieved.

Together with working and social collectives, the family is one of society's principal nuclei, a foundation that makes a vital contribution to social development and progress. Neglect in this area cannot but lead to disproportion and contradictions in the development of society.

It is the family that lays the foundations of the individual's personality and his attitude to the world about him. It is to those foundations that all other influences are later added, the impact of those influences and the way they are translated into behaviour depending in considerable measure on the foundations laid down in the family. That is why the family, no less than other social nuclei, determines the moral, ideological and intellectual level of society's make-up.

It is within the family that the special relations can evolve in which, when we become parents, we can achieve a full awareness—not only with the mind but integrally, with all our being—of what the supreme ideal should be of a worthy attitude to one's fellow men.

Children have a globally social role in our lives. By their very status in the system of human relations, this junior part of mankind places their seniors in a position which (of course, given progressive social conditions) gives rise to and maintains the finest human qualities in the latter. In the family, children give to humanity what the lofty ideals and principles of social organisation give society. In that lies their inimitable and vital role for humanity.

NOTES

[1] Karl Marx and Frederick Engels, *From Early Works*, Moscow, 1956, p. 592 (in Russian).

[2] More than one-third of all families in our country (35 per cent) are one-child families, the urban rate standing at 41 per cent (*Results of the All-Union Census of 1970*, Vol. 7, p. 250, in Russian).

[3] V. Perevedentsev, "The Family—Yesterday, Today and Tomorrow", *Nash sovremennik*, No. 6, 1975, pp. 121-122.

[4] L. I. Brezhnev, *Report of the CPSU Central Committee and the Immediate Tasks of the Party in Home and Foreign Policy. 25th Congress of the CPSU*, Moscow, 1976, p. 52.

[5] For further details of the biarchical revolution and the very concept see my article "Love and the Family Today" in the journal *Molodoi kommunist*, No. 10, 1975.

[6] L. A. Gordon, E. V. Klopov, *Man's Leisure. Social Problems of Life After Working Hours*, Moscow, 1972 (in Russian).

[7] *The USSR in Figures for 1977*, Moscow, 1978, p. 175 (in Russian).

[8] This has been convincingly dealt with by demographers A. Volkov, A. Vishnevsky and L. Darsky in the collection *Birth-rates*, Moscow, 1976 (in Russian).

[9] Such women comprise between 80 and 90 per cent in the zone of small families—Russia and the other European republics of the USSR (V. A. Belova, *The Number of Children in the Family*, Moscow, 1975, pp. 93-94, in Russian).

[10] Seventy per cent of all families belong to this type in the cities, the average for the country as a whole standing at 62 per cent (*Results of the All-Union Census of 1970*, Vol. 7, p. 250.

[11] Ludwig Feuerbach, *Gründsätze der Philosophie der Zukunft*, Frankfort on the Main, 1967; Karl Marx, *Grundrisse der Kritik der politischen Ökonomie (Rohentwurf) 1857-1858*, Berlin, 1953, p. 387; Karl Marx, *Capital*, Vol. I, Moscow, 1969, p. 458; Frederick Engels, *Anti-Dühring*, Moscow, 1969, p. 348; August Bebel, *Society of the Future*, Moscow, 1976, p. 48.

[12] N. I. Shchelovanov, *Crèches and Infant's Homes. Problems of Upbringing*, Moscow, 1960, p. 65 (in Russian).

[13] *Voprosy psikhologii*, No. 2, 1965, pp. 137-138.

[14] Karl Bühler, *Die geistige Entwicklung des Kindes*, Jena, 1922; Ch. Bühler, H. Hetzer, B. Tudor-Hart, *Soziologische und psychologische Studien über das erste Lebensjahr*, Jena; Jean Piaget, *Le langage et la pensée chez l'enfant*, Paris, 1923. Publications in Russian: *Questions of Pre-School Age Psychology*, Moscow-Leningrad, 1948; D. B. Elkonin, *Child Psychology*, Moscow, 1960; M. I. Lisina, "The Influence of Relations With Adult Relatives on the Child's Development in Early Age", *Voprosy psikhologii*, No. 3, 1961; M. Yu. Kistyakovskaya, "On Stimuli Evoking Positive Emotions in a Baby During the First Months of Its Life",

Voprosy psikhologii, No. 2, 1965; A. N. Leontiev, *Problems of the Development of the Mind*, Moscow, 1965; I. A. Arshavsky, *Studies on Child Physiology*, Moscow, 1967; B. P. Nikitin, "A Hypothesis of the Inception of Creative Abilities", in the collection: *Sociological and Economic Problems of Education*, Novosibirsk, 1969; P. M. Aksarina, *The Education of Children at an Early Age*, Moscow, 1972; P. M. Aksarina, *The Main Stages and Features in the Development of the Higher Nervous Activities in Children of an Early Age*, Moscow, 1974.

[15] G. A. Slesarev and Z. A. Yankova ascertain that in Moscow, in 65 per cent of working families children are brought up by the mothers alone (*Social Problems of Labour and Production*, Moscow, 1969, p. 433, in Russian). There are some other studies on an insignificant role of the fathers in the families (N. V. Gavrilova, "Breaking Family Functions as an Object of Sociological Study"; O. I. Ivanov, "The Family, Society and Socialisation of the Individual", both in *The Family as an Object of Philosophical and Sociological Study*, Leningrad, 1974, in Russian).

[16] *Women in the USSR. A Statistical Collection*, Moscow, 1975, p. 86 (in Russian).

[17] A. S. Makarenko, *On the Upbringing in the Family*, Moscow, 1955, p. 144 (in Russian).

SCIENTIFIC LIFE

THE SOVIET POLITICAL SCIENCES ASSOCIATION

The Soviet Political Sciences Association (SPSA) was established in 1960. Its activities are a reflection of the development of the political sciences in the Soviet Union and of the growing need for greater cooperation between specialists in different spheres of knowledge investigating political problems. The SPSA is "a voluntary scientific association of people who engage in studies in the political sciences, established in accordance with Article 51 of the Constitution of the USSR" (Article 1 of the Charter adopted on May 11, 1978). The Association is affiliated to the USSR Academy of Sciences and functions under the auspices of the Social Sciences Section of the Academy's Presidium.

The Association's supreme body is its All-Union Conference, which convenes at least once a year. The Conference sets the guidelines for the Association, discusses research papers and reports on topical problems in the political sciences, elects the President, Vice-President and General Secretary, the Executive Committee and Auditing Commission.

There are territorial sections of the Association in six cities, and it also has sections on various spheres of science and groups on fundamental problems.

The Association's basic tasks are defined as: the promotion of creative work in the political sciences; their development in a spirit of democracy, humanism and social progress; the participation in measures to enhance the political standards of the people and popularisation and dissemination of political knowledge; criticism of unscientific theories and views in the political domain; the strengthening of understanding and international cooperation between political scholars.

Lately Soviet scholars have been working on a wide range of problems in the political sciences. The effectiveness of that work depends in many respects on the coordination of various researches in this field. The SPSA has an important part to play in coordinating these researches.

One of the latest undertakings in this sphere was a symposium "Political Relations: Planning and Forecasting", sponsored jointly by the SPSA, the Soviet Sociological Association, the USSR Philosophic Society and the Soviet Internation-

al Law Association. The All-Union SPSA Conference in May 1978 discussed "The New Constitution of the USSR and the Tasks in Political Studies".

Since 1975, the Association has been putting out a yearbook. Each edition is devoted to a certain theme. The *1975 Yearbook* (Moscow, Nauka Publishers, 1976), was devoted to the topic, "International Relations, Politics and Personality"; the *1976 Yearbook* (Moscow, Nauka Publishers, 1977) was on "Peaceful Coexistence and Social and Political Development"; the *1977 Yearbook* (Moscow, Nauka Publishers, 1978) was on "Political Relations: Planning and Forecasting".

The articles and reviews cover topical issues extensively debated by Soviet and foreign researchers.

The *Yearbook* extensively reports achievements of the political sciences in the socialist countries. The said issues carried reviews of papers by scientists from the GDR, Hungary, Poland and Rumania at the 10th Congress of the International Political Science Association and articles by authors from Bulgaria and Cuba on questions of peaceful coexistence.

The *Yearbook* also carries information and reference material on the activities of the SPSA, and bibliographical reviews of Soviet political literature.

The Association has been actively promoting international contacts in recent years. It is a member of the International Political Science Association (IPSA) and takes an active part in the functioning of its bodies (notably, SPSA President G. Shakhnazarov is a Vice-President of IPSA), as well as in international political science congresses, conferences, meetings and symposiums and also in sessions of national political science associations.

In September 1977, SPSA representatives for the first time attended a congress in Rabat, Morocco, of the African Association of Political Science, formed in 1974 by the national associations of a number of African countries. In August-September 1977, SPSA members attended a round table conference on "Political Culture" sponsored by IPSA in Cracow. In April 1978, representatives of the Soviet and Finnish national political science associations met for the first time in Helsinki, where they exchanged information on political research in both countries. They also signed a cooperation protocol between the two associations.

In August 1978, an SPSA delegation took part in a round table discussion on "Technocracy and Its Control with Special Reference to the Developing Countries", sponsored by IPSA in Rio-de-Janeiro. Representatives of the Soviet and Brazilian associations exchanged information on the functioning of their organisations and the development of the political sciences in their countries.

SPSA cooperation with the political science associations of the socialist countries is steadily expanding. In April 1977, a conference of representatives of these associations and an international symposium on "Current Problems of the Development of the Political Sciences and a Critical Analysis of the Present State of Bourgeois Politology" was held at Liblice, Czechoslovakia.

As is known, the 11th World IPSA Congress will be held in the summer of 1979 in Moscow.

The preparations for the congress occupied a key place in the

work of the SPSA in 1978-1979. A national organisational committee of 37 members has been set up. It has held a number of national scientific conferences on the topics of the congress. Collections of papers to be submitted by the Soviet delegation have been published in Russian, English and French. The committee has in many ways promoted the expansion of business contacts with national political science associations in other countries.

At a meeting with members of the IPSA Programme Committee, in March 1978 in Moscow, Vice-President of the USSR Academy of Sciences P. Fedoseyev stressed that politologists had a special responsibility for moulding constructive political consciousness in their countries. On behalf of Soviet scientists, he expressed the conviction that the Moscow IPSA congress would be a forum for the scientific discussion of outstanding problems of mankind in the name of humanism and social progress.

V. Smirnov,
General Secretary,
Soviet Political
Sciences Association

COOPERATION BETWEEN LITERARY CRITICS OF SOCIALIST COUNTRIES

Last year literary scholars from eight socialist countries (Bulgaria, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, the German Democratic Republic, Hungary, Mongolia, Poland and the USSR) held an inauguration meeting of the Problem Commission of multilateral cooperation for studying "The Laws of Development of World Literature". They discussed the lines of research to be undertaken by the commission for the next few years. Regular plenary sessions will be held in Berlin in 1979 and in Budapest in 1980. The Director of the Gorky Institute of World Literature of the USSR Academy of Sciences, G. Berdnikov, Corresponding Member of the USSR Academy of Sciences, was elected Chairman of the Commission.

At the 25th Congress of the CPSU, L. I. Brezhnev said: "The ties between socialist states are becoming ever closer with the flowering of each socialist nation and the strengthening of their sovereignty, and elements of community are increasing in their policy, economy, and social life. There is a gradual levelling up of their development. This process of a gradual drawing together of socialist countries is now operating quite definitely as an objective law."

Cooperation between the fraternal socialist countries has considerably expanded in recent years in all spheres: political, economic, ideological and scientific. This was pointed out in the Report to the 25th CPSU Congress: "Many scientific trends are now being developed by the collective effort of scholars of socialist countries."

This statement, as the discussion among the participants in the inauguration meting has shown, can be fully applied to literary studies. Cooperation between literary scholars of socialist countries has been carried out for already quite a number of years. Members of the Commission agreed that this cooperation had proved its viability and

yielded important results. Fruitful work has been and is being conducted in the study of international literary ties.

Back in 1964, a joint work, *Hungarian-Russian Literary Ties*, was published in Russian and Hungarian. It traces the mutual influence of Russian and Hungarian literatures in the light of the development of realism.

Also in 1964, *Czechoslovak-Soviet Literary Ties*, prepared jointly by Soviet and Czechoslovak scholars, came off the press. It discussed various aspects of mutual enrichment of Soviet and Czechoslovak literatures. A number of articles in the book deal with the study of Soviet literature in Czechoslovakia. Other articles show the profound interest of the Soviet reading public and Soviet critics in Czech and Slovak literatures after the October Revolution of 1917.

In 1964, a joint work, *Rumanian-Russian Literary Ties*, was published in Russian and Rumanian. It covered the period from the latter half of the 19th century to the early 20th century. The book gives a comprehensive picture of Rumanian-Russian ties in the field of literature and discusses the historical reasons for which Russian literature proved to be an important factor in the development of Rumanian literature. One article is devoted to the subject of the study of Rumanian literature in Russia before 1917.

Polish-Russian Literary Ties, published in Moscow in 1970, and compiled by Soviet specialists in Polish literature and Polish cultural history, is a successful attempt to systematise literary ties. It discusses the mutual influence of Polish and Russian literatures from the 17th to the 20th century, including the contemporary period. An analogous work prepared by our Polish colleagues was published in 1969.

In 1971, another joint Soviet-Czechoslovak work came off the press: "*Czechoslovak-Russian Literary Ties: Typological Aspect*" (in Russian). All the articles in the book have a scientific approach: they examine typological analogies in Russian literature, on the one hand, and in Czech and Slovak literatures, on the other. The authors show that literary influences are largely determined by similarities in cultural and social processes which account for their character in the given epoch.

Another monograph, jointly prepared by Soviet and Czechoslovak scholars, *Czech-Russian and Slovak-Russian Literary Ties*, is now in press in Prague. .

Meetings and Cooperation. Soviet and German Literature. Historical and Theoretical Aspects (in German, Berlin, Academia-Verlag, 1972, 1973) has gone through two editions.

In 1975, a joint Soviet-Yugoslav work was published in Russian: *Russian-Yugoslav Literary Ties. The Latter Half of the 19th-Early 20th Centuries*. It examines the many-faceted ties between Russian literature and the literatures of the Yugoslav peoples in the period of the emergence of realism in Yugoslav literatures.

A major joint literary project is the two-volume *Russian-Bulgarian Folklore and Literary Ties* (1976-1977). It examines all stages of the development of Russian-Bulgarian literary ties from the 11th to our time.

In 1977, the Academic Council of the Gorky Institute of World Literature of the USSR Academy of Sciences and its counterpart,

the Institute of Language and Literature of the Academy of Sciences of the Mongolian People's Republic approved for publication their joint work *Mongolian Literature and Its Ties with the Literatures of Neighbouring Countries*, in which Mongolian literature is presented against the background of its ideological and aesthetic connections with Soviet literature and Asian literatures.

Along with works of a local character, so to say, literary scholars of socialist countries have carried out studies of a generalising nature. A good example is the work prepared by Soviet and Hungarian scholars—*European Romanticism* (published in Moscow in 1973, and later in English in Hungary). This work marks an important stage in the study of the general trends of Romanticism, its development in European countries and the various types of Romanticism whose origin lies in the social and cultural history of the peoples of Europe. The work examines 20th-century literature in the European context. A comparison of the images in romantic literature with those in painting and music imparts to the book features of a major study in the history of art.

The book *Semiotics and Artistic Creation*, a joint work of Soviet and Hungarian scholars, published in 1977, discusses the semiotic approach and other methods of studying literary works.

Researchers at the Gorky Institute of World Literature received much help from their colleagues in the GDR, when preparing *A History of the Literature of the German Democratic Republic*.

Many more examples could be cited showing fruitful bilateral cooperation between scholars of socialist countries. There are also many cases of successful cooperation on a multilateral basis. Often these are jointly-prepared monographs containing papers based on reports delivered at international conferences or symposiums.

The book *The Great October Socialist Revolution and World Literature* (Moscow, 1970), was compiled on the basis of the materials of an international conference. It contains articles by literary scholars from Bulgaria, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, the GDR, Hungary, Mongolia, Poland, Rumania, the USSR and Yugoslavia. They deal with the influence exerted by the October Revolution and its ideas on the intellectual and cultural life of mankind and with the ideological impact of Soviet literature and Soviet aesthetic theories on world literature.

An international conference held in Moscow resulted in the publication of a joint work *Comparative Study of Slavic Literatures* (Moscow, 1973), to which scholars of all the European socialist countries contributed.

An important subject—"Modern Progressive Literature and the World Revolutionary Process"—is now being studied on a multilateral basis. This was the subject of an international symposium held in Berlin in October 1977 and devoted to the 60th Anniversary of the Great October Socialist Revolution. It was attended by scholars from Czechoslovakia, the GDR, Hungary, Poland, the USSR, and Vietnam. The materials of the symposium will form the basis for a collective monograph on the subject.

Another joint work which will soon be published is *Current Problems in the Study of the Literatures of*

Socialist Countries, which is based on the materials of an international conference "The General and the Particular in the Literatures of the European Socialist Countries" which was held in Moscow in 1975.

The International Bibliography for *A History of German Literature*, compiled by the Volk und Wissen Publishers in the German Democratic Republic and the Gorky Institute of World Literature, with the active participation of Bulgarian, Czechoslovak, Hungarian, Polish, Rumanian and Yugoslav scholars, has been highly praised by experts from many countries. Four volumes have already appeared and the fifth is now being prepared, the one which will cover the period from 1964 to 1975.

A collective work, *Literature in a Changing World. Problems of Today's Ideological and Aesthetic Struggle* (Moscow, 1975), is a milestone in literary study in socialist countries. It has also been published in Bulgarian. Among its authors are leading scholars from Bulgaria, the GDR, Hungary and the USSR. This monograph is devoted to questions of the theory of socialist realism, the international significance of the multinational Soviet literature and the specific features of the literature of socialist realism in developed socialist society. The book discusses at length problems of socialist realism as they manifest themselves in the literature of different countries and the various forms of ideological struggle against bourgeois and revisionist concepts in literature and literary criticism.

Noting these and other achievements of joint work, participants in the meeting at the same time pointed out that the forms of collective activity should be improved. Bilateral cooperation between literary institutes had prevailed so far; such cooperation, as a rule, prior to the publication of the relevant material, was not known to institutes in countries not taking part in the project, and sometimes not even to related institutes in the countries involved. Meanwhile, many of such projects could have been fruitfully carried out on a multilateral basis.

The disadvantage of poor information flow and of the absence of a permanent forum providing opportunities for a systematic exchange of views and for discussing the most important literary trends and subjects of research from a scholarly, social and political point of view, has lately been increasingly felt. And this is only natural. For the questions studied by literary scholars today are acquiring an ever greater ideological significance, and literary studies are more and more becoming an international science, as it has been justly noted by the head of the Bulgarian delegation, Boyan Nichev.

Welcoming the establishment of the Problem Commission of multilateral cooperation, the participants in the meeting unanimously noted that conditions were now being created for a qualitatively new stage of joint work of scholars in the fraternal socialist countries.

On the basis of an analysis of the research projects, that have already been completed, or are now being carried out, and with account taken of the interests of the literary institutes of the participating countries and also of the scientific and ideological significance of possible subjects for joint work, the main fields of multilateral cooperation were defined and adopted for

periods extending to the end of the current and of the next five-year period. Priority research subjects for each of the basic fields were formulated: one for each of the eight participating countries. The centres of literary study in these countries have undertaken to set up working groups on the assigned subjects and these groups are to submit to the Problem Commission concrete proposals concerning the subject and forms of their research, research timetables, and the composition of research teams.

The broadest field of research approved by the participants in the meeting is "History of World Literature". It will cover a wide range of problems and subjects which are now being studied at the respective institutes in all the countries of the socialist community on the basis of bilateral or multilateral cooperation.

A major project which offers great possibilities for cooperation on many subjects is the multi-volume *History of World Literature* now being prepared by the Gorky Institute of World Literature. This work will not be composed of essays or articles on the history of the literatures of individual countries, as has been done before, but will disclose the logical process of development of world literature from ancient times to our day. Such project is being undertaken for the first time in the history of literary studies anywhere in the world.

Thus, it was not accidental that during the discussion of the Problem Commission's future work its members noted the timeliness of scientific studies of the laws governing the development of literature. The importance of a study of the emergence of socialist realism and of the formation of a world literature of socialist realism was especially emphasised.

A number of historical and literary investigations will continue, along the line of *History of World Literature*, on a bilateral basis, and new projects will be started in which specialists from many countries will take part. Thus, Polish scholars will coordinate research on the subject "Baroque and Romanticism. Their Essence and National Features in European Literatures"; scholars from the German Democratic Republic will direct work on the subject "American Literature of the Epoch of Imperialism and Present-Day Ideological Struggle"; and Hungarian scholars will organise and supervise research on a subject which they themselves have proposed, namely, the ideological and aesthetic evolution of humanist artists of the 20th century.

The study of literary ties, both bilateral and multilateral, will be continued. It was noted that systematic exchanges of information, ideas, observations, and conclusions within the framework of the Problem Commission would contribute to a better understanding of the history of the national literatures of the participating countries, and that in some cases, such activities might be conducted jointly by scholars of two or more countries.

At first glance the second field—"The General and the Particular in the Literatures of Socialist Countries"—does not seem to go beyond the confines of the first field. However, the participants in the meeting decided to single it out, above all, owing to its literary and social significance.

Almost all members of the Commission noted the growing impor-

tance of the study of the literatures of the socialist countries and the process of their mutual enrichment and drawing together. Much work has been carried out on this subject, and the research continues. A monograph, *Art and Socialist Reality*, is now being prepared by scholars from several socialist countries. Scholars in the USSR and the GDR have begun work on a book entitled: *Traditions and the History of the Multinational Soviet Literature. Dialectics of the National and the International in the Development of Socialist Literature.* Soviet scholars have undertaken to submit proposals on collective works on the subject "The Role of Fiction in Building Developed Socialist Society".

The third field—"Realistic Literature in the Modern World"—should cover the entire ideological and aesthetic wealth of contemporary realistic literature.

As the participants in the meeting pointed out, the study of this sphere of modern art is necessary because today the successes of the realistic trend in literature are becoming increasingly evident, and together with this also its significance for determining the immediate and long-term development prospects of world literature. This explains the acute ideological struggle being waged in the world today around the questions of realistic art, its relation to other trends, its social role, etc.

On this subject, too, a certain amount of work has been jointly carried out. We have mentioned earlier the works which have been completed or are nearing completion, and which deal with the main aspects of this subject. They include *The Great October Socialist Revolution and World Literature*, and *Modern Progressive Literature and the World Literary Process* which will soon be published. A Soviet-Bulgarian symposium resulted in the publication of the work *Ideological and Artistic Features of Modern Literature* (Sofia, 1975). An international conference devoted to the 60th Anniversary of the Great October Revolution was held in Moscow in October 1977. It was attended by many scholars from socialist countries. The Gorky Institute of World Literature is now preparing a collective monograph on the subject. And one more work should be mentioned here—*Problems of the Formation of the World Literature of Socialist Realism, 1917-1945.*

Participants in the conference have agreed jointly to prepare a study on the subject of "Realistic Literature and the Revolutionary Movement in Latin American Countries". Scholars from Cuba will coordinate work for this project.

Research will be continued on other aspects of this problem, too.

Finally, the fourth field—"Problems of the Theory of Literature and Methodology of Modern Literary Study"—is also a very broad one, covering the most diverse problems. They include numerous questions of the theory of literature, new problems and schools in modern literary research, theoretical interpretation of modern literature, further elaboration of the theory of socialist realism, criticism of the latest trends of non-Marxist literary study and aesthetics, and many other burning problems in the field of literary study.

Some of these problems were discussed at the Commission's meetings. Its members also raised a

number of other questions: bibliographic research, preparation of reference works, etc. S. Volman from Czechoslovakia, emphasised the broad scope and the importance of the tasks to be carried out by literary scholars and pointed out that they could not be tackled without the so-called auxiliary work.

He also called attention to the problem of scientific terminology, because some terms and phenomena are understood and defined differently in different countries. The participants in the meeting agreed that it was necessary to carry on scientific auxiliary work. The Czechoslovak representatives are to draft, for the next meeting of the Commission, proposals on the forms of conducting bibliographic work.

Three working groups have been set up to carry out research in the fourth field. Bulgarian scholars are to coordinate work on the subject "Ideological Struggle and Current Problems of Modern Literary Studies and Aesthetics". Mongolian scholars are to submit proposals on defining the theoretical, historical and literary problems of another subject—"The Specific Features of the Formation of the Literatures of the Peoples Who Have Bypassed the Stage of Capitalist Development".

The members of the commission stressed the importance of further work on the methodology of comparative study of literatures. Czechoslovak scholars are to submit research proposals on this subject.

The members of the Problem Commission agreed that the most diverse forms of work should be adopted. These include small-size conferences where specialists can exchange views on possible ways of dealing with the problem they are interested in, or inform one another of the work in progress; meetings on scholarly and organisational matters; and scholarly meetings and conferences which would draw the attention of the broad public and help it to better understand contemporary literature. The participants in the meeting called for close cooperation of scholars in all countries with writers.

The sessions of the Problem Commission were held in an atmosphere of friendship and mutual understanding. The participants displayed a constructive approach which helped solve all questions on the agenda.

It was a good beginning and much strenuous work lies ahead on implementing everything that has been agreed on by the participants in the inauguration meeting.

G. Berdnikov

Congresses • Conferences • Symposiums

WORLD CONGRESS OF SOCIOLOGY

The old university town of Upsala (Sweden) was the venue of the Ninth World Congress of Sociology. It was held in August 1978 and attended by more than 3000 people from 50 countries. The Soviet Union was represented by a delegation of 98 sociologists from many Union Republics and scientific centres. It was headed by Corresponding Member of the USSR Academy of Sciences T. Ryabushkin. In all there were more than 300 delegates from socialist countries.

In the 30 years of the International Sociological Association (ISA) such congresses have become authoritative scientific forums. The programme of the Ninth Congress scheduled four plenary sessions, 17 working groups, 12 symposiums, 14 special sessions, 26 ad hoc groups, and 34 research committees.

The main theme of the Congress—"Paths of Social Development"—offered every opportunity for comparing various theoretical concepts and socio-political approaches to the cardinal problems facing mankind.

The undoubted and increasing influence of the Marxist-Leninist sociological theory upon broad scientific circles abroad was a feature of this most representative international meeting of sociologists. This was admitted, in particular, by the eminent British scholar T. Bottomore, former ISA President, who, discussing a wide range of sociological concepts of the 20th century, in his opening address noted the growing influence of Marxism.

The four plenary sessions revealed the ideological and theoretical confrontation between Marxism and present-day bourgeois thought on key issues of social development. The joint report by Corresponding Members of the USSR Academy of Sciences M. Rutkevich and J. Gvishiani devoted to the Marxist conception of the theoretical modelling of global problems of mankind's development and, to the methodological significance of materialistic dialectics in sociology, stood in the focus of attention at the first plenary session. The report contained a critical analysis of the philosophical and sociological basis of the models of global de-

velopment proposed by the Club of Rome, outlined positive ways for the solution of the most complex methodological problems, including the use of mathematical models and computers. It was emphasised that radical social transformations, the genuine economic, social and spiritual liberation of the developing countries, the prevention of a nuclear world war, the ending of the arms race and consolidation of international detente are needed if the global problems facing mankind, such as the environment, energy, raw materials, food and the prevention of diseases, are to be fully solved. The report "Deterministic, Voluntaristic and Intermediary Theories of Social Development" by A. Etzioni and communications made by, among others, S. Rokkan (Norway) and N. Smelser (USA) revealed a trend in modern Western sociology to interpret the prospects of social development, and particularly the problems of the developing countries, in the spirit of the "modernisation" and "post-industrial society" concepts advanced as an alternative to the Marxist point of view. Soviet scholars and Marxists from other countries showed the main weakness of these concepts: the elimination of the key factor of social development—the economic basis, the relations of ownership of the means of production and, on this basis, the distorted interpretation of the correlation between economics and politics, the essence of political guidance and the nature of the ultimate goals and ideals of social life.

At the plenary session devoted to the problem "Spontaneity and Planning in Social Development" its raporteur Corresponding Member of the USSR Academy of Sciences, T. Zaslavskaya, described the social and class content and the limited character of the elements of planning in antagonistic bourgeois society. Drawing upon the practical experience of socio-economic planning in the USSR over the past fifty years and in other socialist countries, she revealed the humanistic nature of the aims of planning in a socialist state of the whole people, the mechanisms for ensuring planned national economic development and the harmonious blending of the interests of various classes, social strata and groups of society under mature socialism, the ways of the further democratisation of social planning in the USSR.

At the plenary session, which focused on the theme "Societies, Cultures and Civilisations: Autonomy and Interdependence", Academician Yu. Bromley (USSR) delivered a report on the relationships between cultural and local communities and civilisations. During the discussion of the reports, a Western speaker propounded the eternity of religion in the system of human culture, rejected the thesis that, as science and technology develop, religion, to a great extent, loses its significance in the life of society, and attacked the socialist countries where religion is allegedly eradicated by force. Prof. Kh. Momdjan emphasised in the discussion that the overcoming of religious survivals under socialism is a natural historical process based on the social gains and cultural progress of the people in the conditions of democracy and humanism. Freedom of conscience is guaranteed by the Constitution of the USSR.

The working groups, symposiums and research committees also sur-

veyed a wide range of problems relating to sociology and social practice. Here too the increasing influence of Marxist methodology was felt as evidenced by the keen interest in Marxist theory shown by a considerable part of young sociologists from the capitalist and developing countries. In the working group that discussed general theoretical problems of sociology Chairman—G. Andreyeva (USSR), Raporteur—R. Mukherjee (India), the Marxist position was presented in the report of the author of these lines on the correlation between social and moral progress, in that by S. Popov (USSR) on the Marxist-Leninist concept of "the quality of life", in the communication by A. Zdravomyslov (USSR), and also in the report "Historicity and the Poverty of Empiricism: the Case of Sociology" by R. Antonio and P. Piran, two young scholars from the United States. Vigorously defending the theoretical platform of historical materialism they subjected to exhaustive criticism the idealism and metaphysics of modern bourgeois sociology. A great interest in Marxism, in the experience in solving the national question in the USSR and countries of the socialist community was shown at the sessions of the working group "National and Ethnic Movements" by young scholars from the developing countries.

The report "The 20th-Century Social Revolution: Results, Problems and Prospects" by Yu. Krasin (USSR) and his exposition of the socio-transforming role of Marxist sociology in the life of socialist society during the discussion at the symposium "The Political Context of Sociology" drew attention and support from a number of participants, including those from the capitalist countries.

Experience shows that the growth of the prestige of Marxist ideology is facilitated most of all by a combination of theoretical elaborations with a high professional level of empirical research. Many theoretical and methodological problems were touched upon in the reports by V. Dobriyanov (Bulgaria) and I. Kon (USSR) at the symposium "Sociology and History". Marxist criticism of the Western concepts of alienation and a constructive approach to this very complex problem was contained in the communications by representatives of the socialist countries at the special session devoted to this problem. Soviet scholars used the results of concrete sociological research in their reports: A. Kharchev—in his report "The Scientific and Technological Revolution and the Family", F. Filippov—concerning the sociology of education, M. Titma—on social stratification, Yu. Arutyunyan—in his report on the determinative role of social relations in the development of culture, V. Patrushev—concerning the sociology of leisure, I. Bestuzhev-Lada—on social prognostication, V. Shubkin—on the social aspects of the development of the youth, V. Konoplev—in his report on the impact of social development on the armed forces, and G. Starushenko on the sociology of the developing countries.

An analysis of the reports and communications made at the Congress by representatives of the socialist countries, gives a picture of the deepening crisis of such leading directions of present-day bourgeois sociology as structural functionalism, neo-positivism, phenomenological sociology, neo-

evolutionism; of its increasing eclecticism and inner contradictoriness. Western sociologists often borrow Marxist terminology, often use Marxist tenets and formulae while retaining the essence of bourgeois theoretical systems. It should be noted that the transition of progressive sociologists from Western and developing countries to the Marxist positions is a complex and sometimes contradictory process. That is why Marxists should take into account the concretely historical and national conditions, the varied socio-psychological, professional and personal features of the ascent towards the truth, towards the spiritual values of communist civilisation. Mention should be made here of the realistic stand of those representatives of bourgeois sociology who subscribe to the need for detente and peaceful coexistence of different world systems. The ad hoc group "Socialism and the New International Economic Order" discussed the report "Soviet Social Imperialism: Reality or Myth: a New Look at Aggregate Relations" made by Prof. A. Szymanski (USA) who convincingly showed the slanderous nature of the term "Soviet social-imperialism" invented by the Peking theorists to conceal the chauvinism and aggressive aspirations of the present Chinese leadership. Prof. A. Szymanski cited many examples to demonstrate that the USSR has built its relations with other countries on the lofty principles of respect for national sovereignty, mutual benefit, disinterested assistance and the promotion of social progress in every possible way.

It is noteworthy that the Marxist sociologists at the Congress fully and broadly represented the socio-economic, political and cultural achievements of existing socialism from common ideological and theoretical positions.

The growing influence of Marxist-Leninist sociology is reflected in the consolidation of the positions of the socialist community in the governing bodies of the International Sociological Association. Prof. M. Sokolowska was elected Vice-President of the Association, and Prof. Kh. Momdjan, Chairman of the Soviet Sociological Association, Prof. S. Nowak (Poland) and Academician A. Szalai (Hungary), were elected members of the ISA Executive.

G. Kvasov

INTERNATIONAL CONFERENCE ON THE HISTORY AND PHILOSOPHY OF SCIENCE

The conference took place in Pisa, Italy, in September 1978. It was sponsored by the Joint Commission of the International Union of History and Philosophy of Science, formed in 1970. The Commission's main aim is the organisation of international conferences to discuss problems of common interest to historians and philosophers of science, extension of the interconnection between the historico-scientific and methodological approach to analysis of the structure and advancement of scientific knowledge. As at the first conference (Finland, 1973), the organisers of the Italian meeting aimed to

provide the maximum possibilities for creative discussion. Hence the number of participants was limited—not more than 40 (from 14 countries); 2-3 main reporters and 2-3 co-reporters (commentators) on each theme were appointed in advance. The texts of the reports were distributed among the participants before the conference, at the conference sessions, only the basic theses of the reports and co-reports were expounded, as a result of which the main time was devoted to discussion.

The following six themes were on the agenda: the structure of theory change; the early history of the axiomatic method; philosophical presuppositions and shifting interpretations of Galileo; probability theory and probabilistic thinking in the 17th and 18th centuries; thermodynamics and physical reality since 1850; round-table discussion: What can the history and philosophy of science do for each other?

Paying homage to Pisa, the birthplace of Galileo, the conference participants devoted the first session to discussion of the third theme "Philosophical Presuppositions and Shifting Interpretations of Galileo". The president of Domus Galilaeana, Prof. V. Cappelletti (Italy), spoke of the significance of Galileo's ideas for the development of science and philosophy of modern times and informed the participants of the work being done by Domus Galilaeana in publishing the works of the great scientist. The session then heard and discussed reports by W. Wisan (USA) and D. Gruender (USA), and a joint report by L. Markova and V. Kirsanov (USSR). In the centre of attention of all the reports was an analysis of the changes in the interpretation of Galileo's creative legacy over the past fifty years. The interpretation of his role in the history of science projects serious problems connected with the historical reconstruction of its past. In her report Wisan expressed an interesting idea about the existence of important points of contact between the history of science and the history of art. In her opinion the history of art can help the historian of science to identify various styles of scientific activity and to understand the processes of the formation of these styles. Similar ideas were expressed by the well-known English historian of science, A. Crombie. In their report Markova and Kirsanov raised the question, a fundamental one for the history of science, of the possibility of overcoming the demarcation line between the individual activity of the scientist (for example, Galileo) in producing new knowledge and the system of logical regulated scientific knowledge of his times. Such an approach is possible on the basis of Marx's theory of universal and joint labour. Universal labour is creative labour to produce new knowledge and its social character is of a special type, within the framework of which the cooperation of people is carried out in accordance with principles different than those under the joint labour typical for material production. B. Kuznetsov (USSR) proposed using the "strong irreversibility of knowledge" concept in analysing the scientific thinking of the Renaissance and Postrenaissance, which makes it possible to describe the science of that period in its specificity and integrity and not by comparison with its "predecessors", and "followers".

In the discussion on the first theme "The Structure of Theory Change" the main accent was on the investigation of the possibilities of formalising the concept of normal and revolutionary science propounded by T.S. Kuhn in his book *The Structure of Scientific Revolutions* (Chicago, 1962). Nearly ten years after the appearance of this book J. Sneed proposed an original logical approach, making it possible to analyse the Kuhn concept. Many works on the subject appeared in the 1970s. An attempt was made at the conference to sum up the prospects of investigations in this direction. In his report I. Niiniluoto (Finland) proposed some improvements and modifications of Sneedian formalism and expressed the view that the Sneedian formal concept of the Kuhn theories was by no means similar in every respect to the Kuhn concept of paradigm or disciplinary matrix. V. Sadovsky (USSR) in his co-report noted three points, from his point of view the most important, in which the inadequacy of the Sneedian formalisation of the Kuhn theories are evident; of the basic components of the disciplinary matrix only exemplars and symbolic generalisations find expression in Sneedian formalism; explication of the structure and dynamics of the scientific community, which is an extremely important aspect of the Kuhn theories, is replaced by subjecting to formalisation the attitude of the individual scientist with respect to the scientific theory exemplifying this community; the various types of reduction of theories established by Sneed and his followers, make it possible to receive only the static dynamics of theories, that is, explicate only the final results of scientific revolutions. Sadovsky formulated the basic principles which underlie from the Marxist point of view, the theory of the development of scientific theories.

J. Sneed (Netherlands) accepted a great part of the critical remarks expressed at the conference and the proposals for improving his formalism. He also offered some general observations on ways of elaborating problems of the philosophy of science and on the possibilities of using its results for determining scientific policy.

Discussion on the second theme, "The Early History of Axiomatic Method", centred on the concept of the origin of this method, propounded by the well-known Hungarian historian of mathematics, A. Szabo. According to this concept the roots of the axiomatic method lie not in mathematics but in Eleatic philosophy, and especially in the teachings of Parmenides and Zeno. At the conference some basic propositions of Szabo's concept came in for criticism. W. Knorr (USA) showed that mathematics of antiquity contained all the conditions needed for the inception of the idea of the axiomatic method. J. Hintikka (Finland), K. Berka (Czechoslovakia) and some others observed that Szabo's argumentation contained some inconsistencies. P. Suppes (USA), F. Medvedyev (USSR) and other participants noted the limited role of the axiomatic method both in mathematics of antiquity and in its subsequent development. S. Demidov (USSR) discussed the various forms in which the axiomatic method appeared at different periods in the history of mathematics. In his report on the second theme M. Popovich (USSR) fo-

cused on an important problem from the historico-scientific and methodological aspect, that of the ancient Greek ideal of theoretical knowledge.

In the centre of the discussion of the fourth theme "The Probability Theory and Probabilistic Thinking of the 17th and 18th Centuries" was the book by the American researcher I. Hacking *The Emergence of Probability*, published in 1975 in London. The reporters and co-reporters I. Schneider (FRG), A. Fagot (France), V. Kostyuk (USSR), L. J. Cohen (Great Britain), and L. Novy (Czechoslovakia) spoke highly of the book, their remarks concerning mainly specific premises of Hacking's concept. Thus, Kostyuk did not agree with Hacking's view that Berkeley's philosophy served as the premise for the inductive method, and expressed the opinion that it was rather Locke's philosophy that performed such a role. Kostyuk substantiated the thesis of the inductive method being independent of the probability concept. Another interesting question bearing on Bacon's elaboration of the probability concept was raised by Cohen who held that Hacking was mistaken in thinking that Bacon had no concern with probability, because it is not a question of a quantitative concept with Bacon but of determining the qualitative concept of probability.

Two reports were made on the fifth theme "Thermodynamics and Physical Reality", one by L. Krüger (FRG) in which he discussed the ontological, epistemological and pragmatical facets of the reduction of theories, and the other by C.-U. Moulines (Mexico) who made an attempt to give a strict formal definition of the concept of the equilibrium thermodynamic theory. The communications by the Soviet scholars V. Kartsev who dealt with Maxwell's views on physical reality, and by O. Lezhneva whose paper was devoted to the assessment by Russian physicists of the second half of the 18th century of the ideas of Boltzmann and Mach, evoked much interest.

The closing session of the conference was held in the form of a round-table discussion: What can the history and philosophy of science do for each other? In the course of an interesting discussion participated in by E. Agazzi (Italy), R. Butts (Canada), J. Murdoch (USA), J. Hintikka (Finland), J. Agassi (Israel), J. North (Great Britain) and by the Soviet scientists L. Markova, E. Mirskoy, V. Sadovsky and B. Yudin, the general opinion was expressed that the neopositivist concept proclaiming antihistoricism in scientific research has come to nothing. The philosophy of science considers its main task to be analysis of the mechanisms of the development of scientific knowledge, and the history of science is based on the prior philosophico-methodological perception of the nature of science, of its cognitive and social characteristics. At the same time, however, as the Soviet participants particularly stressed, the concrete mechanisms of the reciprocal influence of the history and philosophy of science are still far from clear. Progress in this field depends largely on the successful construction of models of the reciprocal influence of historical and philosophico-methodological scientific investigations (for example, by drawing on science-of-science data); on finding adequate

sociological approaches to science recording not only its structure but its dynamics as well; on further utilising the ideas of Marxist philosophy for understanding the basic characteristics of science and scientific activity.

The materials of this discussion, like the materials of the entire conference, will be of undoubted interest to all who are working in various fields of contemporary research.

The Joint Commission of the International Union of History and Philosophy of Science expressed the advisability of holding such conferences in future.

V. Sadovsky

ECONOMIC HISTORY FORUM

The Seventh International Economic History Congress sponsored by the International Economic History Association (IEHA) and held in Edinburgh in August 1978, was attended by more than 750 scholars from 37 countries, including Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia, the GDR, Hungary, Poland, the USSR (the delegation was headed by I. Kovalchenko, Corresponding Member of the USSR Academy of Sciences), and Yugoslavia.

All the materials presented at the Congress were distributed between three groups ("A", "B" and "C"). Group "A", subdivided into four sessions, discussed the texts of reports and supporting papers that had been distributed in advance; Group "B", consisting of 10 sessions, likewise focused on earlier distributed communications, while Group "C" with 25 discussion sessions worked according to the schedules suggested by the organisers of these sessions. Here the texts for discussion had not been distributed in advance.

Session I of Group "A" discussed the report "Natural Resources and Economic Development" by A. Maczak (Poland) and W, Parker (USA). Some convincing conclusions were drawn by its authors, including the conclusion that the correlation between the preservation of resources and consumption is of decisive importance. The "social framework" of the theme, however, was, in our view, less thoroughly analysed, and the process under study was consequently considered not within its historical but only chronological framework. Of interest were also the supporting papers on this theme: "The Beginning of International Competition in Oil" by A. Fursenko (USSR), "Natural Resources, Pre-Industrial Society and Industrialisation in Scandinavia" by K. Hildebrand (Sweden), and "Resources in Japan's Modern Economic Growth" by Y. Yasuba (Japan).

The second report, "Urbanisation and Social Change", by D. Herlihy (USA) and B. Ohngren (Sweden) reflected the extensive research done by them to generalise the results of their studies. They defined the starting point of urbanisation in the life of society; the economic changes caused by urbanisation, and their impact on the economic and social life of town-dwellers; the definitions of the concept of "town" as the unity of structural, socio-economic and functional community, etc. Among

the supporting papers to this report I should like to single out two: "Industrialisation, Urbanisation and Changes in the Social Structure of Towns During the Industrial Revolution in Germany" by L. Baar (GDR) and "Urbanisation and Social Changes in the USSR in the 1920s-1930s" by V. Drobizhev and V. Selunskaya (USSR).

J. Goy and E. Le Roy Ladurie of France in their report on the third theme, "Peasant Dues, Tithes and Trends in Agricultural Production in Pre-Industrial Societies", explored the possibility of using the data relating to peasant dues and tithes to define the dynamics of agricultural production in "pre-industrial societies". The authors had analysed numerous sources in a number of European countries and reviewed the latest literature on the problem discussed (excluding Soviet, unfortunately). But they failed to cover the bourgeois revolutions of the 16th-18th centuries in the Netherlands, England and France, which radically changed the character of agrarian relations and to a great extent "devaluated" the representativeness of the sources on which the authors had based themselves. Supporting papers to this report were presented by L. Makkai (Hungary) "Peasant Dues, Tithes, Ground-Rents and the Movement of Agrarian Products in Some Countries of Eastern Europe in the Pre-Industrial Epoch", H. Van Der Wee (Belgium)—"Agrarian Development in the Low Countries as Reflected in Tithe and Rent Statistics", N. Nosov (USSR)—"Corvee and Serfdom in Russia", and by some other scholars.

In the report on the fourth theme "Regional and International Disparities in Economic Development Since the Industrial Revolution" its authors M. Lévy-Leboyer (France) and P. Bairoch (Switzerland) discussed the disparities between development levels, methods of defining them, the relationship between regional and international disparities in development, the economic disparities within multinational states, etc. The authors came to a number of interesting, though often disputable, conclusions. A valuable contribution to the report was the supporting paper "Constraints to Economic Development in Africa—Some Determinants of Economic Disparities" by R. Ekundare (Nigeria) who convincingly, in our view, showed that the per capita gross national product in Black Africa should not be measured by the same yardstick as in developed European states. The communication "Regional Difference in the Position of Peasants in the European Part of Russia in the 19th Century" by J. Kahk and I. Kovalchenko was highly interesting and well-reasoned.

In Group "B" the agenda of the session "General Methodological Problems in Economic History" was the most interesting and exhaustive. Its organiser, J. Topolski (Poland), pointed out in his opening speech that the rapid development of historico-economic studies makes imperative not only the improvement of methodology but the creation of a special branch of methodology. In his communication "Some Problems of the Application of the Comparative-Historical Method in Socio-Economic History", A. Chistozvonov (USSR) expounded the principles of the Marxist theory of reflection and epistemology both in their universal form and conforma-

bly to the specific requirements of the study of the regularities of socio-economic history, and the new methodological approaches by Soviet economic historians to some of its cardinal problems. K. Kuklinska (Poland) in her communication "Types of Explanation in Economic History" enlarged on the problems raised by J. Topolski and outlined the theory of cognition and explanation in economic history, advanced by the Poznan methodological school.

J. Janssens (Belgium) devoted his communication "Empiric and Experimental Verification in Economic History" to a description of deductive nomology in practice. It was supplemented, in a way, by another communication "The Motivation of Economic Agents in the Past" by J. Elster (Norway) who rejected the Marxist explanation of economic history and offered his own scheme, which we do not consider convincing.

Assessing these and similar theories I should like to note once again the ideological and theoretical significance of Lenin's classical work *Materialism and Empirio-Criticism* which rejects the attempts to improve Marxism by supplementing it with alien ideological appendages.

I. Berend (Hungary) in his communication "The Indivisibility of the Social and Economic Factors of Economic Growth" highlighted Marxist historiography's fruitful contribution to this field of research.

H. Boehme (FRG) presented an interesting communication entitled "Political Factors and Methods of Economic History". In his opinion, the preoccupation with timeless quantitative mathematical statistics, with speculative econometric and nomological modelling, and the disregard of qualitative criteria, of historicism lead to the alienation of theory from practice, to the "dehistorisation" of historical science.

The work of such sessions of Group "B" as "War, Military Expenditure and Economic Change" (V. Glushkov of the USSR presented a communication "The Arms Race and International Economic Relations") and "Problems of Work and the Labour Force in Enterprise in the 19th and 20th Centuries" (Corresponding Member of the USSR Academy of Sciences V. Vinogradov contributed a communication "Leninist Ideas of Workers' Control and Modern Times"), was devoted to problems that were important from the scientific point of view and highly topical politically. Some interesting themes were discussed at Group "C" sessions, among them "The State as a Factor in Economic Development", "State-Owned Enterprises and Economic Development", "The Economic History of the Third World". At one of the sessions of this group V. Doroshenko (USSR) made a report "Some Problems of Baltic Trade in the Light of the Riga Archival Sources of the 17th-18th Centuries".

The members of the Soviet delegation took an active part in the discussions on the key problems dealt with at the congress. Many of them were session organisers (I. Dyakonov, I. Kovalchenko, G. Kotovsky, V. Doroshenko). I. Kovalchenko was elected a member of the IEHA Executive (in place of V. Vinogradov).

A. Chistozvonov

SEMINAR ON ENGLISH AND AMERICAN PHILOLOGY

The Lajos Kossuth University in Debrecen (Hungary) held an international seminar on English and American philology in September 1978, to mark the 40th anniversary of its Department of English. Scholars from eleven countries attended the seminar, among them from Czechoslovakia, the German Democratic Republic, Hungary, Poland and the Soviet Union. The Soviet delegation included V. Yartseva, Corresponding Member, USSR Academy of Sciences, and M. Koreneva, a researcher at the M. Gorky Institute of World Literature. The seminar was opened by the head of the Department of English of the University, I. Pálffy. The plenary session following the opening ceremony was mainly devoted to Hungarian-British cultural ties. The paper presented by L. Országh (Hungary) contained interesting information on the study of the life and political institutions of Britain in Hungary. S. Maller (Hungary) described the history of the University's Department of English. The paper delivered by G. Cushing (Britain) dealt with the study and translation of Hungarian literature in Britain during the past 40 years.

After the first plenary session other plenary and also sectional sessions were held.

There were two sections working simultaneously: one on English literature and another on American literature. The papers and reports presented were not confined to any particular historical period or to the work of any one group of authors; consequently, they were varied. Participants in the seminar devoted as much attention to questions of literary history, as to contemporary literature.

One of the sectional sessions was devoted to drama. In his paper "Metatheatre" C. Bigsby (Britain), citing Edward Albee's work, analysed modern American drama and characterised it as post-modernist drama. The last plays by Albee, he said, were close to the theatre of the absurd, although his earlier works belonged to another tradition. The paper by M. Koreneva (USSR), also devoted to Albee, showed that despite a certain similarity between the dramatic forms used by Albee and the theatre of the absurd, Albee's views on man and society had little in common with the philosophy of the latter. The use by Albee of the means and methods of the theatre of the absurd did not destroy the realism of his plays, but, on the contrary, helped to broaden its horizons.

V. Floyd (USA) spoke on the plays of Eugene O'Neill, examining them in connection with the problem of Catholicism and Irish immigrants in the United States. P. Egri (Hungary) suggested that a comparison be made between the plays of Chekhov and O'Neill, proceeding from the structure of the genre of short story which, in his view, formed the basis of their drama patterns. H. Höhne (GDR), in his paper dealt with the correlation of social views and dramatic innovation in the work of two modern English playwrights, T. Stoppard and E. Bond, who, owing to their lack of a genuinely historical approach to the objective contradictions of present-day life, gave a wrong picture of the world in their plays.

Several papers were devoted to problems of 20th-century literature. J. Gřmela (Czechoslovakia) analysed Dos Passos' novel *Manhattan Transfer;* I. Geher (Hungary) discussed the work of Faulkner on the basis of motifs and their reflection in the structure of his books; Z. Nagy (Hungary), in his paper on the American novel of our time, drew a number of conclusions which had much in common with the conclusions drawn by Bigsby; J. Kocmanová (Czechoslovakia) traced the successes of Scottish poetry in the 1920s and 1930s to its drawing closer to the ideas of the proletariat's struggle.

Comparative analysis held a prominent place in the papers presented at the seminar. For instance, Ch. Kretzoi (Hungary) showed the specific character of 17th-century American literature by way of comparing the styles of works by the American and English Puritan writers. J. Gellén (Hungary) analysed two ways of handling the subject of immigration in American literature, citing the work of Willa Cather and the American writer of Norwegian origin, O. Rolvaag. The paper by O. Øverland (Norway) was also devoted to Rolvaag, the speaker emphasised the problem of the writer's belonging to two national cultures.

Comparing the work of Swift and Samuel Beckett, J. Fletcher (Britain), in a paradoxical form—"Does It Help to Read Swift as if He Were Samuel Beckett?"—stressed the importance of a historical approach, the absence of which results in giving a new meaning to a classical work, thus distorting the author's ideas. He pointed to certain coincidences in these writers' perception of the world and in their artistic principles. The paper by J. Lowlor (Britain) was devoted to an analysis of one of the monuments of English mediaeval literature—*Piers Plowman* by Langland.

In a number of papers questions of methodology were examined. First of all, this applies to the theory of myth, which was dealt with in the papers presented by J. Vickery (USA) and Zs. Virágos (Hungary). E. Bollobas (Hungary) discussed in his paper the use of linguistic methods in analysing literary work.

The papers read in the linguistics section covered a wide range of problems relating to a semantic analysis of the word and sentence, the form and content of grammatical categories, the social and territorial conditions of the development of language, general typology and contrastive grammar. L. Lipka (FRG) showed that it was legitimate to describe the nouns and verbs of the English language with the help of an analysis of semantic components. Y. Ikegami (Japan) examined the questions of dissymmetry in communicative purposeful speech complexes. J. Firbas (Czechoslovakia) cited instances where a semantic and grammatical sentence structure containing a finite verb can be divided into complexes for which the temporal and modal exponents of the finite verb serve as a communicative link. The paper by B. Korponay (Hungary) analysed the functions of the instrumental and the ablative as multiciphered forms. B. Hollósy (Hungary) showed how the feature "durative" could be utilised in a semantic description of English.

S. Rot (Hungary) gave an interesting description of the development trends of present-day English and its socio-linguistic problems. J. Fišiak (Poland) presented a

paper entitled "Isophones or Isographs; a Problem in Historical Dialectology". Problems of territorial differentiation of language were dealt with in the paper by W. Viereck (Austria)—"The Dialectical Structure of British English", and in the paper by V. Kniezsa (Hungary) who described the Scottish language of the 14th century in terms of spelling and phonology. The latter paper, drawing extensively on literary texts and legal documents, can serve as a basis for further studies in the history of the Scots. Examining the problem of typology as the interaction of universals and variations specifying separate languages, V. Yartseva (USSR) discussed the practical aims of modern linguistics. A lively exchange of opinions took place concerning the papers on contrastive investigations of languages. J. Hladký (Czechoslovakia) said that one of the differences between English and Czech was the weakened character of the verb in English (in contrast to the unweakened verb in Czech). This could lead to different frequencies of adverbs in the two languages. J. Csapó (Hungary) dealt with some problems in the contrastive analysis of lexical derivation between two so unrelated languages as English and Hungarian. Differences in the derivation of sentences in English and Hungarian were also discussed by K. Kiss (Hungary). These and other papers on linguistics read at the seminar were distinguished by the timeliness of the problems posed and a wealth of illustrative material, which made for a fruitful discussion of problems of modern linguistics.

V. Yartseva,
M. Koreneva

CHRONICLE

* *The last, 30th volume of the third edition of the Great Soviet Encyclopaedia (GSE) has been published.* The first edition was undertaken as far back as 1926, with Academician O. Schmidt as Editor-in-Chief. The second edition was started in 1949 under the general editorship of Academician S. Vavilov. The glossary of the second edition contained 60,000 new articles as compared with the previous one. But nine years after the publication of its last volume, the data contained in that edition of the encyclopaedia became obsolete.

More than 10,000 scientists and scholars worked on the third edition. And not only them: statesmen and public figures, experts in all branches of science, technology and culture were engaged in this endeavour. The work was directed by the prominent physicist, Academician A. Prokhorov, Editor-in-Chief of GSE, and Lenin and Nobel prizes laureate. The radical changes in the world arena, scientific and cultural achievements of mankind, new trends in the natural science and technology, have all found reflection in the new edition of GSE. From the stream of information the most important facts and phenomena have been selected in which the development of man and nature manifests itself.

Thirty volumes in 630,000 copies with 100,000 articles, 36,000 illust-

The review covers the events of August-October 1978, unless stated otherwise.

rations, 1,650 maps and charts, such are the main parameters of the new, third edition, which is being translated into foreign languages and published in the USA, Italy, Greece and Spain.

* The *World Congress on Aristotle—2,300 Years since the Philosopher's Death* was held in Thessaloniki, Greece. About 350 scholars from 45 countries, including seven socialist, took part in the event. Eleven reports were heard at the plenary meetings and 230 in the four panels. The Soviet participants presented papers "Aristotle and Karl Marx" (Th. Kessidis) and "Aristotle and questions of the early-Byzantine aesthetics" (V. Bychkov).

* A *symposium on "Dialectics of the Socialist Way of Life and Socialist Consciousness"* took place in Dresden, GDR, within the framework of the 8th Session of the Bilateral Commission of Philosophers of the USSR and the GDR. The following reports were heard and discussed: "Topical philosophical and methodological problems of the concept of value" (E. Hahn, GDR), "The categories of value and evaluation in the system of Marxist-Leninist world-view" (S. Popov, USSR), "The problem of unity and diversity in the development of the socialist way of life and socialist consciousness" (R. Weidig, GDR), and "The socialist way of life and socialist consciousness" (A. Kharchev, USSR).

* The participants in the *all-Union conference "Frederick Engels's 'Anti-Dühring' and Topical Problems of the Development of Marxist-Leninist Theory (in Commemoration of the Centenary of 'Anti-Dühring')"* which was held in Moscow heard the reports: "Historic significance of F. Engels' *Anti-Dühring* and contemporary ideological struggle" (A. Kosichev); "Philosophical aspects of natural science in F. Engels' *Anti-Dühring* and our day" (Yu. Zhdanov); "F. Engels' *Anti-Dühring* and the development of political economy at the present stage" (N. Tsagolov); "F. Engels' *Anti-Dühring* and topical problems of the theory of scientific communism" (A. Kovalev); and "Problems of coordination of integrated studies in social sciences at higher educational establishments" (Yu. Tolypin). About 90 reports and communications were delivered in the panels of philosophy, economy, and scientific communism.

* Historians from Belgium, Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia, the GDR, the Netherlands, Poland and the USSR took part in the *23rd annual meeting of the Hanseatic Working Group of the Historical Society of the GDR on the subject "Rate of Interest and Profit in the Late Mediaeval Economies, Particularly in the Hanseatic Economic Zone"*, which was held in Sellin, Rügen Island, GDR. The Soviet scholars presented the following papers: "Costs and profit in Hanseatic trade in the early 15th century according to Hildebrand Veckinchusen's commercial books" (M. Lesnikov), "The study of Hanseatic trade profits in postwar Soviet historiography" (A. Khoroshkevich), and communications: "The general historical aspect of changes in the rates of interest and profit in the Hanseatic economic zone" (A. Chistozvonov), "On methods of deriving profits by Hanseatic merchants in Sweden" (A. Svanidze).

* About 100 scholars from Argentina, France, the United Kingdom, Israel, Italy, the USA, the USSR and the Vatican attended the *international colloquium on "Feudal Structures and Feudalism in the Western Mediterranean (the 10th-13th Centuries). Results and Prospects of Studies"*, which took place in Rome and was sponsored by the National Centre of Scientific Research of France and the French School of Rome. The Soviet historian, L. Kotelnikova, made a report on "Landowners and landholders in the early-mediaeval towns of Toscana (the 8th-11th centuries)."

* The *49th National Congress of Italian historians devoted to the history of Risorgimento—"The State and Society in the Period of 1876 to 1882"*—held in Viterbo, Italy, was attended by scholars from 12 countries, including Rumania and the USSR. The participants heard six reports and seven communications. The Soviet historian, V. Nevler, read a communication about the Russian press' comments on the advent to power of the "historical left" in Italy in 1876.

* The *27th scientific conference of the Commission of Historians of the USSR and the GDR*, held in Kiev, USSR, *discussed the problem "Fascism and Neo-Fascism. History and Our Day"*. The main reports were delivered by P. Zhilin (USSR)—"The rout of fascism in the Second World War and the struggle against neo-fascism in postwar period", and by W. Schumann (GDR)—"On the postwar fascist concepts in the light of new documents". Then the work of the conference proceeded in the two panels dealing with the themes "From the rise of fascism in Germany to the collapse of Hitler's dictatorship in 1945" and "Neo-fascism and the struggle of democratic forces against fascist threat led by Communist parties", where 36 reports and communications were heard.

* The *meeting of historians of the GDR and the USSR*, which took place in Sellin, Rügen Island, GDR, *was devoted to the problem "The Social Nature of Burghers Under Feudalism and in the Transitional Period from Feudalism to Capitalism"*. The Soviet delegation headed by A. Chistozvonov presented the following papers: "The social nature of Dutch burghers in the 14th-17th centuries" (A. Chistozvonov); "The role of burghers in the formation of limited monarchies in Western Europe" (E. Gutnova); "The social character of the Italian *popolani* and their landed property in the 14th-15th centuries (on the example of Toscana)" (A. Kotelnikova); "The socio-ethnic structure of the urban population in Ireland in the 12th-15th centuries" (T. Osipova); "The town and the social function of credit-debt relations. Concerning the social role of Swedish burghers in the 13th-15th centuries" (A. Svanidze); "Merchant companies and social movements in Germany in the first third of the 16th century" (N. Savina).

The German scholars (Professor A. Laube was the leader of the German delegation) made the reports: "Theoretical and methodological problems of contemporary research into the history of the town of the 11th-13th centuries" (W. Kütler); "On political role of the mediaeval German burghers" (E. Engel); "The social structure and social dynamics of

the mediaeval German town of the 13th-early 16th centuries" (J. Schildhauer); "The economic structure of mediaeval German towns and the origin of hired labour" (K. Fritze); "The social status of woman in the mediaeval town" (E. Uitz); "The communal movement and the inner-town struggle" (B. Berthold); "On the role of town representatives in the Reichstags of 1521-1526" (M. Meyer); "Suburbs: their origin, economic and social development in the history of mediaeval German towns" (K. Czok).

* The *5th Soviet-Finnish seminar on the comparative study of the socio-economic development of Russia and Finland* took place in Leningrad. "The comparative study of home trade and the history of crafts in Russia and Finland in the 15th-18th centuries" was the theme of the reports by K. Serbina (USSR) and O. Nikula (Finland). A. Solovyova (USSR) and J. Ahvenainen (Finland) presented papers devoted to comparative study of the industrial development of Russia and Finland in the period from the early 20th century to 1917. Nine Finnish and 12 Soviet scholars took part in the discussion on both themes.

* A *joint jubilee session of the USSR Academy of Sciences and the Academy of Sciences of the Armenian Soviet Socialist Republic devoted to 150 years of Armenia's joining Russia* which took place in Yerevan, USSR, was opened by Academician A. Alexandrov, President of the USSR Academy of Sciences. On behalf of the Central Committee of the Armenian Communist Party and the Government of the Republic, the participants were greeted by F. Sarkisyan, Chairman of the Council of Ministers of the Armenian SSR.

At the plenary meetings the following reports were read: "Friendship of the peoples of the USSR—the great achievement of the October Revolution" by Academician P. Fedoseyev; "The development of science in Soviet Armenia" by V. Ambartsumyan; "Historical premises for Eastern Armenia's joining Russia" and "Eastern Armenia's joining Russia" by A. Ioannisyan and M. Nersisyan, Members of the Armenian Academy of Sciences, respectively; "The major stages and trends in studying nationalities development in the USSR" by Academician Yu. Bromley; "The main tasks of the Soviet economic science" by Academician T. Khachaturov; "Characteristic features of ideological struggle in the present conditions" by Academician M. Mitin; "Resurrection of the Armenian people liberated by the October Revolution" by G. Galoyan, Corresponding Member of the Armenian Academy of Sciences; "Dialectics of the international and the national in the development of philosophy" by M. Iovchuk, Corresponding Member of the USSR Academy of Sciences.

The participants heard about 40 reports at the panel sessions and discussed problems of history and philology. The jubilee session was attended by K. Demirchyan, First Secretary of the Central Committee of the Armenian Communist Party.

* An *all-Union scientific conference "The USSR Archives in Developed Socialist Society"*, held in Moscow and sponsored by the Central Archive Administration under the

USSR Council of Ministers, was devoted to the 60th anniversary of the Soviet state archives which were instituted by the Decree of the Council of People's Commissars of the RSFSR signed by V. I. Lenin on June 1, 1918.

* The *all-Union symposium on agrarian history held its 17th session to discuss the problem "The Place and Role of the Peasantry in the Socio-Economic Development of Society"* in Rostov-on-Don, USSR. Questions concerning the implementation of Lenin's cooperative plan, its socio-economic significance, the agrarian policy of the CPSU, and the further development of Soviet agriculture were dealt with in the reports by I. Bondarenko, First Secretary of the Rostov Regional Committee of the CPSU, V. Selunskaya and E. Oskolkov at the plenary session and at the meetings of Section One of the symposium. Problems of the pre-revolutionary agrarian history of Russia were discussed in the other four panels.

* Economists and sociologists from 13 countries, including Poland and the USSR, took part in an *international scientific conference on "Unemployment in Western Countries Today"* sponsored by the International Economic Association, which was held in Bischenberg, near Strasbourg, France. The report made by Professor N. Kaldor (United Kingdom) was devoted to the "free trade theory" in employment which, in fact, means the lack of a guaranteed right to work. The problem of discrimination for age, race and other reasons was dealt with in the report delivered by Professor B. Bergmann (USA). The Soviet scholars Academician T. Khachaturov and T. Timofeyev, Corresponding Member of the USSR Academy of Sciences, and Professor A. Lukaszewicz of Poland spoke about the experience of socialist countries which are free from economic crises and unemployment.

* An *international symposium on cooperation between the socialist and developing countries* held in Moscow was attended by scholars from seven socialist countries. The main report on "New forms and prospects of economic, scientific and technological cooperation between the socialist and developing countries" was made by G. Prokhorov (USSR).

* An *international "summer school" of young economists* held in Suzdal, USSR, was devoted to the problem "The Scientific and Technological Revolution: Economic and Social Contradictions of Capitalism at the Present Stage". Thirteen lecturers and 24 students from seven socialist countries took part in its work.

* At a *Soviet-Hungarian symposium of economists* held in Vilnius, USSR, Soviet economists presented the following reports: "Changes in the character, essence and conditions of work at the stage of developed socialism" (D. Karpushin, I. Yablonskaya); "Regulation of the processes of distribution and redistribution of labour resources in the USSR in the conditions of the dynamic development of the national economy" (I. Maslova); "Wages as stimuli in raising labour productivity" (R. Batkayev); and "The increase in the efficiency of labour resources in Soviet Lithuania" (V. Januškevicius). Hungarian economists made reports: "Prospects for employment

in 1990-1995" (J. Edel); "Efficiency and regulation of wages" (A. Póngráez); and "Utilisation of manpower and the ensuing problems" (J. Kovács).

* A *Soviet-Indian symposium on "Regional Development Within the Framework of National Planning"*, held in Tbilisi and Baku, USSR, was attended by Indian scholars (Professor M. Raza, head of the delegation, of the Centre for the Study of Regional Development, Jawaharlal Nehru University, S. Chakraborty, R. P. Misra, K. V. Sundaram, G. S. Gosal, K. C. Singh, S. L. Kayastha, A. K. Jewari, P. S. Joshi, A. Kundu), who presented 10 papers. Soviet scholars presented 27 papers. The discussion centred around the four main themes:

1. The theory of regional development and planning (levels of regional development and multilevel planning, regional and sectoral approaches in planning, comprehensive and integral area development).

2. Factors of regional development in the system of state planning (optimal utilisation of natural and labour resources, system of settlements).

3. Regional development in the specific conditions of mountainous and arid territories (land use, protection of environment, transport development in mountainous areas).

4. Economic and social development of various ethnic groups of population.

* More than 150 scholars from higher educational establishments, academic institutions and other research centres of the USSR, and scholars from five socialist countries participated in the *all-Union conference on "Problems of Economic Relations of Socialist Countries with Advanced Capitalist States"*, which took place in Moscow.

The participants heard the reports: "The material base of peaceful coexistence" (O. Bogomolov, Corresponding Member of the USSR Academy of Sciences, Director of the Institute of the Economy of the World Socialist System); "The development of international division of labour and problems of relations between socialist and capitalist countries" (Yu. Shiryaev, D. Sc. (Econ.), Director of the International Institute of Economic Problems of the World Socialist System); "New trends in international economic relations, and the East-West cooperation" by M. Maximova, D. Sc. (Econ), and others. Then, work proceeded in three panels.

* Vladivostok, USSR, was the venue of an *all-Union conference on "The Economy of the Ocean"*. At the plenary session and panel meetings, more than 250 reports and communications were presented on the problems of the economic utilisation of the Ocean and littoral areas, on the international, economic and legal aspects of their exploitation, etc.

* An *international congress of lawyers on "International Cooperation, Disarmament and Especially Nuclear Disarmament"* took place in Espoo, Finland. It was attended by about 100 representatives of more than 25 countries, including six socialist countries. The discussion concentrated on the legal aspects of disarmament and international cooperation. A resolution adopted at the congress noted that the Final Act

of the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe had a great role to play in broadening the process of detente and pointed out the necessity to complement political detente with detente in the military sphere and to work out measures for a reduction of armed forces and armaments in Central Europe.

* Scholars from eight socialist countries took part in an *international symposium on "The Great October Revolution and Experience in Creating the States of the Dictatorship of the Proletariat"* held in Budapest, Hungary. The participants discussed a broad range of problems, including the unity of the main principles of socialist statehood and the variety of methods of their implementation; the dictatorship of the proletariat and a multi-party system; the revolutions of the 1940s in Central Europe and the historical experience of creating the states of the dictatorship of the proletariat, etc.

* A *round-table conference on "Technocracy and Its Controls with Special Reference to the Developing Countries"* sponsored by the International Political Science Association (IPSA) was held in Rio de Janeiro, Brazil. It was attended by scholars from 23 countries, including five socialist countries. After an opening address made by the prominent Brazilian scholar and public figure C. Mendes, First Vice-President of IPSA, the participants heard and discussed 15 reports. G. Shakhnazarov, President of the Soviet Political Sciences Association, made a report on "Technocracy: idea and reality". The report "Military technocracy and political development: divergent roles of the military in developing countries" was presented by the Polish scholar J. Wiatz, and the report "The problem of the realisation of scientific and technological progress within a developed socialist country", by K.-H. Röder of the GDR.

* An *international meeting of lawyers devoted to the struggle against racism and apartheid* took place in Baku, USSR. Among the participants were 47 foreign delegates from 36 countries, and representatives of the United Nations and national liberation movements of Southern Africa. The speakers expressed the unanimous support by the international lawyers' community for the just struggle of the peoples of Southern Africa and other parts of the world for their freedom and independence.

* Experts from six socialist countries took part in a *round-table conference on topical problems of ideological struggle on the African continent* which was organised by the Institute of Africa, the USSR Academy of Sciences, in Moscow. Its aim was to conduct a close study of present-day trends in, and specific features of, ideological struggle in Africa.

* The *4th Soviet-Japanese symposium on problems of security in Asia* was held in Tashkent, USSR. The Soviet delegation was headed by G. Kim, Corresponding Member, USSR Academy of Sciences; the Japanese delegation, by O. Kaihara, Director of the Research Institute of Japan. The discussion, in which prominent scholars and public figures of both countries participated, centred around urgent questions of security and detente in

Asia and the Pacific region, as well as questions of the development of good-neighbourly relations between the two countries.

* *On the occasion of the 150th anniversary of establishing diplomatic relations between Russia and Brazil*, a ceremonial exchange of copies of historical documents from the archives of the Soviet and the Brazilian Ministries for Foreign Affairs took place in Brasilia. The transfer was made by Rio Branco, Chief of the European Department, Brazilian Foreign Ministry, and Sergei Tikhvinsky, Head of the Historical-Diplomatic Department, the USSR Foreign Ministry. Among the documents were copies of despatches by diplomats of both countries elucidating the history of the establishment and consolidation of bilateral diplomatic relations, including documents connected with the activities of G. Langsdorff (1774-1852), Russian Consul-General in Rio de Janeiro, a prominent scholar and member of the Russian Academy of Sciences.

* A *scientific conference on "The Great October Revolution as Reflected in Soviet and Foreign Historical Literature"* was held in Tskhaltubo, USSR. The participants analysed the works on the history of the October Revolution and its international significance, published in 1918-1924. Besides a large group of Soviet scholars, historians from six other socialist countries took part in the conference.

* The *8th International Congress on Criminology*, held in Lisbon, Portugal, was attended by some 800 scholars and practical workers from 55 countries, including eight socialist countries. The opening session was addressed by J. Pinatel of France, President of the International Criminological Society.

The congress then continued its work in eight panels: criminogenesis, the administration of justice, treatment, juvenile delinquency, victimology, prevention, epistemology and history, standards and safeguards relating to criminological research.

Soviet scholars presented some 20 papers, among them: "Criminology and criminal policy" (I. Galperin); "Conceptual principles of the system of prevention of juvenile and youth delinquency in the USSR" (G. Minkovsky, E. Melnikova); "Causes of crime and personality of offender" (A. Dolgova); "Critical evaluation of the clinical approach in criminology" (A. Yakovlev).

* The *58th Conference of the International Law Association* held in Manila, Philippines, was attended by experts in international law from more than 30 countries, including four socialist countries. The conference worked in plenary sessions and in committees. The participants discussed such important items as theory and methodology of international law, space law, law of the sea, human rights, sovereign immunity, international criminal law, water resources law, legal problems of the environments, etc. The Soviet delegates presented the paper "Theory and methodology of international law" (O. Bogdanov) and communications "Legal regulation of the utilisation of international rivers" (L. Korbut) and "Problems of international criminal law" (E. Lyakhov).

* Some 800 delegates, including jurists from six socialist countries, met at the *9th International Congress*

of the International Society for Labour Law and Social Security in Munich, FRG. The Soviet participants delivered the following papers: "The regulation of labour disputes in the USSR" (R. Livshits); "The situation of workers and employees in the Soviet Union in case of illness" (A. Pyatakov) and "Codification of labour laws" (S. Ivanov).

* Participating in the *international scientific conference "The Role Played by International Treaty and Institutional Mechanism in the Development of Socialist Integration"*, held in Moscow, were noted jurists from six socialist countries. They heard and discussed more than 20 reports and communications on various aspects of the conference's theme, among them: the interconnection of international treaty and institutional mechanisms of socialist economic integration; international departmental agreements in the system of regulating economic cooperation of the CMEA member countries; the essence and main features of the international institutional mechanism of socialist economic integration; the concept, structure and main elements of the institutional mechanism of socialist economic integration; CMEA's relations with non-member countries, international organisations, etc.

* A *Soviet-American symposium "Legal Forms of Public Participation in Environmental Protection in the USSR, and the US"* which took place in Moscow, Alma Ata and Rostov-on-Don (USSR), was sponsored by the Institute of the State and Law, USSR Academy of Sciences. The delegation of Soviet jurists was headed by Corresponding Member of the USSR Academy of Sciences V. Kudryavtsev, Director of the Institute; the American delegation, by N. Yost, General Counsel, Council on Environmental Quality.

Among the papers and communications presented by the Soviet delegation were: "The progress of Soviet law in environmental protection" by A. Kolbasov; "Soviet legislation on public participation in environmental protection" by S. Bogolyubov; "The structure and activities of the all-Russia society for nature protection" by L. Alferov; "Public participation in protecting the environment in Kazakhstan" by Sh. Aliev.

The American delegates submitted the following papers and communications: "The national environmental policy act and the operation of the environmental impact statement process" by N. Yost; "How conservation and environmental groups operate in the US to press for effective environmental protection and adherence to environmental laws" and "How manufacturing facilities organise internally to assume that environmental protection measures will be adhered to" by N. Robinson; "How non-governmental organisations for environmental protection influence governmental decisions" by O. Houck; "Comparing the water pollution laws of the US and the USSR" by K. Hall; and "Legal protection of the environment in the US" by J. Moorman.

* Legal experts from research institutes and higher educational establishments, as well as heads of a number of central national bodies and legal services took part in an *all-Union scientific-coordination conference, "The Tasks of the Further Development of Jurisprudence in the*

Light of the New Constitution of the USSR and the Constitutions of the Union and Autonomous Republics" which was held in Moscow.

At the plenary meetings the participants heard the following reports: "The Constitution of the USSR and the development of Soviet legal science" by V. Kudryavtsev, Corresponding Member of the USSR Academy of Sciences; "The Constitution of the USSR and the development of the Soviet state of the whole people" by G. Shakhnazarov, President of the Soviet Political Sciences Association; "The Constitution of the USSR, and the public order protection" by N. Shchelokov, Minister of Internal Affairs of the USSR; "Soviet justice and the defence of the citizen's constitutional rights" by L. Smirnov, Chairman of the USSR Supreme Court; "The Constitution of the USSR and the strengthening of Soviet legality" by A. Rekunov, First Deputy, Procurator-General of the USSR. Ten sections were working at the conference.

* In 1978, the *150th birth anniversary of Lev Tolstoy*, one of the greatest writers of the world, was widely observed internationally. In the USSR, the occasion was celebrated on a specially large scale. Many Soviet cities and towns were the venue of public meetings, scientific conferences, academic sessions and gatherings of writers.

* * *

The main event to commemorate the occasion was the Tolstoy memorial evening at the Bolshoi Theatre in Moscow attended by Party and Government leaders, writers, cultural and art workers, public representatives, and guests from 17 countries. The evening was opened by the Chairman of the All-Union Jubilee Committee, G. Markov, First Secretary of the Soviet Writers' Union. Among the speakers were G. Berdnikov, Corresponding Member of the USSR Academy of Sciences, Director of the Gorky Institute of World Literature, delivered the report "Lev Tolstoy and our epoch"; P. Zarev, President of the Bulgarian Writers' Union, A. Varela, Vice-President of the World Peace Council, U. Joshi, President of the National Academy of Letters of India, and I. Yunak, First Secretary of the Tula Regional Committee of the CPSU.

* * *

An *all-Union scientific conference devoted to the 150th birth anniversary of Lev Tolstoy* was held at the Gorky Institute of World Literature, USSR Academy of Sciences. An introductory speech was made by Academician M. Khrapchenko. The participants heard the reports: "Lev Tolstoy and the millennial traditions of Russian literature" (Academician D. Likhachev); "Tolstoy and the Russian revolutionary movement" (K. Lomunov); "Tolstoy's traditions in realistic literature of the 20th century" (N. Gey); "The significance of Tolstoy's aesthetic heritage and our time" (M. Ovsyannikov); "Tolstoy and Russian Soviet literature" (D. Starikov); "Tolstoy and the literatures of the peoples of the USSR" (R. Yusufov); "Tolstoy on the ways of development of art in the 20th century" (P. Palievsky); "Tolstoy and modern West European literature" (D. Urnov); and "Tolstoy and the literature of the

East" (E. Chelyshev). Taking part in the conference were numerous guests from abroad.

* * *

An *international colloquium devoted to Lev Tolstoy's 150th birth anniversary* was held in Paris, under the patronage of President Giscard d'Estaing of France. It was sponsored by the Ministry of Culture and Communications with the assistance of the French Association for National Celebrations, "Les Amis de Léon Tolstoi" Association and the French National Institute of Slavonic Studies. The colloquium started at the Sorbonne, then continued its work at the Grand-Palais.

It was attended by prominent scholars from Belgium, Canada, France, the FRG, Italy, Poland, Switzerland, the USA, the USSR and Yugoslavia. Participants heard some 30 reports, among them those by Soviet delegates: "Tolstoy as a critic of the 20th century's art" (P. Palievsky); "Tolstoy and antiquity" (S. Averintsev); "D. Makovitsky's diary: an important source of Tolstoy's biography" (S. Makashin); "Turgenev and Tolstoy" (I. Zilberstein); "Tolstoy as a national and world writer" (B. Bursov); "The word *mir* in the novel *War and Peace* (Voina i mir)" (S. Bocharov).

A ceremonial unveiling of a memorial plaque on the house where Tolstoy lived during his visit to Paris in 1857 and the opening of the new exposition in the Tolstoy museum at the National Institute of Slavonic Studies took place during the colloquium.

* * *

An *international symposium "Tolstoy's Humanism"* sponsored by the Giorgio Cini Foundation, the Italian Association of Slavonic Studies and the Italy-USSR Society was held in Venice, Italy. Taking part in it were nearly 60 leading scholars and writers from Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia, France, the FRG, the United Kingdom, Italy, Poland, Switzerland, the USA, the USSR, and Yugoslavia.

The Soviet participants presented the following papers: "Tolstoy and the millennial traditions of Russian literature" (D. Likhachev), "Tolstoy's literary fate in the West" (T. Motyleva), "Tolstoy and the Soviet writers" (Yu. Surovtsev), "Tolstoy: Sensitive Consciousness" (Yu. Trifonov), "Tolstoy as a critic of the 20th century's art" (P. Palievsky), "Tolstoy and China" (N. Fedorenko), "*War and Peace*: features of the great epic" (V. Lakshin), "Tolstoy and Dostoyevsky. Aspects of one problem" (B. Bursov), and "Tolstoy and Proust" (L. Ginsburg). Academician M. Khrapchenko, a prominent Soviet literary scholar, also took part in the discussions.

* * *

In Soviet times, Tolstoy's novels have been published in our country in 67 languages of the peoples of the USSR. All in all, 2,525 books with the total circulation of 218, 644,000 copies have been brought out. They include 1,372 books in Russian (202, 386,000 copies), 973 books in other languages of the USSR (12,606,000 copies) and 180 books in foreign languages (3,652,000 copies). Eighteen editions of collected works by Tolstoy, including the 90-volume complete edition, have been published. Books about Tolstoy's writings have been published under 676

titles. In 1978 alone, Soviet publishing houses produced some 200 books containing Tolstoy's novels or essays on his life and work with the total circulation of 33,000,000 copies.

* The *5th International Congress of Applied Linguistics* in Montreal, Canada, was attended by more than 1,100 linguists and language teachers from 80 countries, including nine socialist countries. They discussed the following topics: theoretical substantiation of teaching languages in specific social and communicative situations; methods of teaching languages; communication theory; bilingualism and multilingualism theory; contrastive-comparative study of languages; language planning; the theory of translation; psycho-lexicology and lexicography; linguistics; sociolinguistics; pragmatic linguistics; stylistics; rhetoric; and speech pathology. The Soviet scholars delivered reports: "The problem of style in language study" (V. Vompersky) and "Monolingualism as the basis of speech activity" (G. Kolshansky, L. Barkhudarov). Besides, submitted to the congress were reports of those Soviet scholars who could not attend personally (M. Drazdauskiene, V. Kukharenko, H. Liiv, L. Pazusis, A. Polikarpov, J. Tuldava).

* More than 200 papers were submitted to the *13th International Congress of Onomastic Sciences* in Cracow, Poland. The Soviet delegation delivered 26 papers.

The main topic was "Proper name and common name" (Nomina appellative et nomina propria) dealing with various complicated cases of the identification of words and with transition of words from one category into another. The following major lectures were heard at the plenary meetings: "Anthroponyms and their place in the system of language" (A. Zareba, Poland); "On the theory of proper names" (W. van Langendonck, Belgium); "Specifics of proper name in language and speech" (Yu. Karpenko, USSR); "The proper name-common name relationship in the ancient European hydronymy" (W. Schmid, FRG). Reports on specific features of proper names in linguistic, logical, ontological and historical aspects were delivered at the meetings of eight sections.

* At its regular meeting held in Moscow, the *Joint Soviet-Iranian Committee on the Firdousi Prize* awarded the 1978 prize to four prominent Soviet and Iranian scientific and cultural workers: A. Boldyrev, head of the Iranian Philology Chair of the Leningrad State University; the Soviet writer and Lenin Prize laureate Rasul Gamzatov; Professor Zabiholla Safi, Secretary-General of the High Council of Iran on Culture and Arts; and Professor Mehri Ahi, expert in Russian literature, of the Teheran University. The prize of Firdousi, the renowned Iranian and Tajik poet, was instituted on the occasion of the 50th anniversary of the establishment of Soviet-Iranian friendly relations. It is awarded to Soviet and Iranian subjects for notable achievements in scientific research, literature, history and art promoting friendly ties and mutual understanding between the two neighbouring peoples.

* Kazan, USSR, was the venue of an *all-Union scientific conference on "Topical Problems of Aesthetics and*

Poetics of Socialist Realism in Literatures of the Soviet East". Among the reports read at the plenary sessions were: "The typology of socialist realism, and literatures of the Soviet East" (A. Yezuitov), "Socialist realism as the result of multinational art endeavour" (Z. Kedrina), "Literature and the moulding of man of communist society" (L. Zalesskaya). In a number of reports heard at the plenary sessions and in the sections "Concept of man and ideological and artistic renovation of literatures" and "Problems of stylistic and genre diversity", various aspects of the development of Soviet literatures of the republics of Central Asia, Transcaucasia and of the autonomous republics of the Russian Federation were analysed. More than 40 reports were delivered at the conference.

* The *19th International Congress of Applied Psychology*, held in Munich, FRG, was attended by scientists from many countries of Europe, Asia, America and Africa, including seven socialist countries. Nearly 800 reports and communications were heard dealing with the present state and prospects of the engineering, social, pedagogical, ethnic, clinical, physiological and other branches of this science.

The problems of pedagogical psychology and the moulding of the individual were central in the discussion. Special attention was given to the study of the motive forces of the development of a child's psychology and to the psychological principles of instruction. The interest that ethnopsychologists take in the development of the personality under conditions of different cultures was reflected in such special symposiums as "A Critical Assessment of Cross-Cultural Psychology", "Personality Assessment: Cross-Cultural Comparison" and "Cross-Cultural and Intracultural Studies". At the symposium "Psychology of Women", the participants discussed the problems faced by this branch of science taking due account of the close interaction of woman's psychology with the environment (ranging from personal relations with men to relations with social institutions).

A number of symposiums were devoted to engineering psychology and labour psychology. Thus, at the symposium "Work and Achievement" specific features of formulation of tasks in labour activity ensuring a high level of achievements were discussed. The symposium on problems of management dealt with the different styles of management and their influence on the results of group activities.

The reports by Soviet psychologists were in the limelight of the congress. The participants showed a keen interest in the lecture delivered by Yu. Zabrodin, Deputy Director of the Institute of Psychology, USSR Academy of Sciences, on "Human operator information processing and designing of his activity". The results of the congress proceedings testify to the fact that elimination of the gap between theoretical and applied psychologies is one of the most urgent problems of today.

* More than 700 scholars from 40 countries, including seven socialist, took part in the *11th International Congress of Classical Archaeology* in London. Besides plenary meetings, where reports were made on new archaeological findings, the greater

part of the congress' work was carried out in three chronological sections: "Greece and Italy up to and including the Archaic Period", "Classical and Hellenistic Greece. Republican Italy" and "Roman Empire". Soviet scholars presented reports: "Greek architects in the Hellenistic Period" (T. Blavatskaya); "Greek art in town and *chora*" (V. Blavatsky); "Etruscan bronzes in the Hermitage Museum" (S. Boriskovskaya); "Fragments of the Sakonid cup from the Olvia excavations of 1973-1974" (K. Gorbunova); "The specific features of the settlement on Berezan Island in the Archaic Period" (L. Kopeikina); "Greeks in Colchis: myth and archaeology" (O. Lordkipanidze); and "Roman bronze vessels in Eastern Europe" (D. Shelov). All in all, more than 250 reports were delivered at the congress.

* A *group of French ethnographers made a month-long trip to Trans-Baikal Region* to study the history, culture and everyday life of local peoples. Their aim was to get first-hand information necessary for translation into French of the heroic epos "Gasar", the most significant monument of the Buryat folklore.

* Some 150 sinologists from 18 countries took part in a *conference of the European Association of Chinese Studies* in Ortisei—St. Ulrick (Bolzano, Italy). The Soviet delegation was headed by M. Sladkovsky, Corresponding Member of the USSR Academy of Sciences and Director of the Academy's Institute of the Far East. At the plenary sessions the following reports were delivered: "Understanding modern China: history and social science" (R. Trau-Zettel, FRG); "Messianism and milleniarism in Ancient China" (K. Schipper, France); and "Literature and linguistics as a means for understanding modern China" (B. Csongor, Hungary). In five panels reports were made on the problems of history and politics, history of Chinese thought, language and literature, archaeology, folklore. The Soviet sinologists presented the papers: "Syntax structures of modern Chinese language" (V. Solntsev), "Literature of the 1940s and the problem of realism in China" (V. Sorokin), and "A rising of political thought in China" (V. Krivtsov). In addition, 10 Soviet papers were circulated among the participants.

* The *14th International Congress of Genetics on "Genetics and Human Welfare"* took place in Moscow. This was the first time that the International Genetic Federation held its meeting in a socialist country. The congress was attended by nearly 3,500 representatives from 60 countries, including nine socialist.

Speaking at the plenary session, Academician N. Tsitsin (USSR), who presided over the congress, made a general survey of the achievements and prospects of genetics at the present stage of its development.

The problems discussed ranged from the molecular level to the biosphere. Central at the congress were such new trends in science as genetic engineering, ecogenetics, environmental genetics, behaviour genetics, and so on. The participants noted that, apart from the proper genetic aspects, these problems were of great significance socially.

The work of the congress was carried on in five plenary sessions,

26 symposiums, and 23 panel meetings. More than 1,700 papers were presented. At the first plenary session devoted to "Genetics and Human Welfare", Academician N. Dubinin (USSR) delivered a report on "Genetics and its importance for mankind" and Prof. P. Oftedal (Norway) spoke on "Problems of genetics risks due to environmental causes". At the concluding plenary session devoted to "N. I. Vavilov's Heritage and Modern Genetics", the papers "N. I. Vavilov and his role in the development of genetics" (F. Bakhteyev, USSR), "Studies on the origin and evolution of cultivated plants since N. I. Vavilov" (J. Harlan, USA), etc., were presented.

Academician D. Belyaev of the USSR was elected President of the International Genetic Federation for another five-year term.

* The *8th International Congress of Slavists*, held in Zagreb, Yugoslavia, brought together nearly 1,500 scholars from 26 member countries of the International Committee of Slavists (ICS), including eight socialist countries. The Soviet delegation was headed by Academician M. Alexeyev, President of the Soviet Committee of Slavists.

At the plenary meeting the opening speech was made by Academician B. Kreft of Yugoslavia, President of ICS, and the following reports were made: "Worldwide fame of Tolstoy" by M. Alexeyev, USSR, and "Communication as a factor of the mediaeval literature" by Professor R. Marinkovič, "Miroslav Krleža" by Academician I. Frangeš and "Tradition as a factor in the development of Slavonic literary languages of the 19th-20th centuries" by Academician B. Koneski, all of Yugoslavia. Then the congress continued its work in five panels (linguistics, literary criticism, literary-linguistic problems, folklore studies, history). About 900 reports and communications were delivered at the congress. Soviet scholars had submitted 99 reports beforehand, and read another 60. The 8th International Congress of Slavists was largely dedicated to the memory of Lev Tolstoy.

Within the framework of the congress, meetings of international commissions on Slavonic studies (on the history of world Slavonic studies, on the all-Slavic linguistic atlas, on Balto-Slavic relations, on folklore, and on the history of the social thought of Slavic peoples) were held.

Simultaneously, an assembly of the International Association for the Study and Propagation of Slav Cultures was convened, with its President, D. Markov, Corresponding Member of the USSR Academy of Sciences, in the chair.

At the plenary meeting of the ICS in Ljubljana, Yugoslavia, Academician M. Alexeyev was elected its new President. The meeting approved his proposal that the 9th International Congress of Slavists be convened in Kiev, in 1983. The participants heard the report "The problems of reconstruction of Old Slavic spiritual culture" delivered by Soviet scholar N. Tolstoy.

* More than 200 scholars from nine countries took part in the *15th International Conference of the Society of Antiquarians of the Socialist Countries "Eirene" ("Pax")* held in Nesebâr, Bulgaria. Its work was carried out in plenary sessions and four panels (history, archaeology,

literature, linguistics), where about 80 reports were heard. At the archaeological panel, the participants discussed, in particular, the results of excavations made by Bulgarian scholars. At the historical panel, reports were devoted, mainly, to problems of agrarian relations in the Ancient East, Greece and Rome (communications by H. Kreissig of the GDR, J. Hahn of Hungary, V. Velkov of Bulgaria and others). Soviet scholars participated in all panels and submitted 20 reports, including one on "Roman bronze vessels in Eastern Europe" delivered by D. Shelov.

* A *scientific conference "Northern Europe in International Class Struggle"*, held in Greifswald, GDR, was attended by scholars from six socialist countries. The Soviet delegation was headed by Academician W. Steinberg of the Latvian Academy of Sciences. At the plenary sessions, the report on the present state and tasks of the study of North European countries in the GDR was made by Professor H. Joachimi, Head of theNorth European Studies Section at Greifswald University.

Then the work of the conference was carried on three panels. The first panel, where 22 reports and 75 communications were delivered, dealt with historical, economic and political aspects of the conference's main theme; the second panel, with the methodological problems of the description of North European literatures and the questions of cultural policy in the countries of Northern Europe; the third panel, with the problems of diachrony in the scientific description of North European languages and in the textbooks of these languages for foreign students.

* More than 300 prominent scholars, experts, statesmen and public figures from 59 countries, including eight socialist, as well as observers from a number of international organisations, took part in the *14th General Assembly of the International Union for Conservation of Nature and Natural Resources (IUCN)* held in Ashkhabad, USSR.

The assembly concentrated on discussing the programme document, *World Conservation Strategy*, the elaboration and approval of which was timed to the 30th anniversary of IUCN. The recommendations contained in this document can serve as the basis for elaboration of subsequent international and national programmes for action to conserve and restore the natural ecological systems and resources of flora and fauna. The assembly took note of the fact that a provision for nature protection had been included in the Constitution of the USSR and that the Soviet Union had thereby fulfilled the principal recommendation made by the *Strategy*.

* The *first scientific conference of the International Information System for Social Sciences (IISSS)* on "The Role of Scientific Information in the Development of Social Sciences in Socialist Countries and the Tasks Faced by the IISSS" held in Varna, Bulgaria, was attended by representatives of the member countries (Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia, the GDR, Hungary, Poland and the USSR) and Vietnam, as an observer. President of the Bulgarian Academy of Sciences A. Balevsky made an introductory speech. The main report "The growing role of social science at the present stage and the major lines of activities and perfection of the

IISSS" was delivered by V. Vinogradov, Director of the Institute of Scientific Information on Social Sciences, the USSR Academy of Sciences. The 36 reports and communications concentrated on two major problems: "Social sciences and scientific information" and "The tasks of the IISSS development".

* Representatives of information centres and major libraries of 22 European countries (including eight socialist countries) and Canada, as well as of nine international organisations, met at the *2nd European Conference on Social Science Information and Documentation* in Blazejevko, near Poznan, Poland.

The participants heard a report of the European Coordination Centre for Research and Documentation in Social Sciences (Vienna Centre) by A. Schaff, Austria, and reports of working groups: on international cooperation in primary and secondary information exchange (A. McGregor, United Kingdom); information on on-going research (H. Stegemann, FRG); on development and compatibility of computerised information systems (V. Vinogradov, USSR). They also heard reports on the preparatory work for publication of a "European Guide to Social Science Information and Documentation Services" (S. Gabrowska, Bulgaria) and "Application of mathematical methods and computers in social sciences: International Bibliographical Index 1975-1977" (V. Khizamutdinov, USSR).

The participants discussed the Programme for Development of Cooperation in 1979-1980 and approved the "Recommendations of the 2nd Conference on European Cooperation in Social Science Information" containing proposals on major lines in cooperation and activities of the centres of social science information in the spirit of the Final Act adopted at the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe.

* Taking part in *all-Union seminar of the executives of the centres for scientific information on social sciences* held in Tbilisi, USSR, were representatives of the republican and of a number of branch centres. At the plenary and panel meetings the participants heard nearly 40 reports and communications dealing with various aspects of information activities in the field of social science, particularly the automation of information processes and the development of selective distribution of information; organisation and improvement of republican services in documentation and archives' activities.

* The *Regional Conference of the International Geographic Union on "Resources and Development in Africa"* sponsored by the National Committee on Geography was held in Lagos, Nigeria. It was attended by almost 1,000 scholars from more than 50 countries of all continents, including 15 African countries. The delegation of Soviet geographers was headed by Academician I. Gerasimov, Director of the Institute of Geography, the USSR Academy of Sciences. The conference was preceded by meetings of about 20 symposiums and working groups which dealt with a wide range of problems concerning the main theme. Their venues were the Universities of Lagos, Ibadan, Ife, Zaria, Benin. Two general symposiums on "The

Role of Geographers in Government Planning" (with I. Gerasimov as one of the main speakers) and "Data Collection and Processing for Development", and meetings of 12 sections with 90 reports were held within the framework of the conference.

Besides, five public lectures on the topical problems of the theme discussed were delivered. Soviet scholars presented four papers at the panel meetings. At the final sitting of the conference, Academician Gerasimov and five other foreign scholars were presented with honorary awards for their distinguished contribution to the study of the geography of Africa.

* An *international symposium on Armenian art* sponsored by the USSR Academy of Sciences, the Armenian Academy of Sciences and the Institute of Art, the Armenian Academy of Sciences, was held in Yerevan USSR. Nearly 300 scholars from 21 countries, including eight socialist countries, took part. They discussed the original features of Armenian art, prospects for its development, its ties and relationship with art of neighbouring peoples. Some 150 reports and communications were delivered at the plenary and panel sittings.

* An *all-Union conference "Methodological Aspects of the Interconnection of Social, Natural and Technical Sciences"* held in Obninsk, USSR, was attended by more than 100 scholars—philosophers, historians and other men of science from 26 cities and towns of the Soviet Union.

The participants heard and discussed more than 20 reports devoted to four themes of the conference; epistemological, methodological and sociological premises of the interaction of social, natural and technical sciences; integration of sciences as a tendency in the present scientific and technological revolution; general scientific concepts and their role in the integration of scientific knowledge; interaction of social, natural and technical sciences as an aspect of the science of science and the history of science. A seminar "Interaction of Sciences as a Phenomenon of Culture" was held within the framework of the conference.

* Academician Pyotr Kapitsa, prominent Soviet physicist, was awarded the 1978 Nobel Prize for fundamental discoveries and research in the physics of low temperatures.

BOOK REVIEWS

И. С. ГАЛКИН. *В. И. Ленин и развитие советской историографии новой и новейшей истории стран Европы и Америки.* М., изд-во МГУ, 1977, 368 стр.

I. S. GALKIN, *V. I. Lenin and the Development of Soviet Historiography of the Modern and Contemporary History of the Countries of Europe and America,* Moscow University Press, 1977, 368 pp.

The first part of the monograph under review is devoted to Lenin's contribution to the study of the problems connected with the modern and contemporary history of Europe and America. It tells of the emergence of the Leninist stage in historiography, of Lenin's development of the materialist understanding of history. Galkin notes that, while Lenin rejected the subjectivism and reactionary essence of bourgeois historiography, he critically used the facts accumulated by it and certain of its conclusions. The author analyses Lenin's periodisation of modern history, his conclusions about the results of the industrial and bourgeois revolutions, about the working-class movement, a proletarian party of a new type and the dictatorship of the proletariat, about imperialism, the national liberation movement of the oppressed peoples, and about the principles of the strategy and tactics of the present-day communist and working-class movement.

The second part of the book examines the principles of Soviet historiography of the modern and contemporary history of Europe and America over the period 1917-1975. The author singles out the first stage, from October 1917 to the mid-1920s, in the establishment of the system of Soviet scientific-historical institutions, shows the specific features of the period when the main tasks of Marxist-Leninist historical science were being defined, when Marxist historians were gathering their forces and the foundation for training new cadres of Soviet historians was being laid. The second stage, from the mid-1920s to the mid-1930s, saw the further affirmation—in conditions of a sharp ideological and theoretical struggle—of the Leninist principles of Soviet historical science in the course of elaborating the history of social revolutions, analysing their driving forces and formulating important methodological questions.

With the consolidation of the young Soviet state in the international arena the activity and influence of Soviet historical science

grew. Soviet scholars made trips abroad to do research in archives. The cultural ties with France and Germany that had existed still before the revolution, and the revolutionary traditions among the progressive intelligentsia of these countries facilitated the establishment and development of contacts between Soviet and foreign historians.

The author exhaustively analyses the application of Leninist methodology in the works of Soviet historians, written between 1917 and 1945, on the bourgeois revolutions of the 17th-19th centuries, the Paris Commune, the First International, on the history of pre-Marxian socialist doctrines and of Marxism; in studies on economic history, the working-class movement and on other problems. In the period between the two world wars, Soviet historians basing themselves on the creative ideas of Marxism-Leninism wrote fundamental, original works on the English Revolution of the 17th century. The Great French Revolution particularly attracted their attention.

In 1930s, Soviet scholars began to make an in-depth study of the revolutions of 1848-1849 and the participation in them of Karl Marx and Frederick Engels.

After Marx Lenin became the leading historian of the Paris Commune. His works on the Commune have become part of the treasure-house of Marxist historiography. As the socialist revolution drew nearer in Russia Lenin more and more often turned to the lessons of the Paris Commune. In the early years after the victory of the October Revolution bourgeois-liberal and petty-bourgeois revisionist concepts of the Paris Commune were still widespread. In their works some historians expounded erroneous theses which denied the socialist content of the Paris Commune, its establishment of a qualitatively new state which became the prototype of the dictatorship of the proletariat. However, the expansion of original sources and a deeper study of the works of Marx, Engels and Lenin made for more scholarly and in-depth research. Of immense importance was the publication of documents on the history of the First International and the Paris Commune.

Galkin examines Soviet historiography of European and American history in the post-war period and notes that after the Second World War the research work of Soviet historians was given particularly wide scope.

The author gives much attention to the measures taken by the CC CPSU and the Soviet Government to ensure the development of historical science, the establishment of a system of new academic institutes engaged in research in the history, military history, economics, politics and culture of different countries, regions and continents. The Urals and Far Eastern centres of the USSR Academy of Sciences, and the North Caucasian Scientific Centre of higher school, for example, are doing intensive researches into a number of important problems of history. Also the history institutions of the Academies of Sciences of the Union republics are doing fruitful work.

Galkin stresses that the further successful development of Marxist-Leninist historical science rests on the programme documents of the CPSU. He notes that at the present time, increasingly deeper interest is centring on problems of the

genesis of capitalism, the industrial and bourgeois revolutions and democratic movements in the countries of Europe and America, the history of socialist doctrines and formation of scientific communism. Also the history of international relations and colonial policy, problems of the international socialist movement and the methodology of history are being researched.

The works of Soviet authors on the history of the bourgeois revolutions of the 17th-18th centuries show that it is in social revolutions that the role of the advanced classes is most strongly evident in the formation of socio-economic relations, the establishment of a political superstructure based on new production relations.

In connection with the bicentennial of the United States of America Soviet historiography focused particular attention on problems of the American Revolution. In monographs and collective works their authors showed the progressive character of this anti-colonial revolution, its driving forces, the clash of interests and aims of different classes and social groups, the actions of the leaders of the American War of Independence. At the same time they also showed the limited character of this revolution which failed to raise the issue of racial discrimination, to defend the broad masses against the exploitation of the ruling classes of the country.

Summarising the results of research by Soviet historians in postwar contemporary history Galkin rightly notes their broad coverage of key problems of social history, of the working-class movement and international relations. Many valuable monographs and generalising works on the history of different continents, countries and peoples have been published, extensive and in-depth studies of the methodology of history and historiography have appeared.

The author focuses special attention on the study of contemporary history. Soviet historians have produced a number of works on the impact of the Great October Socialist Revolution on the world revolutionary process. Other subjects being studied are: the development of the world socialist system, the working-class movement in the developed capitalist countries, problems of the Second World War, the anti-fascist resistance, the liberatory mission of the Soviet Army, the foreign policy of the USSR and international relations. Important works on state-monopoly capitalism and capitalist integration have appeared.

The book notes the substantial success of Soviet historians in their analyses of current problems of world history, and particularly of the development of the communist and working-class movement. At the same time the gaps and shortcomings in their work are not overlooked. Thus economic history, the history of science and culture and the political history of bourgeois states and political parties have been researched to a lesser extent. As yet the area of research has not included the mechanism of bourgeois government. The home policy and especially the social legislation of some capitalist states are examined cursorily, only in connection with the political struggle. The study of bourgeois parties, reformist trade unions and employers' organisations is inadequately conducted. The same holds true as regards the

elaboration of problems connected with social and national psychology, with the changes in the class structure of the population of the countries of Europe and America and the changes in the electoral systems, and in the behavioural motives of the voters. The history of the culture, technology and science of modern times is poorly studied. There are no basic works on the current scientific and technological revolution.

On the whole, however, the monograph is an important and useful work in many respects, summing up and indicating some problems of modern and contemporary history that call for further elaboration.

Academician
A. Narochnitsky

Э. А. БАГРАМОВ. *Ленинская национальная политика: достижения и перспективы.* М., изд-во «Мысль», 1977, 232 стр.

E. A. BAGRAMOV, *The Leninist Nationalities Policy: Achievements and Prospects*, Moscow, Mysl Publishers, 1977, 232 pp.

The author analyses, on a theoretical and practical plane, problems bearing on the elaboration and implementation of the Leninist nationalities policy, examines its basic principles, historical achievements and development trends. Considerable attention is paid to the international significance of the CPSU's experience in solving the national question, and to the exposure of the bourgeois and revisionist falsifications of this experience.

The book opens with a characteristic of the contribution by the 25th Congress of the CPSU to the theory and practice of proletarian internationalism. Proceeding from the ideas of the Congress the author stresses that, "the harmonious development of national relations are determined not only by objective conditions but by subjective factors and, first of all, by a purposeful nationalities policy based on a strict scientific analysis".

Lenin's teaching on the national question was one of the decisive factors that made possible the historical achievements of the CPSU's nationalities policy. Lenin theoretically substantiated, and proved in practice, that in conditions when the Communist Party is the leading force, the slogan of the right of all nations to self-determination, including secession and the establishment of an independent state, can and must lead not to the division of nations but to the voluntary and free alliance and union of nations in their common struggle for national and social emancipation. He advanced a fundamentally new conception of national statehood under socialism, creating the theoretical foundations of international and inter-state relations of a socialist type and defining the specific ways and forms of building a multinational socialist state.

In his writings Lenin takes sharp issue with the Right and Left opportunist concepts on the national question, shows the untenability of both national nihilism and sundry attempts to distort the social content of national problems.

Armed with the Leninist teaching, the CPSU ensured in an in-

credibly short historical period—in the life of one generation actually—all the necessary conditions for successfully solving the national question in the form in which it arose under capitalism, that is, as a question of the complete abolition of national oppression, inequality and antagonism between nations. This actually means, we read in the book, that in the USSR all national oppression has been done away with for all time; all nations, exercising the right to self-determination, have united in a federal union of free peoples; the former actual inequality of nations has been abolished; a modern industry and agriculture have been built up in all the republics and there appeared skilled workers, collective farmers and intelligentsia; a cultural revolution has been carried out which made it possible not only to wipe out massive illiteracy but to give the broadest masses access to the achievements of world and national culture; the class basis of nationalism and chauvinism has been destroyed; the ideas of friendship and brotherhood of peoples have taken firm root in the minds of the overwhelming majority of the country's citizens.

The building of a developed socialist society in the USSR advanced the problem of perfecting national relations in the new conditions. The monograph under review deals at length with this problem.

Drawing on extensive factual material, on economic and demographic statistics, Bagramov analyses the main tendencies in the internationalisation of economic and social life in the conditions of developed socialism. These tendencies are oriented towards overcoming the vestiges of the former isolation of the country's peoples, towards intensification of their allround cooperation and the integrated development of production in each republic, towards strengthening the national economy through the joint efforts of all the nations and nationalities of the USSR.

The author shows the dialectical character of socialist internationalisation which makes for the expansion of all forms of contact and social communication between peoples, for broader exchange of personnel and material and spiritual values, the drawing closer together of nations and nationalities, the formation and strengthening of common traits and traditions, while at the same time ensuring the free development of true national values and the progressive traditions of all the peoples of a multinational country.

A special chapter is devoted to the development in the conditions of mature socialism of the Soviet people as a new historical community of people. It is not a new nation but a multinational community embracing more than a hundred nations and nationalities whose whole tenor of life while preserving its own specific features reflects some common features that took shape and root in the period of socialist and communist construction.

Mature socialist society ensures unity of the allround development of union statehood and the national statehood of the republics on the principles of democratic centralism and socialist federalism, of Soviet democracy. Such unity expresses the interests of all the nations and nationalities of the Soviet Union, embodies the harmonious combination of the international and the

national in the life of society where the international factor plays the leading role.

The aforesaid process has found its reflection in the new Soviet Constitution which has formalised the unity of union and national statehood, has become the legal foundation of the drawing closer together of the socialist nations and the further progress of each of them.

The author refutes, with well-grounded arguments, the false thesis that socialism abolishes nations and national cultures. He stresses that under socialism the international combines within itself the spiritual wealth and diversity of the national. The internationalisation of the Soviet way of life is the harmonious embodiment in a single whole of the values the nations and nationalities possess, including both their progressive traditions of the past and the new features of everyday life, of social psychology, and of the culture that have evolved in the conditions of the building of socialism and communism.

One of the results of the building of developed socialist society in the Soviet Union and of the Leninist nationalities policy is the practical realisation of the great ideal of Marxist-Leninists—the transformation of internationalism into a norm of behaviour of the working people of all the nations and nationalities of the country. The author shows the internationalism of Soviet people as an expression of the humane essence of socialism, as one of the main qualities inherent in the Soviet way of life. By abolishing social and national oppression and inequality socialism for the first time in history demonstrated in practice that the working people of different races and nationalities no longer have any grounds for mutual distrust and hostility. Socialism has ennobled national relations, created an entirely new spiritual and moral climate in the social communication between peoples.

The author also discusses problems of the struggle against the survivals of nationalism in the minds of people.

The monograph shows the untenability of the assertions about national relations in the USSR, including the allegation about forcible Russification being carried out in the USSR. Marxist-Leninists take a positive attitude to processes of assimilation if they are natural and voluntary, and are against artificially accelerating these processes. The drawing closer together of the socialist nations is proceeding without pressure from the outside. It is determined by the objective factors of socialist development and is an integral part of their florescence.

The democratism and enormous vitality of the Leninist nationalities policy have been proved not only by the historical experience of its successful implementation in the Soviet Union, but by the beneficial results of its influence on the mutual relations between socialist countries.

Bagramov's book is a major contribution to the study of the CPSU's nationalities policy in the conditions of developed socialism and helps to explore more deeply the development of national relations in the period of the full-scale building of communism.

Yu. Stepanov

А. Х. КАСЫМЖАНОВ, А. Ж. КЕЛЬБУГАНОВ, К. М. САТЫБАЛДИНА. *«Круги» в познании. Ленинское учение о единстве исторического и логического.* Алма-Ата, изд-во «Наука» Казахской ССР, 1977, 176 стр.

A. Kh. KASYMZHANOV, A. Zh. KELBUGANOV, K. M. SATYBALDINA, *"Circles" in Cognition. Lenin's Theory of the Unity of the Historical and the Logical*, Alma Ata, Nauka Publishers of the Kazakh SSR, 1977, 176 pp.

Philosophical Notebooks holds a special place among Lenin's works, as regards the problems of history and the theory of dialectics. The opinion is widespread that in this work the conspectuses of books, notably the conspectus of Hegel's book *The Science of Logic* and the conspectus of Hegel's book *Lectures on the History of Philosophy* and various notes, outlines and plans, are only a part of a bigger work on materialist dialectics which Lenin was engaged in on the eve of the Great October Socialist Revolution but which he did not finish because of certain historical reasons. Therefore, from the point of view of the constructive elaboration of the modern problems of materialist dialectics, it is important that we should study the ideological content of Lenin's *Philosophical Notebooks*. Whereas Lenin's central idea about unity (coincidence) of dialectics, logic and the theory of cognition has been studied and analysed in several books and dozens of articles, another important idea in *Philosophical Notebooks*, of the development of human cognition as the "circle of circles"—has received relatively little attention. But Lenin returned to this idea again and again, noting the most important points on this matter in Hegel's works, and finally, in the second part of his famous fragment *On the Question of Dialectics*, he wrote his well-known outline of "circles" in philosophy and analysed the key aspects of this idea.

The book under review is, to all intents and purposes, the first monograph devoted to an analysis of the essence of Lenin's idea of the "circle of circles" as it had been formulated in the fragment *On the Question of Dialectics*. The authors discuss its methodological and heuristic significance for an understanding of the dialectics of the process of reflection. They write: "The significance of the idea of the 'circle of circles' consists in that it allows, in the Marxist-Leninist party spirit, to grasp the perspective of the world historico-philosophical process as a whole, in its law-governed development which presupposes the presence of a general direction in its ramification and multiformity and which includes deviations from the main road of advancement."

The analysis of this idea enables the authors to map out two aspects of research: a "circle" as the return to the initial stage and the stages that have been traversed (negation of negation), and a "circle" as an individual stage in the history of philosophy in the form of a relatively closed sphere with the problems inherent in it. It should be noted that in the work under review main attention is devoted to the second aspect of Lenin's idea—to represent "every shade of thought—a circle on the great circle (a spiral) of the development of human thought in general"

(V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Moscow, Vol.38, p.247). The authors have succeeded in showing the essence of Lenin's idea of the "circle of circles", which enables us to grasp, first of all, the logic of the development of philosophy as a process of transition to a new circle of ideas.

The history of philosophy is of primary importance in revealing the idea of "circles" in cognition because of the specific features of philosophy in the system of knowledge in general, and, in particular, because of the fact that through the history of philosophy the purely philosophical categories of cognition are included in the theory of dialectics.

The book cites interesting material from the history of philosophy with a view to illustrating the "circles" idea. This refers, in particular, to questions of Arab philosophy discussed by the authors.

The authors counterpose a concrete historical approach to two extreme positions: an excessive exaggeration of the role of a logical approach from the position of the absolutised mature form, and the isolation of a concrete historical cycle from the entire course of historical development.

In our view, the authors' attempt to examine the nature of myth as a special logical phenomenon constituting a milestone in man's conquest of the world and cognition of himself merits special attention. Various philosophical, mathematical and general cultural material is analysed in connection with defining the pattern of thought inherent in the "golden age" of the mediaeval period in the Orient.

One should also pay attention to the authors' analysis of the last "circle" in Lenin's notes which is connected, as is known, with the formation of Marxist philosophy. The book shows that the taking shape of all the component parts of Marxism was connected with the singling out of the principal idea—that of social relations—which was first discussed by Marx and Engels in *The Holy Family*. This idea constituted the centre around which a new system of ideas began to develop, and it is with the introduction of this system that the process of overcoming the old, that is, pre-Marxian circle of ideas, started. This important conclusion about the character of transition to new systems in the history of philosophy is further developed in the book; it is being applied to the history of cognition and culture which, in the authors' view, may be represented also on the plane of development and change of relatively independent and closed ways of thinking.

Further on, the authors examine the interconnection between mythology and philosophy precisely in this aspect. Within the scope of a review article it is impossible to make a detailed analysis of this approach to mythology. Here we shall only note that the very posing of the question is worthy of attention, inasmuch as it concerns, to a certain extent, the problem of the origin of philosophy. The specific approach of the authors of the book to this question lies in that they regard the problem of the emergence of the philosophical form of cognition as replacement of one way of thinking by another. It is likewise important that the authors perceive the sources of the process of re-orientation of human thinking to the reflection of substantial relations and objective real-

ity in the general radical changes taking place in society at the moment when commodity exchange relations between people began to acquire the predominant role. Citing the history of Ancient Greek natural philosophy as an example, they analyse the objective conditions of its formation and disclose the logical possibilities and dynamics of its development.

The authors draw on the history of the Middle Ages, and this is important; for the role and place of that period in the history of cognition have not been sufficiently studied and assessed. In the chapter "The 'Circle' of Mediaeval Symbolism" the authors attempt to define the pattern of thought characteristic of the development of science, art and philosophy of the Arabic-speaking peoples from the 9th to the 15th century. A comparison of two historical patterns of thought—ancient cosmology and mediaeval symbolism—defining two circles in the history of culture leads the authors to the conclusion about the rational character of mediaeval symbolism which can be traced in the philosophy, science and culture of that period.

One should also mention the consistency with which the authors apply the idea of the "circle of circles" to a study of the periods of philosophical thought which have been insufficiently examined. They have largely succeeded in showing the methodological and heuristic possibilities of Lenin's idea about "circles" and its applicability to the many and varied ties between the historical and the logical.

B. Bogdanov,
E. Tyulepbergenova

Экономика развитого социалистического общества (основные черты, закономерности развития). М., изд-во «Экономика», 1977, 543 стр.

The Economy of Developed Socialist Society (Basic Features and Laws of Development), Moscow, Ekonomika Publishers, 1977, 543 pp.

This work by a team of researchers of the Institute of Economics, USSR Academy of Sciences, headed by E. Kapustin, Corresponding Member of the USSR Academy of Sciences, and V. Cherkovets, D. Sc. (Econ.), investigates the fundamental features of the economy of developed socialism that distinguish it from the preceding stage of socialist development.

An attempt is made to define the new problems that face developed socialism in its evolution to the highest stage of the communist formation. It is a stage at which the advantages of the socialist economic system are fully revealed and the operation of the objective laws inherent in it comes into full play. Accordingly, the features of developed socialism are examined not only from the point of view of its achievements, but also of its potentialities, which take effect gradually, with the development of the productive forces, perfection of production relations and the system of planned management of the economy.

In considering the basic economic features of mature socialism, the authors single out three decisive criteria characteristic of a new historical stage in the develop-

ment of the USSR: the immediate transition to the creation of the material and technical base of communism; comprehensive integration of social production; allround operation of the specific economic laws of socialism, and its fundamental law in the first place.

A considerable place in the work is devoted to an analysis of the improvement of the material and technical base of socialism in the process of its direct development into the material and technical base of communism. The authors examine the latter's criteria, establish the objective laws and socio-economic nature of scientific and technological progress under socialism and the principles of integrated approach to controlling them.

In analysing the role of the scientific and technological revolution in the society's historical development and the forms in which it is organically blended with the advantages of socialism, the authors note that socialist economy creates the need for and possibility of planned formation and perfection of complexes combining science (research), technology (technical development), production (manufacture of new hardware) and consumption (industrial application of new hardware).

The specifics of the process of socialist socialisation of production at the present stage are investigated in two aspects: the material (concentration, specialisation, agro-industrial integration and others) and the socio-economic (the development of forms of socialist property). The trends in the improvement of the forms of socialist property are examined in close connection with this process. The qualitative changes in each of the basic forms of property and their proportions in social production are clearly defined. In the authors' view, the two forms of property (state and cooperative-collective-farm) can merge already at the stage of developed socialism. That is why the evolution of socialist ownership into communist ownership is possible primarily through the development of public ownership.

The changes in the character and content of work in mature socialist society have an ever greater impact on the gradual obliteration of substantial differences between physical and mental work, agricultural and industrial work, and the development of the worker himself. New, creative work incentives appear alongside material and moral ones, the authors stress. Realisation of this is essential for the scientific organisation of labour, the optimum combination of all forms of incentives.

The book investigates the objective prerequisites of the comprehensive operation of the basic economic law of socialism as a regulator of economic development, the specific features of distribution of material and spiritual wealth, and main lines of improving the Soviet people's living standards. The authors investigate the important methodological question of the essence of the "way of life" category and its place in the system of categories expressing aggregate social relations, and the difference in the socio-economic categories of "standard of living" and "way of life". The work notes that the inviolable connection between the two concepts is neither direct nor immediate. The same living standards may exist for entirely different or even diametrically opposed

ways of life. "Living standards" characterise the population's well-being from the point of view of consumption. But whatever its significance, this category cannot be used to characterise a person's social standing, his goals and methods of achieving them, the forms in which they are realised, the degree of satisfaction he derives from his work, relations with people at work and at home, etc. "Way of life" is a category that generalises the economic, social and cultural aspects of a person's life in their intricate and contradictory unity determined by the given mode of production.

The idea is consistently persued that the advantages of the socialist economy and all its laws cannot be realised automatically. The deliberate regulation of the social reproduction process is an extremely complex and comprehensive mechanism.

The authors investigate the basic features of this mechanism, its structure and the interaction of its various elements. They examine new forms and methods of economic planning, the development of organisational forms of managing social production, the specific features of cost accounting at the stage of developed socialism, the improvement of price formation and the financial and credit mechanism. Special consideration is given to problems involving the forms and methods of regulating scientific and technological progress: the efficiency of new hardware, comprehensive programmes of scientific and technological progress, management structures and economic incentives.

All problems are viewed from the angle of assuring the organic unity of its economic and social results. The authors proceed from the idea that economic effectiveness is the basis of all manifestations of the social effect of scientific and technological progress: the more economically effective new hardware, the greater are the opportunities for obtaining its social effect. However, they stress, it would be wrong to claim that the social effect of scientific and technological progress derives automatically from its economic effect. The achievement of social results requires special purposeful, planned actions on the part of the society.

Many pages in the monograph are devoted to problems of extended reproduction at the stage of developed socialism. They reveal its basic features, characterise the transition to predominantly intensive types of extended reproduction, and show the basis of the dynamism of socialist reproduction and the perfection of the economic structure.

The authors examine in detail the problem of rate of development, which remains focal. Provided optimum proportions in the development of subdivisions of social production and individual sectors within them are maintained, the problem of quality does not come into contradiction with the need to accelerate this rate. At the same time, the authors note that in the conditions of a mature socialist economy and the attained level of development, the approach to evaluating the rate and proportions must be different than before. Large-scale production makes it possible to more fully meet social demand at a relatively lower production growth rate, with ever greater orientation on raising quality. Whereas formerly the determining factor was the rate of

growth of industry, heavy industry, to be more precise, now decisive in assessing growth rate is the dynamic and balanced development of all branches of the economy, raising agricultural output and assuring the steady rise of living standards. Growth rates and proportions have a cause-and-effect relationship. High rates are a means of changing proportions, while structural changes lay the basis for changing rates.

The authors see a special aspect of socialist reproduction in the need to assure an organic combination of high growth rate and rational utilisation of natural resources. The socialist system precludes any antagonisms between the purposes of production and ecological requirements and creates the conditions for rationally balancing them.

The work takes in many ways new approaches to the problem of extended reproduction of labour reserves in the conditions of developed socialism. Today, the authors note, the qualitative aspect of the reproduction of the population and labour reserves, i.e., the physical health, education, upbringing and skills of new generations of working people, are of decisive significance.

The monograph devotes considerable attention to the development of foreign economic ties. The influence of real socialism on world economic relations is becoming ever more effective and diversified. At the same time, intensification of external ties is an important factor in the further development of socialist society. The authors note that the formation of developed socialism in the Soviet Union, coupled with the achievements of socio-economic development of other countries of the socialist community, was a prime requisite of the socialist world system's transition to the qualitatively new stage of socialist economic integration, which substantially accelerates processes of socialist construction in all countries of the system. The work investigates the integrational processes, as well as the Soviet Union's economic relations with developing and developed capitalist countries.

The new system of production ties between the Soviet Union and developing countries is shown on concrete facts based on the USSR's regular participation in the realisation of major integrated construction programmes, supplying the implements of labour and other industrial goods. The monograph concludes with a politico-economic assessment of our country's economic, scientific and technical ties with developed capitalist countries on the basis of joint realisation of long-term projects in industrial construction, extensive patent and license exchanges, etc., as one of the bases for expanding and strengthening the material base of the policy of peaceful coexistence.

The Soviet Union has entered the era of developed socialism; other socialist countries are also approaching that stage. New qualities appear in the development of social and production relations which increasingly influence day-to-day life in the Soviet Union and other fraternal countries, the practice of relations between countries, and science, social science in the first place. The principal virtue of the reviewed work is that its authors do not restrict themselves to a historical account and pose many new questions and outline ways of solving them.

B. Miroshnichenko

А. С. КОДАЧЕНКО. *Внешнеэкономическая политика империализма и развивающиеся страны*. М., изд-во «Наука», Главная редакция восточной литературы, 1977, 311 стр.

A. S. KODACHENKO, *The Foreign Economic Policy of Imperialism and the Developing Countries*, Moscow, Nauka Publishers, 1977, 311 pp.

Neocolonialism has by now revealed its utter insolvency; a deep crisis has affected the entire system of economic relations between the imperialist powers and the developing world. The gap between their economic development levels is widening rapidly: the per capita income ratio, which was 2:1 in the early 19th century, was 13:1 in 1970, and in 1975 was already 15:1.

It is this that causes indignation, protest and struggle against all forms of neocolonialist exploitation. This struggle develops the striving for socialist ideals and the orientation of many countries towards socialism. The neocolonialist system, while actively ensuring the flow of profits from the developing states into the vaults of the imperialist monopolies has proved unable to preserve and consolidate the social positions of the monopolies in these states.

The monograph under review is keynoted by the idea that the struggle between the former metropolitan countries and the former colonies today largely determines the fate of capitalism in the liberated states. Concern about keeping the latter as a reserve of world capitalism permeates all claims of the imperialist strategists that the interests of these states be taken into account more seriously and their needs be elevated to the level of imperatives. Here lies the reason for a rapid switch of the recent adherents of aid to the developing countries in the form of grants, subsidies and credits on favourable terms to lauding commercial accounts in all types of relations of international creditors with credit recipients. Hence the lowering of the share of free subsidies of the capitalist countries to the developing states from 50 to 20 per cent by the early 1970s, and, accordingly, an increase in the proportion of loans up to 80 per cent. At the same time the credit terms become stricter. By the mid-1960s the average interest rate on new loans to the young states amounted to 3.1 per cent, on export credits—about eight per cent, and on old debts—8.5 per cent.

The change in the strategy of Western creditors is explained by their desire to create a favourable climate in the liberated countries for the activities of such agents of capitalist enterprise as multinational corporations.

Indeed, during the past 15 years or so, these corporations have shifted such large enterprises to the former colonies that their output exceeds one-quarter of the gross social product of these countries and is almost twice as high as their exports. These multinationals draw on enormous masses of scarce local raw material resources, manpower, etc., to serve their needs, their intrafirm turnover increasingly replaces a considerable portion of the developing countries' foreign trade.

The author does not extensively cite summary information and gives quite differentiated characteristics of individual groups of

countries. The monograph contains data about a sharp increase in the currency reserves of the oil producing countries, showing connections between the class interests of these countries' bourgeoisie and those of the capitalists in general. The author writes that while investing their capitals in Western states, the bourgeoisie of the developing countries dooms to failure industrialisation of their native lands and leaves young and weak indigenous industry unprotected in the face of foreign competition. In turn, the plans of the monopolies for modernising the economies of the liberated countries clearly reveal the features of the old imperialist schemes, whose essence is expressed in the maxim: "hard work to the Blacks, easy work to the whites."

The authors and purveyors of modern myths about equal partnership between the financial oligarchy of the imperialist powers and the rich élite in the developing countries have to defend their sophisms not only in theory, but in real life, too. Relations between the young states and the West are such that they undermine the economies of the former and are in glaring contradiction with the constructive, mutually advantageous economic assistance of the socialist countries to the economic progress of the liberated nations. This subject takes up a large part of the book.

Cooperation between the socialist community and the liberated countries is aimed at the consolidation of the very foundation of their industrial development and a reorganisation, on this basis, of their participation in international economic relations. For example, the Soviet import of finished goods from the developing countries constantly exceeds the import of their raw materials. Of growing importance are the Soviet deliveries of machines and equipment (over one-third of the entire Soviet export to these states). The overall trade turnover of the CMEA countries with the developing states during the period between 1970 and 1975 grew from 1.7 billion rubles to 11.9 billion. The total amount of credits granted by the socialist countries to these states has exceeded 13 billion rubles. Soviet long-term credits for their economic advancement now amount to some six billion rubles. More than 90 per cent of these credits go to finance the production sphere and create such key industries as metallurgy, engineering and power development. About 320,000 specialists have been trained in the developing countries with the help of the USSR, and 150,000 more with the assistance of other CMEA member states. Cooperation between the socialist and liberated countries is distinguished by mutual benefit, stability and favourable prospects.

Some propositions contained in the book appear to be controversial. The author's view of the conditions of trade and exchange in the world market may cause objections on our part. Indeed, the developing countries suffer ever growing losses in exchanges with the capitalist states. But the causes of this state of affairs lie not in the sphere of exchange but in the production processes preceding it, in the unequal distribution of working time among the branches of the world economy, in the attachment of the recently liberated countries to industries whose products inevitably embody less

labour, socially necessary on an international scale, and, consequently, in international cost. The possibility of some countries exploiting others thus emerges in the sphere of production.

However, the author is correct in refuting the claims of those who deny the existence of non-equivalent exchange in international trade. Violation of equivalence to the detriment of interests of the developing countries is aggravated by the deliberate and purposeful policy of monopoly price formation, the author notes, and is caused by speculative policy, falsification of the quality of products, augmenting of inflation, artificial lowering of purchasing prices, etc.

By and large, A. Kodachenko's monograph is an interesting and profound study of an important sphere of international relations.

E. Pletnyov

П. Е. СКАЧКОВ. *Очерки истории русского китаеведения.* М., изд-во «Наука», 1977, 505 стр.

P. E. SKACHKOV, *Essays on the History of Sinology in Russia,* Moscow, Nauka Publishers, 1977, 505 pp.

This book on the history of sinology in Russia over a period of more than 300 years (up to 1917) is the result of prolonged efforts. The author began gathering material for the book back in the mid-1930s and submitted the first draft for discussion in the early 1960s. His death in 1964 left the book unfinished. V. Myasnikov did a great amount of work in the course of more than 10 years in preparing the book for publication.

The book is devoted to sinology as a whole, including the study of history, economy, ideology, and language and literature. Skachkov did not confine himself to the humanities and included in his book accounts of Russian scholars' studies of Chinese medicine, botany, agronomy and astronomy. He paid special attention to the Chinese language studies in Russia at different periods, because it was those who knew the Chinese language, and the Manchurian language, who created the basis and conditions for the development of all forms of sinology.

Skachkov was deeply interested in manuscript sources (initially he had conceived his work as two parallel monographs: one—a description of the manuscript heritage of the Russian sinologists, and another—a bibliographical dictionary). Enumerating and briefly assessing the works in sinology that had been published, the author dwelt at length on manuscripts in the archives (unpublished works, diaries, etc.), many of which had been discovered by Skachkov himself. There are valuable supplements to the book, including a list of archive sources (biographical documents and manuscripts) and a list of names of the members of the Russian Church Mission stationed in Peking between 1715 and 1864. The published works by sinologists are cited in the Notes.

Of course, the history of Chinese studies in Russia covering such an extensive period is so vast a subject that even with the author's comprehensive approach, some spheres

are inadequately described in his book or not described at all. Acknowledging this, Skachkov expresses the hope that in future a work will be compiled which will deal with everything that has been written about China in our country, including the history of museums, articles in the press, and works by translators, artists and writers, natural scientists, etc. This is a grandiose programme, and in our view, of primary importance is a further elaboration of the historiographic subject, since the book itself, for all its comprehensive character, is a part, above all, of the history of historical science. Further studies are needed of the conceptions of Russian sinologists. The work under review is not only a basic source book for this purpose, but itself contains carefully formulated objective evaluations of the contributions made by various scholars, and of their individual works.

In the *Essays* are cited many examples showing that the principal tradition of sinology in Russia was a respect for the Chinese people, their history and culture. Besides N. Bichurin, whose good feelings towards China are widely known, friendly sentiments and sympathy for the Chinese people were voiced by many other Russian sinologists, including P. Kafarov and K. Skachkov. The author justly notes that sinology in Russia was inseparably linked with the general development of the humanities and social thought in pre-revolutionary Russia.

The recommendations for publishing certain archive documents, contained in the book, can be of great practical help to sinologists. For example, Skachkov reminds us that in the S. Oldenburg collection in the Archives of the USSR Academy of Sciences there is a big and important work *Description of Tunhuang Caves*, which is ready for publication and is based on materials gathered in an expedition undertaken in 1914-1915.

Skachkov identifies the following stages of development of sinology in Russia before 1917:

1) 1608-1727—the period of accumulation of information, and of the first attempts to publish works on the geographical and political position of China;

2) 1727-1805—the period of study of China by members of the Russian Church Mission in Peking; the beginning of scholarly research into the history, culture and the languages of the Manchurians, Chinese and other peoples living in the Ching Empire;

3) 1805-1860—the period in which courses in Chinese studies were first taught at Russian universities, and sinology in Russia attained world standards in the field;

4) 1860-1895—the period in which tendencies emerged towards a differentiation of disciplines in sinology, and in which the first works appeared giving a critical appraisal of China's present and past;

5) 1895-1917 — the period of study of China in the years of the upsurge of the national liberation movement of the Chinese people and on the eve of the Great October Socialist Revolution in Russia. This period is characterised by attempts to put sinology on a more practical plane.

In general this periodisation is acceptable; one may point out, however, that the dates which begin this or that period in the given scheme are debatable and do not always correspond to general

historical periodisation. One of the obvious advantages of the book under review is that it raises many problems and invites the reader to ponder over them.

One of the problems touched on in the book concerns the reforms in sinology carried out at the end of the 19th century with a view to bring sinology and the Far Eastern studies in general closer to life. These reforms were inspired by the specialist in Mongolian studies, A. Pozdneyev. Adherents of the traditional, "academic" approach, however, took issue with him on this point.

The difficulty in carrying out the reform on which A. Pozdneyev insisted, meant, in the late 19th and early 20th centuries, closer contacts of sinologists with the official institutions of tsarist Russia. Therefore, this reform was regarded by many scholars, including V. Barthold, as rendering a more active service to the foreign policy of tsarism. But nevertheless it should be borne in mind that at the turn of the century the task of expanding the study of contemporary China and the Chinese language became quite urgent.

Under Soviet power, which proclaimed the policy of fraternal assistance to China, both the practical and the academic aspects of sinology are given equal importance.

The publication of *Essays on the History of Sinology in Russia* is an occasion for all specialists on China. The book will serve as a basis of investigating individual problems and branches of sinology.

V. Nikiforov

А. И. КЛИБАНОВ. *Народная социальная утопия в России. Период феодализма.* М., изд-во «Наука», 1977, 335 стр.

A. I. KLIBANOV, *Common People's Social Utopia in Russia. Period of Feudalism,* Moscow, Nauka Publishers, 1977, 335 pp.

Although the history of humanistic socio-utopian thought in Russia has been the subject of numerous studies, the contribution made to the treasure-house of the spiritual values of the ideologists from among the common people still awaits its thorough study.

The new book by Klibanov is, first and foremost, the work of a researcher who has set out to retrace the chronicle of the intellectual life of the people, to show how their intellectual values, traditions and ideals of a society that knows no exploitation evolved. The subject of research required of the author to go beyond the framework of a historical monograph and centre attention on the profound philosophical probings that were characteristic of the social thinking of the people.

A valuable aspect of the study under review is that in his analysis of social utopia during the feudal period in Russia the author cites numerous similar examples from the history of the socio-ideological activity of the common people of feudal Europe and Asia.

It would be difficult to enumerate all the authors and titles of works on the subject researched by the author. Here the reader finds a description of the common

people's ideal of truth in Ancient Rus, based on a profound analysis of apocryphal writings entered by the ruling church in the Index of prohibited books; various forms of mediaeval utopias depicting the ideal social system in the form of "paradise on earth" and "Elysian fields" to which one only had to find the way; hopes of the imminent perdition of tyrants and oppressors and the emergence, as a rule, of a new, just system.

The social dreams of the oppressed masses of ancient Russian society found their expression in the middle of the 16th century in the utopian teachings of Yermolai-Yerazm, spokesman of the interests of the patriarchal peasantry and of Feodosi Kosoy, representative of the urban lower social strata. The teachings of the first were a scheme to balance the most vital interests of all classes of society, bearing in mind the existence of two separate worlds—that of the town inhabited by feudal lords and merchants, and that of the countryside consisting of peasants holding land in tenure. The interests of the peasants came first. This scheme was intended by its author to be carried out in the immediate future; while for the distant future he envisaged a society free of parasites and the moral vices engendered by the exploitation of the majority by the minority. Feodosi Kosoy, for his part, preached the abolition of all forms of dependence and of the tools of social domination—state and church power. His ideal was a working society, based on common landed property.

Klibanov cites numerous interesting facts showing how the common people carried out their social ideal by way of an accomplished fact. These examples speak of the unfailing devotion of the people to the ideal of collective property and cooperative forms of labour, of the organised distribution of its products (or joint use of them), and associated forms of morals and manners. Such were the "communities" founded at the close of the 17th century by Feodosi Vasilyev and Andrei Vasilyev, which were very like monastic fraternities, but whose founders and participants saw them as the restoration of the system of early Christian communes. Such, too, were the consumer communes which existed in the 1760s in the Voronezh Gubernia and several decades later in the Kharkov and Yekaterinoslav governias. The features of "monastic communism" were not characteristic of them, but they too patterned themselves on the norms of the social relations they thought to be characteristic of the early Christian communes. At the very beginning of the 19th century the experiment of "collective community" was continued at Molochniye Vody in the Tavria Gubernia by the Voronezh, Tambov, Kharkov and Yekaterinoslav "communards" exiled to those parts for their convictions.

The author acquaints us with many other figures and ideologists of the social utopia of the common people, for instance, with the fugitive soldier Yevfimi, a contemporary of Pugachev, who cursed private property and the division of people into "haves" and "have-nots", and who urged waging an uncompromising struggle against the "anti-Christ" in the person of the civil and ecclesiastical authorities, including an open struggle in the form of "civil disobedience".

Thinkers from the common people and seekers of the truth dreamt of a time when life on earth would be righteous and it would be inhabited by new people free of the evils of riches, parasitism and oppression. This was the dream, for example, of the peasants who were imprisoned in the early 90s of the 18th century in Yekaterinoslav for their thoughts and activities. While in prison they expounded their teachings in a large manuscript, analysed in detail in the book under review. They advocated the principle of community of property.

The book introduces us not only to the ideologists of the common people but also to their followers. The reader learns about the peasants Mikhail Sharov, Anikii and Timofey Sukharev, Matvei and Yermolai Kuzmin, Alexander Golovin, about Ivan Golubev who came from the lower middle classes, about the Cossack Osip Zaitsev and about many others who, although from different walks of life, were united in their adherence to their convictions and irreconcilability to serfdom, to the power of the state and church.

Klibanov shows how through the individual traits of these real heroes can be seen what is typical, making it possible to distinguish the new social types in the peasantry and in the urban poor that was taking shape as the experience of class struggle increased and new socio-economic relations developed. They constituted, of course, an insignificant minority with respect to the entire population, but a minority that was indestructible and was growing as the bourgeois structure evolved in the country's economy and the social activity of the masses increased.

The closing chapter of the book tells of a splendid socio-utopian monument of Russian democratic thought *Gospel of Freedom* (*Blagovest' svobody*). It is similar to Yermolai-Yerazm's teaching about a "common society", since it too includes concrete schemes for economic and political transformations. But the two and a half centuries separating the works compared reveal qualitative distinctions between them. *Gospel of Freedom* is a kind of ideological programme of the "third estate" calling for the complete abolition of serfdom, of the economic and political privileges of the ruling class, and envisaging forms of economic and political initiative and activity of the peasants, artisans and merchants for the common good and prosperity of the country. *Gospel of Freedom* clearly realises that the development of the country's productive forces depends on the free labour of its population.

We have touched upon only some of the major subjects and problems explored in the book. Highly interesting is also the author's analysis of the development of the philosophical concepts of the ideologists of utopia of the common people and his analysis of the relationship between the ideological awakening of the common people and the peasant uprisings and wars of the 17th and 18th centuries.

Klibanov's book is a valuable study which greatly enriches our knowledge of the subject.

E. Mayat

Е. И. ЧАПКЕВИЧ. *Евгений Викторович Тарле.* М., изд-во «Наука», 1977, 126 стр.

E. I. CHAPKEVICH, *Evgeni Viktorovich Tarle,* Moscow, Nauka Publishers, 1977, 126 pp.

This book on the life and work of Academician Evgeni Tarle, eminent Soviet historian, publicist and popular lecturer, prominent public figure and pedagogue, has been brought out in the series "Biographies and Memoirs".

The book under review is based on solid factual material, thorough historiographical analysis of the scholar's works and the high theoretical level of his conclusions.

Chapkevich has drawn on various historiographical sources: Tarle's works, including those unpublished, his voluminous epistolary legacy, the reminiscences of scholars and public figures, and materials from home and foreign periodicals. The author analyses works which make it possible to see the relationship between the problems discussed in them and those of the socio-political reality of his times, works which show the complex process of the evolution of his world-outlook and which have retained their scientific value at the current stage of scientific development. Tarle appears before the reader as a historian-economist, as a historian of foreign policies and wars, as a specialist in socio-political movement and in the history of philosophical thought. He was also, we might add, an outstanding authority on archives (take, for example, his works *The National Archives in Paris* and *Archives in the West*), and an historian of historical science (*On Soviet Historiography, Concerning the Study of the History of the West in the Academy of Sciences*). The book once again underscores the fact that the many-faceted subject of the personality and work of Academician Tarle has far from been exhausted and calls for further study.

The first part of the book is devoted to the pre-revolutionary period of the life and work of Tarle. Systematic archive research enabled the author to establish the exact date of the scholar's birth, to give a detailed picture of his school and student years, of the beginning of his scientific work in Kiev and then in Petersburg. Of particular interest are the facts relating to Tarle's active participation in the democratic movement of the progressive Russian intelligentsia and student body, his connections with social-democratic circles which led to arrest and greatly complicated his pedagogical and scientific activities in the early 1900s.

The scientific, methodological, ideological and political views of Tarle were influenced by the most diverse factors often contradictory in content and trend. The author has made an attempt to define some of them. He rightly notes the important role I. Luchitsky, Tarle's teacher in the University of Kiev, played in his development as a scientist. Tarle was indebted to the older generation of the Russian historical school to which Luchitsky belonged, not only for the choice of subjects for research and methods of tackling them, which he always stressed with profound gratitude, but for the solution of methodological scientific problems of the day. The political and methodological ideas of Russian liberal historiography left their imprint on the young scientist as well as the historico-materialist concept

widespread among the progressive Russian intelligentsia which could not but attract the young scientist who, still in his school years, had been drawn to liberal ideas.

However, some of the aspects of the book concerning the moulding of Tarle's world-outlook in the 1890s and beginning of the 1900s should, we think, have been portrayed more convincingly.

The author has rightly focused attention on the Soviet period in the life and work of Tarle when his brilliant and versatile talent, placed at the service of the people, revealed itself in full measure. The book traces the complex process of the ideological searchings of the scholar who succeeded in mastering the Marxist methodology and taking an active part in the development of Soviet science, in Soviet cultural construction.

As is evident from the voluminous material cited in the book, the spring of 1918 saw the beginning of Tarle's active work in reorganisation of archives, in archaeography, in developing and extending the young Soviet republic's international scientific ties. He continued to work successfully in the pedagogical field. In the centre of the scholar's attention at the time were developments in social and political life, the history of international relations at the close of the 19th and beginning of the 20th century, which was the main theme of his researches since 1914. In 1918-1919 the foremost task was to study sources for the future work on the diplomatic and military history of contemporary times, and it was tackled by Tarle in the most complicated conditions.

Notable is Chapkevich's analysis of Tarle's work on the history of the foreign policy and wars of Russia in the 18th-20th centuries. The historiographical characterisation of such works as *Europe in the Epoch of Imperialism, Napoleon, Napoleon's Invasion of Russia, The Northern War,* are based on present-day achievements of historical science. They fully take into account the level of its development in the years of Tarle's creative work, show his significant contribution to the history of diplomacy.

The book under review is not the only one in Soviet literature on the life and work of one of the luminaries of Russian and Soviet historical science, it is probably the first successful attempt at writing a popular science biography of the Soviet historian.

V. Durnovtsev

Е. К. ФЕДОРОВ. *Экологический кризис и социальный прогресс.* Л., Гидрометеоиздат, 1977, 176 стр.

E. K. FYODOROV, *Ecological Crisis and Social Progress,* Leningrad, Gidrometeoizdat Publishers, 1977, 176 pp.

A new book by the well-known Soviet scientist, Academician E. Fyodorov, examines one of the cardinal issues of our day: how long, in what ways and under what conditions can mankind grow and develop on our small planet? This question, the author demonstrates, has been widely discussed and interpreted in various ways in world literature.

For example, in the first report to the Club of Rome by the group of D. Meadows and in the pre-

paratory version of J. Forrester's report, as well as in later publications by the same authors it was claimed that mankind in its numerical growth and economic development, in the 21st century would inevitably reach the "upper physical limits" (see D. H. Meadows, D. L. Meadows, J. Randers, W. W. Behrens III. *The Limits to Growth. A Report for the Club of Rome's Project on the Predicament of Mankind.* London, 1974, p. 46), ultimate limits (see J. W. Forrester, G. W. Low, N. J. Mass. "The Debate on World Dynamics: a Response to Nordhaus", *Political Sciences*, 1976, No. 2, pp. 187-190). They wrote that the world is faced with a rigid alternative: catastrophe or acceptance of the "zero growth" conception. The authors, as E. Fyodorov noted already in 1972, reached their conclusion on the basis of the Malthusian formula (the law of diminishing returns) as applied to the utilisation of all natural resources of our planet (see E. K. Fyodorov. *Interaction of Society and Nature.* Leningrad, Gidrometeoizdat Publishers, 1972).

Although the Malthusian interpretation of modern ecological problems is seriously criticised in foreign literature as well (see C. Freeman. "Malthus with a Computer", *Futures*, Vol. 5, No. 1, 1973; J. R. Macdonald, "The Problem of Growth", *Research Management*, November 1973; W. D. Nordhaus, "World Dynamics: Measurement Without Data", *The Economic Journal*, Vol. 83, No. 332, 1973), it is still widespread in the West, as E. Fyodorov points out. Indicative in this respect is the view of the British scientist K. L. Pavitt who made a special study of this problem. Speaking about the fundamental difference between the first Malthusians and their modern followers, he writes that the former were a diminishing group, as far as their number and influence were concerned, whereas the latter are mustering their forces (K. L. Pavitt, "R. Malthus and Other Economists. Some Doomsday Revisited", *Futures*, April 1973, p. 175).

The complex character of the solution of problems connected with the pollution of the environment, depletion of raw materials and population growth is often used abroad for definite ideological purposes. The "zero growth" conception is described as the most important political manifesto of our time. Such attempts are far from new.

As far back as 1761, the British clergyman, R. Wallace, in his principal work *Various Prospects of Mankind, Nature and Providence* attempted to prove the futility of social progress. Wallace agreed that communism was an ideal corresponding to the ethical nature of man but he believed this ideal unattainable, for with the liquidation of private property the obstacles in the way of human reproduction would be eliminated, and this would be the undoing of humanity.

E. Fyodorov's book thoroughly criticises the modern versions of these ideas and other manifestations of an abstract, extra-historical approach to solution of ecological problems.

Analysing the results of man's impact on the biosphere E. Fyodorov does not deny that at present "irreversible changes are already emerging, or are at least in the offing, in the entire complex of natural processes" (p. 53). The

book emphasises that the transformation of the natural environment in the course of social production at any level of its development is inevitable, and it will continue with the further progress of mankind. And whereas up till now the earth's capacity was expanding only "due to including in economic activity the yet undeveloped elements and regions of the planet and incidental, unconnected and mainly local acts aimed at its transformation", now a pressing necessity is emerging of "conscious increase in the 'capacity', or in other words, the productivity of nature in a broad sense of the word, due to purposeful calculation, designing and its comprehensive transformation" (p. 63).

The development trends of science in general and the sciences about the earth in particular, convince us, the book stresses, that there are real possibilities for solving such tasks as "forecasting the ecological, geophysical and other consequences of human activity" (p. 65), the elaboration of the "principles and methods of refashioning the ecological chains" and the creation of the "combined natural and artificial ecological systems of a local, and then regional and, probably, a global character" (p. 84).

Examining the factors hampering the realisation of broad possibilities opened by science and natural conditions, the author emphasises that private ownership of the resources and means of production has been, and remains now, a serious obstacle in the way to optimising relations with nature. The book also dwells on pernicious influence wars and preparations for them exert on these relations.

Foreign scientists who are far from Marxism also have reached the conclusion that the chief reason for man's unpractical attitude to nature should be sought in the social system prevailing in society. Many of these scientists propose the establishment of a new world economic order within the framework of a somewhat modified capitalist social system. E. Fyodorov's book convincingly shows the utopian character of these ideas.

However, no matter "how well organised and efficient mankind's activity could be, the earth's capacity, although it is a variable value that grows depending on many parameters, is not infinite" (p. 168). Does this testify to the inevitability of a deadlock allegedly awaiting mankind, though in a distant future?

Taking into account the historical logic of the development of mankind and its productive forces, E. Fyodorov arrives at optimistic conclusions, because we are witnessing "civilisation entering into a cosmic state" (p. 169).

The American physicist Gerard K. O'Neil, analysing the physical possibilities of a further development of mankind within the bounds of the Solar system proves that "the ultimate size limit for the human race on the newly available frontier is at least 20,000 times its present value" than believed by the Club of Rome (G. K. O'Neil, "The Colonisation of Space" *Physics Today*, September 1974, p.32). The Soviet astrophysicist I. Shklovsky, also arguing with *The Limits to Growth*, defines more precisely that, on the whole, mankind will require from 500 to 2,500 years for tapping the resources of the Solar system, and 10 million years

for the same of the Galactic. "It should be definitely emphasised," I. Shklovsky writes, "that the modern development of the natural sciences, as well as the experience accumulated during the 20 years of the space age exclude the possibility of the existence of natural reasons that would render such development impossible" (I. Shklovsky, "Mind-Endowed Life in the Universe: Can It Be Unique?", *Social Sciences*, No. 2, 1978).

These are some of the basic ideas contained in the new work by E. Fyodorov. It is a serious contribution to the study of the present ecological situation and the definition of the ways and means of solving its problems. The complicated problems of man's relations with nature are discussed in a manner, easy to grasp. The book makes a good reading.

V. Kobylyansky,
G. Kuznetsov

История фашизма в Западной Европе. М., изд-во «Наука», 1978, 613 стр.

A History of Fascism in Western Europe, Moscow, Nauka Publishers, 1978, 613 pp.

Fascism is the tangible embodiment of that inherent feature of imperialism which Lenin defined as "political reaction *all along* the line" (V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Moscow, Vol. 23, p. 106). This variety of Right-wing radicalism occupies a special place in the confrontation of the two world social systems.

Fascist-oriented parties and groups are active today in nearly sixty countries. Although they have no historical future the Right danger makes itself felt in the political development of many capitalist countries.

Most timely in this connection therefore is the appearance of the collective monograph under review. In it its authors explore the circumstances that gave rise to fascism, its social roots, show who needed it in the past and for what purpose, and who might need it at present and in the future.

Drawing on a wealth of documents and facts the authors base themselves on the conclusions of Marxist-Leninist historical science, characterising fascism as the outcome of the imperialist stage of capitalism which in times of a general crisis looks for various forms of preserving its domination.

The monograph gives a detailed picture of the political, economic and socio-psychological aspects of fascism, comprehensively analyses this phenomenon on three planes: theoretico-methodological, concrete historical and historiographical. The authors show fascism's genetic link with traditional reactionary trends, focusing attention particularly on its specific features. Such an approach makes it possible to take account of the profascist leanings in Right-wing political and militarist circles not directly connected with fascism organisationally and to see, at the same time, in what way fascist movements and regimes differ from traditional ultra-Right bourgeois parties, military dictatorships of a conservative

type and from other forms of reaction. This is important not only for any in-depth analysis of fascism's historical forms but for recognising in time its present-day modified forms. Hence the typology offered in the monograph: it clearly traces the common and specific signs of the many variants of fascism.

Laying bare its social essence the authors thus show the nature of the interrelationship between the mass of the people and fascists, on the one hand, and between their leaders and the ruling classes, on the other. Marxist historians and progressive historians of the West have long since made known the facts of the multilateral collaboration of bourgeois political circles, the military and monopolies with fascism. Special interest is therefore paid in the corresponding chapters to showing the mechanism by means of which the political domination of monopoly capital's most reactionary circles is realised through fascist dictatorships.

The different levels of the socio-economic and political development of individual countries conditioned the variety and multiplicity of specific types and forms of fascist movements and regimes. But all of them are characterised by rabid anti-communism and anti-Marxism, by nationalism which reaches its culmination in racism, by imperialist expansionism, anti-humanism, unbridled social demagogy, and much else in this vein.

Only fascism as a state form gives the clearest idea of the essence of this phenomenon. The authors therefore centre attention on three of its varieties: German, Italian and Spanish.

The conditions favouring the emergence and subsequent development of fascism took shape in Germany and Italy after the First World War. In Spain the position of the fascist party was weaker, falangism becoming only one of the foundations of the system of power, alongside the army and the Catholic church. Other characteristics of Spanish reality were the large proportion of conservative-military elements in relation to the fascist organisations, a form of corporatism differing from Italian, certain parliamentary attributes, and a number of other specific features. All this, the authors of the monograph argue, makes it possible to speak of the existence of a specific model of fascism in the Franco Spain and Salazar Portugal.

The monograph surveys the numerous fascist movements which having failed to come to power became the political reserve of the reactionary wing of the ruling classes. Reference is to such groups in countries of Western Europe where bourgeois-democratic traditions have taken deep root, where for historical and specific situational reasons the more influential factions of the bourgeoisie staked not on fascism but on other methods of preserving their class rule and where more favourable conditions took shape for rallying the anti-fascist forces and organising the repulse of the fascist elements.

Shifts to the right, however, are fraught with grave danger as the postwar development of Western Europe shows. The book's analysis of the history, ideology and practice of present-day neofascist movements is therefore of considerable interest. Fairly widespread among some politologists of the West is

the view of neofascism as a new social phenomenon, allegedly in no way connected with "canonical" fascism. Neofascism in Europe should undoubtedly not be assessed as a simple continuation of prewar fascism. Being its successor neofascism carries within itself new elements dictated by the need to accomodate itself to the conditions of the present stage of the general crisis of capitalism, to the new alignment of forces within the capitalist world and in the international arena.

A notable feature of the monograph is that the history of fascism is shown in interconnection with the antifascist struggle. Taking issue with the thesis widely circulated by Western historiography that fascism was allegedly a determining factor of European history in 1919-1945, the authors prove that in reality it was the struggle of the democratic forces against international fascism and its allies that was of epochal significance. The leading role in this struggle belonged to the world communist movement whose bulwark was the world's first socialist state.

In our days the Communist and workers' parties of Europe, expressing the will of millions of people, are continuing this struggle. "For democracy and social progress, for the maintenance of peace and international relations of mutual trust and friendly cooperation," stresses the document "For Peace, Security, Cooperation and Social Progress in Europe", of the Conference of Communist and Workers' Parties of Europe, Berlin, 29-30 June 1976, "it is necessary to eradicate fascism, prevent its rebirth, either in open or disguised forms and fight against the formation and activities of fascist and neofascist terror organisations and groups, as well as against racialist propaganda and activities which have the object of dividing the working class and other progressive forces."

The book under review by Soviet scholars is a significant contribution to historical science, to the ideological and political struggle against present-day imperialist reaction and fascism.

A. Ryabov

Инженерная психология. Теория, методология, практическое применение. М., изд-во «Наука», 1977, 304 стр.

Engineering Psychology. Theory, Methodology, Application, Moscow, Nauka Publishers, 1977, 304 pp.

It has long been noted that the development of new ideas passes through several stages, as it were: scepticism—enthusiastic recognition—disappointment—and finally, serious work. Something of the kind can be observed in the past 20 years as regards Soviet engineering psychology, which took shape as an independent field of science only in the late 1940s and early 1950s.

There has been a stage of fascination for engineering psychological problems; during this stage specialists of related sciences were drawn into the sphere of psychological investigations on a large scale. Main attention was devoted to the processes of man's perception of individual elements

of information and the construction of signal devices and control panels. A large amount of empirical data was obtained, which needed generalisation in the light of the psychological theory of activity. Absence of such a theory, on the one hand, and the drawing into work of a large number of researchers lacking a thorough training in psychology, on the other, resulted sometimes in a superficial interpretation of experimental data and certain theoretical deadlock. Views were then expressed that engineering psychology had exhausted itself.

However, new ideas were taking shape in the field of engineering psychology and new people were being trained to study and develop these ideas. The opening of faculties and departments of psychology in a number of Soviet universities has largely contributed to this. These measures led to an intensification of psychological orientation in engineering psychological investigations. It can be said that engineering psychology has now entered a period of theoretical formulation.

Owing to an insufficient development of the methodological and theoretical foundations of engineering psychology, an abundance of experimental material notwithstanding, a relatively small number of comprehensive works on the subject have been published in the USSR during the past 20 years. First and foremost, mention should be made of B. Lomov's monograph *Man and Technology* (Leningrad, 1963; Moscow, 1966); *Engineering Psychology*, ed. by A. Leontiev, V. Zinchenko and D. Panov (Moscow, 1964); *Military Engineering Psychology*, ed. by B. Lomov, A. Vasiliev, V. Ofitserov and V. Rubakhin (Moscow, 1970); *Methodology of Investigations in the Engineering Psychology of Labour*, in two parts, ed. by A. Krylov (Leningrad, 1974, 1975).

The monograph under review, written by a team of authors and prepared by the Institute of Psychology of the USSR Academy of Sciences—*Engineering Psychology* (ed. by B. Lomov, V. Rubakhin and V. Venda), is a milestone in the series of works mentioned. It assesses the present state and the trends of development of engineering psychology, examines the practical aspects of engineering-psychological investigations and, what is especially important, devotes considerable attention to general methodological and theoretical problems of engineering psychology.

As is known, the defining of any science presupposes: a) a definition of its subject, and b) a definition of its method. The present monograph copes with both these tasks, although in a different degree of thoroughness.

The subject of engineering psychology is defined as "the processes and structure of information interaction of man and technical devices, including the processes of reception, treatment and storage of information by man, adoption of decisions and psychological regulation of controlling activity" (p. 6).

In this book, a big step forward has been made also in defining the method of engineering psychology. Several principles of conducting engineering psychological research have been formulated in the monograph for the first time: the principle of a systems approach, the principle of an integral character of research, the principle of a

personal approach, the anthropocentric principle.

Of special interest to the reader is the second section of the book. Because of the nature of the material included in it, it may well be entitled "Modern Concepts of the Study and Planning of the Operator's Activity".

Soviet psychologists, B. Lomov notes, were among the first to have addressed themselves to the task of analysing activity. (See: B. Lomov, "Human Intercourse as a Problem of General Psychology", *Methodological Problems of Social Psychology*, Moscow, 1975, p. 2.) The study of activity contributed to an understanding of its role in the formation and development of man's psychology, on the one hand, and on the other, to a more thorough examination of the fundamental practical problem of raising the efficiency of man's labour activity. Three trends can be singled out among concrete psychological works dealing with the problem of activity.

The first includes works in which activity is analysed from the point of view of the vector "motive—aim". At this level, the macrostructure of activity and its essence are revealed, and the regulating role of goal—concepts in organising man's activity—is studied. Another trend includes works which study the psychological mechanisms of receiving, storing and processing information, adopting decisions and regulating activity. The microlevel of studying activity includes an investigation of psychophysiological laws, problems of activation and biochemical processes.

The monograph also deals with the personal aspects of engineering-psychological designing in the structural-psychological concept of the synthesis and adaptation of the technical means of operators' activity (V. Venda), in the concept of the "synthesis of adaptive biotechnical systems" (V. Akhutin), and in the concept of an "active operator" (N. Zavalova and V. Ponomarenko).

In dealing with the concept of "operativeness of reflection" its author, D. Oshanin makes an attempt to examine the psychological motives of the regulation of activity.

V. Nikolayev makes a detailed analysis of a whole range of questions connected with the construction of the "man—machine" systems. He poses a number of problems having to do with designing and exploiting automatic control systems (ACS) and suggests that more attention be given to a special kind of systems—documental systems. The material on psychological problems in space research (G. Beregovoi) is also of interest.

Apart from the concepts mentioned, the monograph under review includes a number of essays and reviews on applied problems of engineering psychology.

In conclusion, it can be said that the monograph is an important contribution to the elaboration of engineering-psychological theory in the USSR. It sums up the many-year theoretical and experimental research into the operator's activity and maps out prospects and problems of further studies.

V. Shadrikov

Эстетика американского романтизма. М., изд-во «Искусство», 1977, 464 стр.

The Aesthetics of American Romanticism, Moscow, Iskusstvo Publishers, 1977, 464 pp.

The romanticists of the New World—both the early and the mature ones—did not belong to a single literary trend or school. It is not accidental that there were no theoreticians of romanticism among them, let alone the Theoretician.

Could it be, then, that the very term "American romanticism" is "conditional", since it includes writers whose works differ radically in subject-matter and style—Irving and Poe, Cooper and Melville? And perhaps the book under review—*The Aesthetics of American Romanticism*—is only an arbitrary selection of various utterances on literature since there is no single aesthetic theory, no unified system of views?

Statements of this kind have often been made. However, it is difficult to agree with them. We feel that there is a certain centripetal force in such unlike works as Cooper's pentalogy about Leather Stocking and *Moby Dick*, Irving's novels and *The Scarlet Letter*. And we not only feel, but clearly perceive here another language—one of the concepts and formulae, a similarity of the writers' views and statements about literature which imparts to the title of the book an essential, and not a formal, character.

One cardinal idea runs through all the essays, articles and reviews included in the book, namely, the idea about the necessity of creating a national culture. This is only natural, for unlike Europe the New World had no rich cultural traditions.

The passionate advocates of an original national culture awaited its emergence, some with greater, others with less optimism. They were not satisfied, obviously, with the state of American literature at the time. The Americans had to prove that they had the right to be represented at the world forum of art. This explains their constant discontent and their anxious waiting for a genius who would completely and wholly embody the American spirit.

It is generally accepted that a literature of critical realism in the United States grew from the "local colour" school that emerged in the latter part of the 19th century (Bret Harte, Garland, Kirkland, and others). This is true, but only in the sense that the "colourists" "discovered" a world hitherto almost unknown to literature: the rough and mundane or earthly life of the Middle and Far West with its irrepressible spirit of adventure, the harsh realities of "frontier" life, and the crowds who rushed to California for panning gold and to Nevada for mining silver. But it was the romanticists who opened the road to the new epoch of American literature as regards its scope and ideological and aesthetic aspects.

In his remarkable book *Romanticism in Germany* the well-known Soviet literary scholar, N. Berkovsky, describing the attitude of the Jensenists to Cervantes, says that their interpretation of *Don Quixote* discloses their own views; therefore they spoke so much about the music of life (as expressed in the novel.—*N.A.*) but said practically nothing about its problems. Ber-

kovsky concludes categorically: "Ethical interpretation means a depature from romanticism."

But it is precisely such an interpretation that was characteristic of the American romanticists. Perhaps they were not romanticists at all? No, they were romanticists, and this is seen in their attitude to nature as the real home of man, in their inclination towards philosophising, in their search for the ideal of beauty and in their emphasis on the freedom of the individual.

While remaining romanticists as far as their perception of the world and creative work were concerned, the Americans began, from the outset, to break old canons and pave the way for realistic literature with its spirit of consistent, principled denunciation of social vices.

In this lies another major feature of romanticism in America: it was, I would say, fraught with realism, it was prepared for it.

Irving and partly young Cooper were relatively untroubled in their general outlook, but the works of the later romanticists—Poe, Hawthorne and Melville—already contained moral criticism of various aspects of bourgeois life. Can one not see in the powerful symbols in *Moby Dick* the real America of the mid-1850s, with its mercantilism, complacency, and a fanatical conviction in its own messianic role (need one mention here that the novel is not confined to the present moment but encompasses the distant horizons of human life)? And *The Scarlet Letter*, too, reveals the roots of Puritan intolerance which permeated the social organism of the nation and hampered the free expression of the individual and the flourishing of his spiritual forces.

A similar critical attitude can be traced in the romanticists' views on literature. Bryant saw all around him an onslaught of soulless and unnatural customs which make civilisation "look" dull and empty. Poe wrote an article entitled "Philosophy of Furniture", which is only apparently about the interior of a dwelling but is in actual fact a sarcastic portrayal of America, where ideas of taste were reduced to luxury and where the striving for magnificence, valued mostly for its high cost, was thriving. This article, introduced, for the first time, the expression "the aristocracy of the dollar" which became so famous that its authorship was often unknown.

And Thoreau, with his usual ardour, passionately denounced the American system that reduced man to the level of building material and transformed him into a machine which, naturally, had no use for reason or moral sense.

Emerson's major essay—"Nature"—is about the same subject, but it is written in a lyrical-philosophical manner and its tone is more optimistic. Emerson called on man to learn, or to be more exact, to remember the laws of the natural life.

Of course, this is a typically romantic position. One can add that the Americans, just as the Europeans, but with a greater keenness, took to heart the victories of technical civilisation. But it is important, in our opinion, not to miss the main point behind the social naiveté of such views: the acumen with which the romanticists pointed to the greatest danger of the development of bourgeois society, namely, the danger of the disappearance of man as the highest and truest yardstick of things.

Later, with the advent of Anderson, Fitzgerald, Hemingway and Wolfe, the irreparable loss of spirit will be assessed by the realists as the greatest tragedy of American civilisation.

The moral position led to the emergence of an artistic feature which is peculiar to American romanticism; here, too, one can see signs of realistic literature. To put it briefly: the romanticists in their work drew on the happenings in everyday life for their material; their writings, which discussed the great beyond and dealt with noble, elevated subjects and feelings, at the same time never departed from the real ground of America. This largely determined the stylistic pattern of American romantic prose. In it one rarely finds vague outlines, ambiguities and uncertainties which, as N. Berkovsky has demonstrated, form the basis of the style of the German romanticists.

This stylistic pattern is no less characteristic of the Americans than vagueness is of the Germans.

The theoretical legacy of the American romanticists is not a rich one. A. Nikolyukin, who compiled and edited the collection under review, has succeeded, in my opinion, in presenting the most essential materials on the subject in a comparatively small volume. The American romanticists were people more inclined to literary creation than to theoretical formulation. But nevertheless it is useful to know something of their aesthetic views as this helps us better to understand the historical significance of their literary achievement.

It is in the romantic works that the specifically national code of American literature was formed, and its pronounced and original poetic quality, as compared with the world's developed literatures, emerged. Much has changed, naturally, over the decades, but the central feature has remained the same: a unique plasticity of language and the conveyance of a feeling of everyday life without which there can be no real life.

As I see it, it is precisely the romanticists who stand at the head of the democratic tradition that distinguishes the greatest works of American literature. We now remember, not the illusions of the romanticists, but their ethical maximalism, and we feel more strongly than ever their faith in man which is characteristic even of such sceptics as Melville and Hawthorne.

Writers of later generations have more than once turned to the source of this faith, even though in some of their statements they sometimes seem to disown those who laid the foundation of literature in America. At present, after the "New Left" have made attacks on culture, interest in the past, in the sources has revived in the United States, and many have realised the futility of a total negation of the spiritual values accumulated over the decades. In this light, works by the American romanticists are read and re-read, for they represent a living tradition of progressive American literature.

N. Anastasyev

BIBLIOGRAPHY

NEW BOOKS BY SOVIET POLITOLOGISTS

From the Editors: We now offer you a list of books by Soviet politologists, compiled for our journal by the Soviet Association of Political Sciences.

A. A. Amvrosov, *The Social Structure of Soviet Society (Developed Socialism)*, Moscow, Politizdat Publishers, 1975, 120 pp.

The book discusses changes taking place within classes, social sections and groups in developed socialist society, the processes of the drawing closer together of the classes and the manual and mental workers, people in town and country, and the leading role of the working class in all spheres of social life. The problem of strengthening the socio-political and ideological unity of the Soviet people, and ways of advancing to a classless, socially homogeneous society are also examined.

G. A. Arbatov, *Ideological Struggle in Present-Day International Relations. The Doctrine, Methods and Organisation of Imperialist Foreign-Policy Propaganda*, Moscow, Politizdat Publishers, 1970, 351 pp.

The monograph analyses the principal factors of the growing role of ideological struggle in international relations and investigates the theory and methods of imperialist foreign-policy propaganda in different countries, the specific features of its strategy and tactics in the present conditions and the functioning of the foreign-policy propaganda apparatus of Western countries.

V. G. Afanasyev, *Social Information and Management of Society*, Moscow, Politizdat Publishers, 1975, 408 pp.

The author analyses the qualitative conceptual aspects of social information and suggests its classification depending on the degree of its relation to reality. He also examines the sources of social information, the role of information in management of society, decision-making, various information systems, the organisation and content of scientific and technical, and political information.

F. M. Burlatsky, A. A. Galkin, *Sociology, Politics, International Relations*, Moscow, Mezhdunarodniye otnosheniya Publishers, 1974, 328 pp.

The work analyses theoretical and methodological problems of

the sociology of political relations in the developed capitalist countries. It discusses the significance of a systems analysis and a comparative method and the effectiveness of the methods of concrete social investigations. The book examines the social structure as a medium of a political system, the social and political leadership and other elements of the political system, problems of international relations and world politics.

V. V. Vinogradov, *Social Sciences and Information*, Moscow, Nauka Publishers, 1978, 263 pp.

The monograph examines the questions of providing information for the social sciences and organisation of information services in the USSR. Much attention is devoted to the growing role of information in the further progress of Soviet social sciences, including the political and legal disciplines.

J. M. Gvishiani, *Organisation and Management. Sociological Analysis of Bourgeois Theories*, Moscow, Nauka Publishers, 1970, 382 pp.

The author analyses the function of management in the system of social production and critically examines the "classical" theory of organisation and management, the doctrine of "human relations", the "empirical" school of the theory of management, as well as the school of "social systems" and the "new" school of the theory of management. The book discusses the prospects for the development of managerial activity in the American theory of management and the ideological function of the bourgeois concepts of management.

G. E. Glezerman, *Classes and Nations*, Moscow, Politizdat Publishers, 79 pp.

The book discusses the place of classes and nations in society's structure, the correlation of class and national struggles in various historical conditions, the interaction of class and national factors in the USSR's social development, the strengthening of the social and internationalist unity of the Soviet people, and ways of obliterating class distinctions and further drawing closer together of Soviet nations and nationalities. The book also criticises modern nationalist and racist theories.

P. S. Gratsiansky, *Political Science in France. Critical Essays*, Moscow, Nauka Publishers, 1975, 183 pp.

The monograph analyses the special features and basic concepts of political science in France and criticises its methodology. It examines the theories of political power, political institutions and political regimes and systems. It especially dwells on the Sovietological aspects of French political science.

Democracy of Developed Socialist Society, Ed. by Yu. N. Tikhomirov, Moscow, Nauka Publishers, 1975, 295 pp.

The theory and practice of the development of democracy in the conditions of mature socialism is examined here in relation to the consolidation of the rights and freedoms of citizens, improvement in management, advance of the consciousness and political activity of the population, the formation of the socialist mode of life and the mass participation of the working people in management. Prospects of developing the political system of mature socialism into a communist society are analysed.

Yu. E. Yeremin, *The Classes and Democracy*, Moscow University Press, 1974, 206 pp.

The monograph demonstrates the historical connections between the division of society into classes and changes in socio-economic and political relations and the objective reasons of the emergence of the democratic forms of the state. The book examines the economic and political foundations of bourgeois democracy, as well as the development of socialist democracy.

D. V. Yermolenko, *Sociology and Problems of International Relations (Some Aspects and Questions of Sociological Studies of International Relations)*, Moscow, Mezhdunarodniye otnosheniya Publishers, 1977, 232 pp.

The author considers the sociological aspects of international relations against the background of the growing role of international contacts. The book also reviews the state of modern bourgeois sociology of international relations, the forecasting as a means of sociological analysis and international conflict as an object of investigation.

V. V. Zhurkin, *The USA and International Political Crises*, Moscow, Nauka Publishers, 1975, 325 pp.

The book analyses the basic laws and specific features of US policies in international crisis situations, the evolution of foreign policy doctrines and the mechanism of crisis management, as well as bourgeois political science in the service of US foreign policy.

E. A. Ivanov, *Trade Unions in the Political System of Developed Socialism*, Moscow, Profizdat Publishers, 1978, 280 pp.

The book presents a sociological analysis of the functions and methods of work of trade unions, their actual and legal position in the political system of socialism and their relations with the Party and the state. The book also criticises modern bourgeois and revisionist views on the status of the trade unions under socialism.

I. P. Ilyinsky, *Political Organisation of Socialist Society*, Moscow, Mezhdunarodniye otnosheniya Publishers, 1976, 255 pp.

Basic elements of political organisation of the countries of the socialist community are examined in the book: the parties, state, territorial and labour collectives, personality. The role and functions of the political organisation as a dialectically whole phenomenon in the political and social system of socialism are defined.

N. N. Inozemtsev, *Modern Capitalism. New Phenomena and Contradictions*, Moscow, Mysl Publishers, 1972, 160 pp.

The book analyses the key problems of economics and politics of imperialism and its main contradictions in present-day conditions. Much thought is given to the correlation of integration processes and the development of inter-imperialist contradictions, and to capitalism's adaptation to historical changes and the alignment of class and political forces in the Western countries.

The East Today. The Main Laws and Specific Features of the Development of Newly-Free Countries, in two volumes, Ed. by B. G. Gafurov *et al.*, Moscow, Nauka Publishers, 1974 (Vol. 1—456 pp.; Vol. 2—680 pp.).

This collectively written monograph is devoted to the problems of the social and economic development of the newly liberated

countries. The shifts in their economic basis are examined in close connection with socio-economic relations. The work also analyses the evolution of the principal ideological trends in the East.

V. G. Kalensky, *The State as an Object of Sociological Analysis (Essays of the History and Methodology of Investigation)*, Moscow, Yuridicheskaya literatura Publishers, 1977, 182 pp.

The book criticises modern bourgeois (mainly American) political science, the theory and methodology of investigating the political organisation of society. It examines the sociological aspects of the categories "political power", "political organisation" and "political system".

N. M. Keiserov, *Power and Authority. Criticism of Bourgeois Theories*, Moscow, Yuridicheskaya literatura Publishers, 1973, 264 pp.

The monograph discusses the modern bourgeois theories of power, the social nature of power, the correlation of the concepts of management and power, methods of effecting power, the unity and difference between the concepts "power" and "authority", and the basic types of power. The book also touches on such problems as power over the labour of others, the structure and methods of pressure groups, the social relations of domination and subordination, the functions of the bourgeois state in the intellectual life of society, etc.

D. A. Kerimov, *General Theory of State and Law: Subject-Matter, Structure, Functions*, Moscow, Yuridicheskaya literatura Publishers, 1977, 135 pp.

The monograph shows the correlation between historical materialism and jurisprudence, notably, the general theory of state and law. It analyses the subject-matter, methodological functions, fundamental problems and the place of the general theory of state and law in the system of the juridical sciences.

Communism and Management of Social Processes. Vol. 2—*Guiding the Political and Spiritual Processes of Socialist Society*, Ed. by A. K. Belykh, Leningrad University Press, 1975, 143 pp.

The collection examines the political organisation of socialist society as a subject and object of management, as well as a system of management. It discusses problems of the political leadership of socialist society by the working class, democracy in socialist, work collectives and the functional aspects of society's political organisation.

Yu. A. Krasin, *Theory of Socialist Revolution: Lenin's Heritage and Our Time*, Moscow, Mysl Publishers, 1977, 292 pp.

The monograph discusses the objective conditions and the subjective factors of socialist revolution, the laws of developing revolution, and the peaceful and non-peaceful winning of power by the working class. Special attention is devoted to the democratic transformations of a transitional type.

A Critical Analysis of Bourgeois Sociological Concepts, Ed. by V. N. Ivanov and Yu. N. Davydov, Moscow, The Soviet Sociological Association, 1977, 173 pp.

The collection analyses the bourgeois theories of international relations, management, futurological and propaganda concepts, including the so-called theories of

hyperideologisation and the sociological versions of élitism. It also studies various anarchic trends, concepts of culture, the Freudian approach to the individual and the problem of the alienation of the youth in modern bourgeois society.

The Marxist-Leninist General Theory of State and Law, Volumes I-IV, Moscow, Yuridicheskaya literatura Publishers, 1970-1976. Vol. I—*Basic Institutions and Concepts*, 1970, 622 pp.; Vol. II—*Historical Types of State and Law*, 1971, 640 pp.; Vol. III—*The Socialist State*, 1972, 559 pp.; Vol. IV—*Socialist Law*, 1976, 647 pp.

Volume I defines the place of the state and law in the political organisation and the life of society, as well as the ways in which they influence economic and ideological relations. Considerable attention is devoted to ascertaining the correlation between the state and law, the problems of legality, the sources of law and the methodology of law. The book dwells at length on the development of the Soviet theory of state and law.

Volume II analyses typology and also the emergence and development of state and law within the framework of antagonistic socio-economic formations. It centers around an analysis of the bourgeois state and law. It critically reviews bourgeois theories of state and law, and analyses the state and law in the developing countries.

Volume III discusses the essence and principal features of the socialist state, the conditions and requisites for the transformation of the state of proletarian dictatorship into a state of the whole people, the forms, functions, basic features of organisation and the activity of state power, trends of the further development and consolidation of the socialist state and the problems of improving socialist democracy. Much attention is paid to the question of the correlation of the state and society, and the individual and the state.

Volume IV discusses the concepts, essence and laws of the development of socialist law and the correlation of the legal norms with other kinds of social norms. The mechanism of legal regulation, the problem of socialist legality as an indispensable condition for solving the tasks facing the socialist state, the trends and prospects of the further development of socialist law and the requisites for its turning into non-legal norms of regulating social relations, are also examined.

Marxist-Leninist Theory of the State and Law. History and Development in Our Time, Ed. by N. V. Vitruk *et al.*, Moscow, Nauka Publishers, 1977, 352 pp.

The monograph discusses the socio-historical conditions of the formation of the Marxist-Leninist theory of state and law, as well as its theoretical sources. Problems are examined of the correlation of the socio-economic system and law, political power and law, as well as the class character of law.

Marxist-Leninist Theory of Socialism and the Modern Time, Ed. by P. N. Fedoseyev *et al.*, Moscow, Politizdat Publishers, 1975, 478 pp.

The monograph characterises the socialist system from the angle of unity between the Marxist-Leninist theory of socialism and its practical implementation. It analyses the periods and stages of the formation and development of ma-

ture socialist society and the laws of building developed socialism which are common to all countries.

G. I. Mirsky, *The "Third World": Society, Power, Army*, Moscow, Nauka Publishers, 1976, 408 pp.

The author defines the laws that led to, during the post-war period, the interference of the armed forces in the political life of a number of Asian and African countries, describes the armies of these countries and discusses the concrete measures taken by the military after their coming to power.

M. F. Orzikh, *The Individual and Law*, Moscow, Yuridicheskaya literatura Publishers, 1975, 110 pp.

The author shows that the legal activity of the individual is viewed by socialist jurisprudence as an independent form of social activity, mediated by law and legal consciousness. Special attention is devoted to topical questions of the methodology of general theoretical jurisprudence applicable to the individual.

Politics and Society (Socio-Political Problems of Developed Socialism), Ed. by A. K. Belykh and L. T. Krivushin, Leningrad University Press, 1975, 191 pp.

The socio-political development of socialism at the present stage is viewed from the angle of such socio-philosophical categories as "politics", "power" and "the state". The work defines the socio-political organisation of society as a definite type of its inner structure, the political interaction of all social subjects in the sphere of power and organisation of society into an integrated, governed socio-political structure.

Political Theories: History and Our Time. Pre-Marxist Political Thought, Moscow, Nauka Publishers, 1976, 495 pp.

The book stresses the role of political theory in ideological struggle and emphasises the constant interest of Marxism-Leninism in studying both the historical development and the present state of political thought. It examines political theories of antiquity, the Middle Ages and modern times: from Plato to Kant and Hegel.

E. M. Primakov, *The Anatomy of the Middle East Conflict*, Moscow, Mysl Publishers, 1978, 374 pp.

The author analyses the causes of the Middle East conflict and traces the history of confrontation between Israel and the neighbouring Arab states, as well as the Palestine resistance movement, the US policy in the Middle East and the impact of the energy crisis on the developments in this region.

The Working Class—the Leading Force of the World Revolutionary Process (Criticism of Bourgeois and Reformist Concepts), Moscow, Politizdat Publishers, 1973, 184 pp.

The collective monograph examines the concepts of Western theoreticians about "deproletarianisation" of the working class and its "integration" into capitalist system, the real processes determining the make-up and development trends of the working class today, and its role in the struggle against imperialism, for peace, democracy and social progress.

N. N. Razumovich, *Who Rules Whom in Latin America. The Political System of Latin American Countries*, Moscow, Mezhdunarodniye otnosheniya Publishers, 1967, 264 pp.

The author examines the forms and methods of domination by pro-imperialist oligarchies and the conciliatory bourgeoisie, political parties, the system of electoral rights and the state regulation of party activities and the main principles of organisation of state power and the activities of its bodies in some Latin American countries.

R. A. Safarov, *Public Opinion and State Management*, Moscow, Yuridicheskaya literatura Publishers, 1975, 255 pp.

The monograph investigates the real, normative and ideal models of ascertaining public opinion and analyses state management institutions in the light of the prevailing public opinion. On the basis of the surveys conducted in various areas of the USSR, it offers practical recommendations on increasing the role played by public opinion in the managerial process.

P. I. Simush, *Social Portrait of the Soviet Peasantry*, Moscow, Politizdat Publishers, 1976, 319 pp.

The book describes profound changes in the socio-economic conditions of the life of Soviet peasants, the specific features of modern agricultural work and the structure and level of the material requirements of the peasantry. It also analyses the dynamics of socio-professional changes among the collective farmers and the social evolution of the distribution of the collective-farm peasantry.

V. V. Smirnov, *The USA: The Political Mechanism of Municipal Government. Criticism of Bourgeois Concepts*, Moscow, Nauka Publishers, 1976, 144 pp.

The book discusses the structure and functioning of the political mechanism of municipal government in the United States: the role and activity of political parties and interest groups in cities, elections and other forms of political participation. It critically evaluates the activities of city management bodies, and also theoretical works of American scholars on the subject.

The Soviet People—A New Historical Community of People. Its Formation and Development, Ed. by M. P. Kim, V. P. Sherstobitov *et al.*, Moscow, Nauka Publishers, 1975, 520 pp.

The monograph describes the formation and development of a new historical community of people in the USSR, its political, socio-economic, cultural and ideological foundations. Great attention is paid to the problem of improving the intellectual make-up of the Soviet people and increasing the mutual influence and enrichment of national cultures.

G. B. Starushenko, *Socialist Orientation in the Developing Countries*, Moscow, Politizdat Publishers, 1977, 192 pp.

The author discusses the essence of the policy of socialist orientation, its external and internal factors, and analyses the state and political mechanism of countries that have chosen the socialist path of development; the problems of political leadership, political stability and socio-economic development and the impact of the scientific and technological revolution on the developing countries.

The USA: Political Thought and History, Ed. by N. N. Yakovlev, Moscow, Nauka Publishers, 1976, 619 pp.

The book analyses the principal trends of American political

thought, the past and present of the ideas of the American revolution, the "theory of manifest destiny", the balance of power doctrine and the political credo of the Democratic and Republican parties.

T. Timofeyev, *Some Ideological and Theoretical Problems of the Working-Class Movement (Against Anti-Sovietism and Modern Opportunism)*, Moscow, Institute of the International Working-Class Movement, USSR Academy of Sciences, 1975, 265 pp.

The author studies the problems of social forecasting, trends of bourgeois and petty-bourgeois ideology, and the development of the class struggle in the conditions of the aggravation of the general crisis of capitalism.

V. A. Tumanov, *Bourgeois Legal Ideology. A Critique of Theories of Law*, Moscow, Nauka Publishers, 1971, 381 pp.

The monograph examines the evolution of bourgeois legal views. It critically analyses juridical positivism, sociological jurisprudence and various versions of the philosophy of law. The book devotes much attention to the political and ideological role of law in social life.

B. N. Topornin, *The Soviet Political System*, Moscow, Politizdat Publishers, 1975, 128 pp.

The author discusses the main aspects of the Soviet political system in the conditions of developed socialism and substantiates the law of the steady growth of the leading role of the CPSU in society and the state and shows the state as the principal instrument of social transformations, emphasising the developing and increasing independence and initiative of non-government organisations in the Soviet political system.

A. A. Fedoseyev, *Politics as an Object of Sociological Investigation. A Critique of the Methodological Foundations of Modern Bourgeois Politology*, Leningrad University Press, 1974, 122 pp.

The author analyses the Marxist-Leninist interpretation of politics, critically evaluates the main trends of bourgeois political science and the sociological problems of political systems. The author also characterises the difference in the understanding of state power in bourgeois and Marxist-Leninist sociology, interrelations between social standards and politics, political behaviour, political culture and the political socialisation of the individual.

P. N. Fedoseyev, *Marxism in the 20th Century. Marx, Engels, Lenin and the Present Time*, Moscow, Mysl Publishers, 1972, 582 pp.

The monograph analyses the process of the formation and development of scientific communism and its cohesion with the international working-class movement. The basic ideas of Marx and Engels are characterised in connection with the practice of the revolutionary struggle for the socialist transformation of society. The monograph shows the creative development and implementation of Marxist theory by Lenin and the international communist movement. The principal social problems of the 20th century are also examined. Much attention is devoted to the Communist Party. The milestones in Soviet history are viewed in the light of the ideas of Marxism-Leninism.

Functions of the State in Independent Countries of Africa, Ed. by R. A. Ulyanovsky, Moscow, Nauka Publishers, 1972, 324 pp.

The work examines the main trends in the activities of the young African states of various social orientations, the methods of safeguarding their social and state systems, as well as the economic, social, ideological and foreign-policy functions of African states.

E. M. Chekharin, *The Soviet Political System in the Conditions of Developed Socialism*, Moscow, Mysl Publishers, 1975, 350 pp.

The author examines the historical experience of the CPSU in creating, developing and improving the political system of socialism, relations between governmental and non-governmental organisations under socialism; democracy is analysed not only as a form of organisation of power, as a form of government and state structure, but also as a principle, method, regime of the functioning of this or that socio-political system. The book also deals with the problems of managing social processes in connection with the scientific and technological revolution.

G. Kh. Shakhnazarov, *Socialist Democracy. Some Questions of Theory*, 2nd Enlarged Edition, Moscow, Politizdat Publishers, 1974, 336 pp.

The book analyses the key problems of the development of people's rule under socialism, the essence of socialist democracy, the relations and role of the Party and the state and the organisation of the political system of socialism. The book also examines the role and forms of the Party leadership of socialist society, the working people's participation in management of socialist society and the questions of the freedom of the individual and the rights and duties of Soviet citizens.

V. S. Shevtsov, *The Working Class and Socialist Democracy*, Moscow, Profizdat Publishers, 1978, 71 pp.

The author emphasises that the working class is the principal guarantor of democracy in the present conditions. He analyses the role of the trade unions in drawing the working people into the management of state and social affairs, the socio-economic and political foundations of democracy for all people, and the problems of combining representative power with direct democracy.

G. I. Ezrin, *The State and Religion. Religious Organisations and the Political Structure of Society*, Moscow, Politizdat Publishers, 1974, 135 pp.

The monograph discusses relations between religion and political power in the ancient states of Sumer, Babylonia, Assyria, Egypt, Greece and Rome. Special attention is devoted to the interrelationship between the emerging Christian church and the slave-owning state of Rome and the turning of Christianity into the state religion. The formation of the organisational structure of the Russian Orthodox Church and the history of the Soviet state's attitude to religion and religious organisations are also examined.

L. M. Entin, *Political Systems of the Developing Countries (The State and Political Parties in the Countries of Asia and Africa)*, Moscow, Mezhdunarodniye otnosheniya Publishers, 1978, 264 pp.

The author shows how the nature of the political systems in the

liberated countries affects the process of socio-political and state development, as well as the foreign policies of the young states. He also examines the activities of political parties and party systems, and the role of the state in the political systems of the developing countries.

Y. A. Yudin, *Political Systems of the Independent Countries of Equatorial Africa (The State and Political Parties)*, Moscow, Nauka Publishers, 1975, 325 pp.

The author examines the social nature of states in transitional periods, the system of their functions, analyses political parties and party systems, relations between the state apparatus and its individual links and the ruling party, and also the trade union, women's, youth and other organisations.

SCIENTIFIC THEMATIC COLLECTIONS

Since 1969, the "Social Sciences Today" Editorial Board, USSR Academy of Sciences, has been publishing the "Problems of the Contemporary World" series dealing with current problems in philosophy, history, economics, politics, sociology, law, psychology, ethnography, philology, and other social sciences. The collections acquaint the reader with the latest achievements of Soviet scholars in these fields of knowledge and with their approach to problems of broad interest to scientific and social circles.

In 1978, the "Social Sciences Today" Editorial Board, meeting the wishes of numerous specialists abroad, started the publication in Spanish a new series of thematic collections under the title "Latin America: Studies by Soviet Scholars". They include writings by leading Soviet experts in the history, economics, home and foreign policy, culture, national liberation struggle and the working-class and communist movements in Latin America.

The Editorial Board would appreciate your opinion on the scientific collections in the "Problems of the Contemporary World" and "Latin America: Studies by Soviet Scholars" series. Your remarks and suggestions will be taken into consideration in further plans for the series.

Below please find lists of collections that have been already published or are being prepared for press.

The Editors

"Problems of the Contemporary World" series

Already Published:

1977

☒*Philosophical Concepts in Natural Science*—Eng., Fr., Ger., Span.

The World Population Today (Ethnodemographic Processes)—Eng., Fr., Ger., Span.

☒*Theoretical Aspects of Linguistics*—Eng., Fr., Ger., Span.

Soviet Studies in US History—Eng., Fr., Span.

French Studies by Soviet Scholars—Fr.

The Law of the Sea: Topical Problems—Eng.

Ethnography and Related Sciences—Eng.

Resources and Economic Growth—Eng., Fr., Span.

Soviet Studies in the History of Science—Eng., Fr., Ger., Span.

☐ *Historical Materialism: Theory, Methodology, Problems*—Eng., Fr., Ger., Span.

Remaking of Nature Under Socialism. Desert Development in the V. I. Lenin Karakum Canal Zone—Eng.

The Great October Socialist Revolution and the World Social Progress—Eng., Fr., Ger., Port., Span.

1978

Fundamental Law of the Socialist State of the Whole People—Eng., Fr., Ger., Span.

Pages from the History of the Antifascist War—Eng., Ger.

Bourgeois Democracy and Human Rights—Eng., Fr., Ger., Port., Span.

No! to Racism and Apartheid—Eng., Fr., Span.

Youth in the Modern Society—Eng., Fr., Ger., Port., Span.

From the Historical Experience of the Leninist Komsomol—Eng., Fr., Span.

The October Revolution and the Youth—Eng., Fr., Span.

The Unity of Social and Scientific Progress Under Socialism (2nd, enlarged ed.)—Eng.

The Second World War and Our Time—Eng.

The Working Class and Social Progress—Eng.

Non-Alignment: Its Friends and Adversaries in World Politics (2nd, enlarged ed.)—Eng., Span.

☐ *Philosophy and the World-Views of Modern Science*—Eng., Fr., Ger., Span.

☐ *Aesthetics and the Development of Literature*—Eng., Fr., Ger., Span.

Constitution of the USSR: Theory and Policy—Eng., Fr., Ger., Port., Span.

The Development of Soviet Law and Jurisprudence—Eng., Fr.

Soviet Studies in Ethnography—Eng.

Ethnography and Ethnic Processes—Eng.

The USSR: Sixty Years of Struggle for Peace—Eng.

1979

Socialism and Human Rights—Eng., Fr., Ger., Port., Span.

Soviet Studies in Sociology—Eng., Fr., Ger., Span.

Being Prepared for Press:

The Comparative Historical Method in Soviet Mediaeval Studies—Eng., Fr., Ger..

☐*Ethics. Communist Morality*—Eng., Fr., Ger., Span.

Soviet Economic Science: New Researches—Eng., Fr, Ger., Port., Span.

Archaeology and Ancient History of Siberia—Ger.

Soviet Policy of Peace—Eng., Fr., Ger., Port., Span.

Political Systems Development Trends—Eng., Fr., Port., Span.

Socialism: Some Aspects of the Social and Economic Development—Span.

African Studies by Soviet Scholars—Eng., Fr., Port., Span.

"Latin America: Studies by Soviet Scholars" series

(in Spanish)

Published in 1978:

Studies in the History of Cuba. Part I, *The Colonial Period*
Ancient Civilisations in America

Being Prepared for Press:

Studies in the History of Cuba. Part II, *Bourgeois Cuba*
Studies in the History of Cuba. Part III, *Revolutionary Cuba*
Indians of Latin America
Mexico: Past and Present
Puerto Rico: Problems of Its History and Present Development

Orders for the collections can be placed with firms and bookshops handling Soviet publications in your country, including the firms listed at the end of this issue. Sample copies are sent on request by the Editorial Board.

Editorial Office: 33/12 Arbat, Moscow, 121002, USSR.

* * *

CONTRIBUTORS TO THIS ISSUE

P. FEDOSEYEV, Academician, Vice-President of the USSR Academy of Sciences, Chairman of the Section of the Social Sciences of the Presidium of the USSR Academy of Sciences. Chairman of the Editorial Council of this journal. Author of many works on the dialectics of contemporary social development, the interaction of the productive forces and relations of production, the role of the masses and the individual in history, problems of humanism, including the monographs *Communism and Philosophy; Marxism in the 20th Century. Marx, Engels, Lenin and the Present Epoch.*

G. SHAKHNAZAROV, D.Sc. (Law), President of the Soviet Political Sciences Association. Author of many works, including *Socialist Democracy. Some Questions of Theory; The Bourgeois State in the Epoch of Imperialism; Communism and the Freedom of the Individual.*

G. ARBATOV, Academician, Director of the Institute of US and Canadian Studies, USSR Academy of Sciences, member of the Editorial Council of this journal. Author of many works on international relations, ideology, management and the world economy, including the monograph *The Battle of Ideas in Present-Day International Relations.* Editor and author of many works, including *The USA: Scientific and Technological Revolution and Trends in Foreign Policy,* and *The USA: Modern Management Methods.*

N. INOZEMTSEV, Academician, Director of the Institute of the World Economy and International Relations, USSR Academy of Sciences, member of the Editorial Council of this journal. Author of the monographs *US Foreign Policy in the Epoch of Imperialism; Present-Day Capitalism. New Phenomena and Contradictions.* Editor and author of the main chapters of *International Relations After the Second World War* in three volumes, and *The Political Economy of Present-Day Monopoly Capitalism.*

E. PRIMAKOV, Academician, Director of the Institute of Oriental Studies, USSR Academy of Sciences, member of the Editorial Council of this journal. Author of the books *An Anatomy of the Middle-East Crisis, Egypt: President Nasser and His Time* (in co-authorship with I. Belyaev), editor and co-author of the book *The Energy Crisis in the Capitalist Countries,* etc.

M. KHRAPCHENKO, Academician, Academic Secretary of the USSR Academy of Sciences' Division of Language and Literature, a Lenin Prize-winner and member of the Editorial Council of this journal. He has written numerous works on problems of Russian classical literature and the theory of literature, including *The Writer's Creative Individuality and the Development of Literature.*

T. KHACHATUROV, Academician, Editor-in-Chief of the journal *Voprosy ekonomiki*, Chairman of the Presidium of the Association of Soviet Economic Scientific Institutions, member of the Editorial Council of this journal and author of many works on the development of the socialist economy and the efficiency of social production.

B. RYBAKOV, Academician, Director of the Institute of Archaeology, USSR Academy of Sciences. His major works are devoted to the socio-economic and political history of Eastern Slavs and Old Rus, to the history of old Russian crafts and culture, paganism, chronology, etc., including *The Early Centuries of Russian History, Russian Chroniclers and the Author of "The Lay of Igor's Host", Russian Maps of Muscovy of the 15th-Early 16th Centuries.*

F. BASSIN, D.Sc. (Med.), professor of the Institute of Neurology, USSR Academy of Medical Sciences. Specialises in psychology, consciousness and the unconscious. Author of *The Problem of the Unconsciousness, The Unconscious and Behaviour,* and other works.

A. PRANGISHVILI, Academician, Vice-President of the Georgian Academy of Sciences, Director of the D.N. Uznadze Institute of Psychology. Specialises in problems of psychology and the theory of psychological set. Author of many works on the above problems.

A. SHEROZIA, D.Sc. (Philos.), professor of Tbilisi State University, studies consciousness and the unconscious, has many works in this field.

I. ANTONOVICH, D.Sc. (Philos)., specialises in general theoretical problems of sociology. Author of *The Social Law of Bourgeois Humanism, US Sociology: Problems and the Quest of Solutions, Social Development and the Problem of Progress,* and some other books.

A. GRACHEV, Cand. Sc. (Hist.), studies problems of the youth and students in the capitalist countries. The author of the books *A Defeat or a Lesson? For the Right to a Future,* and a number of articles on this theme.

Yu. RYURIKOV, an associate of the Institute of Sociological Research, USSR Academy of Sciences. Studies problems of the family and marriage. The author of the books *Three Attractions. Love: Its Yesterday, Today and Tomorrow, The Difficulty of Happiness. Love and a Young Family. In a Hundred and a Thousand Years (Concerning Social Utopia and Fiction).*

OUR GLOSSARY

POLITICAL SCIENCE (PS) is that branch of the social sciences whose subject of research is politics, political theories, systems, processes, structures; the state as a form of social organisation, political power, culture, ideology; political regimes and democracy, international relations, etc. It also includes the study of public opinion, mass political movements and political behaviour, political parties and election campaigns, public organisations and social groups, state and legal institutions, and so on.

These and other problems such as, for instance, those of war and peace, settlement of conflicts, federalism, integration, economic, geographical, ecological, and ethno-linguistic are considered by political science through the prism of politics and the class struggle. Alongside theoretico-analytical methods political science is ever more extensively applying the empirical methods of sociology, including mathematico-statistical methods and simulation with computerised quantitative data not only sociological, but also socio-psychological and psychological methods and analysis technique are made use of.

The complexity of politics as a subject of research, the changes in the prevailing socio-class and political world-views, the cultural and historical features of peoples and the historically shaped differences between the social sciences, determined the specific features of political science in different countries and epochs.

In Soviet social science, historical materialism studies the most general laws of the functioning and development of the political superstructure of society, the interrelations between politics and economics. Scientific communism studies the establishment and evolution of the communist formation, the specifics of its political system, the prospects of the state becoming communist public self-government. Legal experts engaged in analysing politics, are interested primarily in the state and its apparatus, and in legal

norms as a part of political norms. Politologists are attracted by the political thought of mankind and by the history of political institutions and ideas. At the same time, today as never before, there is a pressing need for a comprehensive study of the current political issues by all branches of social science. The need to integrate the political sciences into a single political science is emphasised also in other socialist countries, particularly Poland, Yugoslavia, and Hungary.

Though the idea of creating an independent political science with its own aims and functions was advanced already by Aristotle, this branch of knowledge began to take shape in Western countries in the late 19th-early 20th centuries, and to develop widely only after the Second World War. In the West, political power and then the state are recognised as the subject-matter of political science. Despite the dominating influence until very recently of US politology with its pronounced scientism, there remain certain distinctions between the political sciences of the leading capitalist countries. In France, politological studies maintain the closest ties with jurisprudence, while in the FRG they are intertwined with philosophy. In Great Britain, the political sciences which originated from history, political economy and philosophy, are still under their influence. In Italy, often referred to as the home of bourgeois political science, associating its genesis with the name of Machiavelli, politological research is proceeding along the road of mastering the theoretical and methodological experience of other countries and selective use of the political thought of their predecessors.

On the whole, the dimension of this notion has still not been determined, and marked differences exist in its interpretations.

THE STATE SECTOR in the developing countries includes the enterprises and institutions in industry, agriculture, domestic and foreign trade and banking, which are the property of the state.

The establishment and expansion of the state sector is a distinctive feature of the development of most of the Asian, African and Latin American countries, irrespective of their political orientation. However, the character of development, economic significance and the social consequences of the growth of the state sector depend on whom the power belongs to and what the social aspirations of the dominating forces in the given society are. In the countries of progressive orientation, the consolidation of the positions of the state in the key branches of national economy (power engineering, large-scale industry, irrigation installations, the infrastructure, foreign trade, financing and crediting) on the basis of the socialisation of the basic means of

production promotes the establishment of an independent economy and the solution of complicated social problems. In those countries, however, where the economic policy of the state is determined by the big national bourgeoisie, the development of the state sector is often limited to the branches and enterprises which facilitate the growth of private enterprise in more profitable spheres of production.

The state sector in the developing countries is established in different ways. In some countries, it was initially created on the basis of the enterprises and institutions which remained from the colonial authorities and became the property of the state in the period when political independence was gained. Another way in which the state sector is formed is through the nationalisation of foreign and domestic firms. The main method of expanding the state sector is the new construction, usually on the basis of the national development programmes. The USSR and other socialist states often participate in such construction and their credits and loans are used primarily to build enterprises forming the foundation of national industry.

The state sector is of great importance for solving the problem of accumulation in the developing countries where the rates of accumulation are as yet still low. The growth of the state sector increases the entire national income and particularly that part of it which remains at the disposal of the state for purposes of expanded reproduction. The development of the enterprises belonging to the state sector draws the surplus able-bodied population of town and countryside into industry, transport, and the services, increases the capacity of the home market, helps to raise the people's living standards and, on the whole, serves social progress in the liberated states which are striving to lessen their economic and political dependence on the world capitalist system.

Our Mailbag

Here are some excerpts from our readers' letters, in the original or translated into English.

"I do enjoy ***Social Sciences,*** *each issue. It has come to my office since 1972. There are fine articles on a variety of topics. There are some on the interrelations of the social sciences especially including philosophy. Perhaps something more could be done on the transition from old-time philosophy to the new scientific philosophy to help your Western readers in America."*

Dale Riepe,
Professor of Philosophy,
New York, USA

"A week ago I got the opportunity to read your magazine ***Social Sciences*** *(at the permanent Soviet Exhibition in Addis Ababa). It gives me a great pleasure. Whatever my interest—philosophy, history, economics, politics, law, etc.—... it gives me the necessary background. I would like to read your magazine month after month, to read it from cover to cover. I have therefore decided to write this short letter to you. I wish and am eager to be a subscriber to* ***Social Sciences*** *and to become a regular reader of your magazine."*

Wubneh Asfaw,
Addis Ababa, Ethiopia

"I am keenly interested in all fields of the social sciences discussed in your journal. It is useful to me in my work..."

Jean Charles,
Editor-in-Chief,
Cahiers d'histoire,
Sâone, France

"I became a reader of ***Social Sciences*** *only recently, with the first issue of this year, to be more exact. The two issues, however, have been enough to make me a regular reader of your journal.*

"It would be difficult to single out articles in the journal, which I would find more interesting than the others, for their in-depth approach, high scientific level and high style make them all equally interesting to me. I should like however to make special mention of the articles by Alexei Kiva and Iosif Shklovsky." (No. 2, 1978, "Socialist Orientation: Problems of Theory and Practice", and "Mind-Endowed Life in the Universe: Can It Be Unique?" respectively.—Ed.)

Francisco Javier Nieva,
Madrid, Spain

"As a reader of your journal I should like to express satisfaction over the felicitous selection of material for ***Social Sciences*** *No. 1. I was especially impressed by B. Andrianov's article "The Concept of Hydraulic Society".*

Herbert Schmidl,
Karl-Marx-Stadt, GDR

DENMARK

Akademisk Boghandel,
Universitetsparken, Aarhus-C;
Sputnik International Import og Boghandel,
Vester Voldgabe 11, 1552, Copenhagen K;
Rhodos International Subscription Agency,
36 Strandgade, DK-1401, Copenhagen K.

FINLAND

Akateeminen Kirjakauppa,
Postilokero 128, Helsinki 10;
Kansankulttuuri Oy, Simonkatu 8, Helsinki 10;
Rautakirja Oy P1
1, 01641 Vantaa 64.

GHANA
Science Spot Book Shop,
P.O.Box 10331, Accra North.

GREECE

"Planet" Co.,
C. Camarinopoulos,
Panepistimiou 57, Athens.

GUYANA

GNTC,
45/47; Water Street,
P.O.Box 308, Georgetown.

HONG KONG

Apollo Book Co.,
27 Kimberley Road,
P.O.Box 5710, Kowloon;
Great Eastern Book Co.,
123 Henessy Road,
13 F P.O.Box 20005, Hong Kong.

INDIA

People's Publishing House (P) Ltd.,
Rani Jhansi Road, New Delhi-55;
Magazine Centre,
2nd Floor, M.C.D. Buildings
D.B. Gupta Rd. Paharganj,
New Delhi 110055;
Lok Vangmaya Griha,
190-B Khetwadi Main Road, Bombay-4;
People's Book House,
Piramshah Manzil, Relief Road, Ahmedabad;
Vijay Stores,
Station Road, Anand 388001;
Magazine Centre,
2nd Floor, Ganapathi Bldgs,
B.V.K.Iyengar Road, Bangalore-560053;
People's Book House,
Opp. B.N.College
Patna-80 000, Bihar;
Manisha Granthalaya (P) Ltd.,
4/3B, Bankim Chatterjee Street,
Calcutta-12;
National Book Agency (P) Ltd.,
12 Bankim Chatterjee Street,
Calcutta-12;
Bingsha Shatabdi,
22/A, Arabinda Sarani, Calcutta-5;
Visalaanhdra Publishing House,
Chandram Bldgs, Vijayawada-4; A.P.
Magazine Centre,
54, Abid Shopping Centre Lane,
(Chirag Ali), Hyderabad, 500 001;
New Century
Book House (P) Ltd.,
41/B Sidco Industrial Estate,
Madras-600 098;
Navakarnataka Publications
Sarpabhushana Mutt Compound,
Kempegowda Circle,
Bangalore-9;

Prabhath Book House,
Head Office Prabhath Bldg.
Trivandrum-24;

Vijay Stores,
6?, Kalyan Bhuvan, Ahmedabad-1;

Vijay Stores,
Rajni, 1st Floor, Bhupendra Road,
Rajkot-1;

Punjab Book Centre,
S.C.O. 1126-27, 22-B,
22-V,
Chandigarh-22.

IRAQ

National House for Publishing, Distributing and Advertisement,
Baghdad

JAMAICA

Independent Book Stores,
2, Wildman Street, Kingston W. 1.

JAPAN

Nauka Ltd.,
30-19, Minami-Ikebukuro,
2-chome, Toshima-ku, Tokyo;

Nisso Tosho Ltd.,
c/o Masumoto Bldg., 1-5-16, Suido,
Bunkyo-ku Tokyo;

Kaigai Publications Ltd.,
P.O.Box 5020, Tokyo International,
Tokyo 100-31;

Far Eastern Book-Sellers,
Kanda, P.O.B.72, Tokyo.

JORDAN

Jordan Distribution Agency,
P.O.Box 375, Amman.

NEPAL

Baje Ko Pasal,
Bank Road, Biratnagar, P.O.1,
Biratnagar;

International Book House,
11/20, Kamalakshi, Post Box 32,
Katmandu.

NETHERLANDS

"Pegasus" Boekhandel,
Leidsestraat 25, Amsterdam.

NEW ZEALAND

Progressive Book Society Ltd.,
21 Elliott Str., Auckland I.;

Technical Books, Ltd.,
262 Lambton Quay, Wellington;

New Zealand Tribune,
P.O.Box 19-114, Auckland.

NORWAY

A/S Narvesens Litteraturtjeneste,
Bertrand Narvesens vei 2;
Postboks 6140, Oslo 6;

Tanum-Cammermeyer Subscription Centre,
Karl Jahansgt. 43, Oslo 1;

Norsk-Sovjetrussisk Samband,
Rădhusgt, 8-V, Oslo;

A/S Norsk Forlag Ny Dag,
Boks 3634 GB, Oslo;

Universitetsbokhandelen
307, Blindern, Oslo 3.

PAKISTAN

Standard Publishing House,
Marina Hotel, Bonus Road,
Karachi-4.

P.D.R.Y.

The 14th October Printing Publication, Distribution and Advertising Corporation,
P.O.Box 4227, Aden.

SINGAPORE

New Soviet Gallery, Pte., Ltd.,
1st Floor, Choon Bee Building,

333 North Bridge Road,
Singapore.

SRI LANKA

People's Publishing House,
124, Kumaran Ratnam Road,
Colombo-2;

Lake House Bookshop,
100, Chittampalam Gardener
Mawatha, Colombo 2.

SUDAN

Sudanese Intercontinental
Marketing Co.,
P.O.Box 1331, Khartoum.

SWEDEN

Wennergren-Williams AB,
Fack, S-104 25 Stockholm 30;

Gumperts Bokhandel AB,
Södra Hamngatan 35, Göteborg;

Almqvist & Wiksell,
26 Gamla Brogatan, Box 62
S-101 20 Stockholm;

Gleerupska
Universitetsbokhandel,
Lund;

Förbundet Sverige-Sovjetunionen,
Katarinavägen 20, 1 tr.,
116 45 Stockholm.

SYRIA

Dar Dimashq,
Editeurs-Distributeurs,
Adib Tounbakji,
Share Port Said, Damas;

Dar-Al-Fair Edition
et Distribution,
Rue Al-Kouatly,
En Face du Cercle des Officiers,
Alep.

TANZANIA

Tanganyika Standard
(Newspapers) Ltd.,
P.O.Box 9033, Dar Es Salaam.

UNITED KINGDOM

Central Books Ltd.,
14 The Leathermarket,
London SE1 3ER;

Collet's Holdings, Ltd.,
Denington Estate,
Wellingborough Northants.

USA

Four Continent Book Corporation,
149 Fifth Ave., New York,
N.Y. 10 010;

Imported Publications Inc.,
320 West Ohio Street,
Chicago, Illinois 60610;

Stechert-Macmillan, Inc.,
7250 Westfield Avenue
Pennsauken, New Jersey 08110;

EBSCO Subscription Services,
17-19 Washington Avenue,
Tenafly, New Jersey 07670;

Znanie Book Store,
5237 Geary Boulevard,
San Francisco, Ca. 94118.

«ОБЩЕСТВЕННЫЕ НАУКИ» № 3, 1979 г.
на английском языке

IN OUR NEXT ISSUE:

The Concept of Developed Socialism

Current Aspects of African Development

History Periodisation Criteria

STR, Society and Man

On Reading Einstein

Structural Analysis in the Humanities

Psychology, Linguistics and Psycholinguistics

Issued by the "Social Sciences Today" Editorial Board

Printed by Nauka Publishers