

**SOVIET
DEMOCRACY
IN THE PERIOD
OF DEVELOPED
SOCIALISM**



PROGRESS Publishers

SOVIET DEMOCRACY IN THE PERIOD OF DEVELOPED SOCIALISM



Progress Publishers
Moscow
1979

Translated from the Russian by *Barry Jones*
Designed by *Maria Melik-Pashayeva*

General Editor: *D. A. Kerimov*, Corresponding Member, USSR
Academy of Sciences

Authors :

V. G. Afanasyev, Corresponding Member, USSR Academy of Sciences ;

N. V. Chernogolovkin, Dr. Sc. (Law) ;

D. M. Gvishiani, Corresponding Member, USSR Academy of Sciences ;

I. P. Ilyinsky, Dr. Sc. (Law) ;

V. N. Ivanov, Cand. Sc. (Philosophy) ;

D. A. Kerimov, Corresponding Member, USSR Academy of Sciences ;

N. F. Kuzmin, Dr. Sc. (History) ;

G. V. Maltsev, Cand. Sc. (Law) ;

G. Kh. Shakhnazarov, Dr. Sc. (Law).

«СОВЕТСКАЯ ДЕМОКРАТИЯ
В ПЕРИОД РАЗВИТОГО СОЦИАЛИЗМА»

На английском языке

First printing 1979

© Издательство «Мысль», 1976

© Издательство «Прогресс», 1979, с дополнениями

English translation © Progress Publishers 1979

Printed in the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics

C 11302-434 48-79 0902000000
014(01)-79

CONTENTS

	<i>Page</i>
PREFACE	5
Chapter I. THE LENINIST PARTY—BEARER AND GUARANTOR OF SOVIET DEMOCRACY	23
The All-Round Development of Soviet Democracy Is One of the Fundamental Objectives of the CPSU Policy	23
Strengthening the Bonds Between the Party and the People—an Essential Factor in the Building of a New Society and the Development of Socialist Democracy	38
The Democratic Foundations of the Life and Work of the Leninist Party	46
Chapter II. POLITICAL GUIDANCE AND THE FUNDAMENTAL INSTITUTIONS OF DEMOCRACY	52
Political Guidance: the Idea and the Instruments	52
The Political Organization of Soviet Society	58
Political Ideology, Socialist Law and Morality as Instruments of Implementing Policy	66
Chapter III. THE FORMS OF DEMOCRACY	72
The Class Nature of Socialist Democracy	72
State Power—the Basic Form of Socialist Democracy	78
Socialist Democracy and Public Organizations	84
Representative and Direct Democracy	86
Chapter IV. POLITICS, DEMOCRACY AND THE PEOPLE	96
Mass Involvement in Politics	96
A Critique of Bourgeois Elitist and Pluralist Models of Political Democracy	105
Chapter V. SCIENTIFIC MANAGEMENT OF SOCIETY AND DEMOCRATIC CENTRALISM	129
Essence of Scientific Management of Society	129
Scientific Management and Party Guidance	132

Democratic Centralism	137
The Further Development of Democracy and the Strengthening of Centralism	144
Chapter VI. PROFESSIONALISM AND DEMOCRACY IN MANAGEMENT	148
Democracy and Technocracy	148
Democratic Control—a Form of Mass Participation in Management	154
Democratic Methods for the Selection and Placement of Executive Personnel	159
Democracy, Management and the Ideological Struggle	163
Chapter VII. DEMOCRACY AND THE INDIVIDUAL	172
Individual Freedom and Socialist Democracy	172
The State and the Individual in Socialist Society	182
The Socialist Constitution, the Individual and Human Rights	192
The Individual and the Public Organizations	210
Chapter VIII. THE WORK COLLECTIVE AND DEMOCRACY	218
The Increasing Role of the Work Collective in the Development of Socialist Democracy	218
The Work Collective and the Sphere of Management	224
The Educational Role of the Collective and the Improve- ment of Democracy at Work	234
Social Planning and the Development of Democracy	242
Chapter IX. THE SCIENTIFIC AND TECHNICAL REVOLU- TION, SOCIAL PROGRESS AND DEMOCRACY	250
The Nature and Social Consequences of the Scientific and Technical Revolution	251
The Scientific and Technical Revolution and the Prospects for Social Progress	258
The Scientific and Technical Revolution, Management and Democracy	265
Name Index	273
Subject Index	275

ERRATUM

Should read:

Page 264, lines 1 to 4 from top	introduction of new technology and raising its effectiveness. One of the most important indicators of social progress is the individual's way of life. The tremendous growth of social progress, the continually increasing influence that
------------------------------------	---

PREFACE

The building of communism is inseparable from the all-out development of socialist democracy, the strengthening of the Soviet state and the general improvement of the whole system of the political organization of society. In his report to the 25th Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union (CPSU) in 1976, the General Secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, L. I. Brezhnev, emphasized that the all-round development of the political system of Soviet society was an important line of all work in communist construction. This meant, he said, improvement of the socialist state, further development of socialist democracy, consolidation of the legal basis of the life of the state and society and invigoration of the activity of public organizations.

The sense and substance of socialist democracy consists in the fact that more and more working people are drawn into administering the country, managing public and state affairs and creating the necessary conditions for the all-round harmonious development of the individual and for strengthening the unity of the Soviet people. By improvement of socialist democracy the Communists primarily understand a steadily growing involvement of the working people in the management of public affairs, the expansion of the democratic basis of the state and creation of the right conditions for the all-round development of the individual. Socialist democracy draws the working class, the collective-farm peasantry and the working intelligentsia closer together, promotes the development of the socialist nations and national-

ities and strengthens the friendship and monolithic unity of all the Soviet peoples. Socialist democracy is the basis of the socialist way of life.

Socialist democracy ensures the continued growth of the people's standard of living, which is the highest aim of the economic policy of the Communist Party. Scientific and technical progress combined with the fuller utilization of all the reserves and potentialities of the socialist system have raised the effectiveness of social production and improved the system of managing economic and social processes in the country. Socialist democracy has exerted salutary influence on culture, education, science, literature and the arts and has positively affected the whole cultural life of the Soviet people.

As Lenin pointed out, the political system and political authority under socialism is authority open to all, it carries out all its functions before the eyes of the masses, is accessible to the masses, springs directly from the masses, and is a direct and immediate instrument of the popular masses, of their will.¹

The genuinely popular essence of Soviet power is fully and consistently manifest in the daily life of Soviet society, the society of developed socialism. At the root of socialist democracy lies the conception of socialist property and the socialist system of the economy, together with the increasing social homogeneity of the Soviet people as a new historical community. Having accomplished the tasks required of it during the period of the dictatorship of the proletariat, the Soviet state has become a state of the whole people and Soviet democracy has acquired a nation-wide character without any exceptions or limitations. Under these conditions the social activity of the working people has assumed unprecedented scale and scope.

The new Constitution of the USSR, adopted in 1977, is a historical landmark in the development of Soviet society. It has given legislative force to the tremendous achievements of the Soviet people under the leadership of its vanguard—the Communist Party of the Soviet Union.

All aspects of life in the Soviet country have undergone tremendously important changes in the 60-odd years of its existence. At the basis of these changes lie the revolution-

¹ See V. I. Lenin. *Collected Works*, Vol. 10, p. 245.

ary transformation of the mode of production, and of the class structure of society, the adoption by all sections of the population of the ideological and political position of the working class, and the essential reconstruction of the whole tenor of life and of the psychology of the millions of working people. The country's economy has changed radically. It has been transformed on the basis of the complete domination of socialist property into a single, powerful, planned economic complex, which is developing under an organic combination of the benefits of the scientific and technical revolution and the advantages of developed socialism.

Significant changes have taken place in the sphere of social relations and in the social structure of Soviet society. A firm union and all-round cooperation have been established between the working class, the collective-farm peasantry and the people's intelligentsia.

The modern Soviet worker is a politically mature, widely educated and cultivated man with firm ideological convictions, who takes an active part in the running of society and the state. The collective farmer of today hardly differs from the industrial worker in terms of outlook, education and way of life. The Soviet intelligentsia has become genuinely popular and socialist in outlook, exercising real influence on all aspects of the life of society. All these changes reflect the growing social homogeneity of Soviet society, the strengthening of bonds between classes and the gradual obliteration of distinctions between the main social groups.

In the state of the whole people, just as in the state of proletarian dictatorship, the working class plays the leading role. This expresses one of the essential features of the historical continuity in the development of the socialist state, the inherent link between the state of proletarian dictatorship and the state of the whole people, and dialectic transition from the former to the latter.

Socialist democracy affects not only the state, but has spread to all aspects of economic, social and cultural life. It permeates the wide and varied activity of the Soviets—the most representative organs of popular rule, as well as the trade unions, which have at their disposal wide powers and great possibilities for solving social and economic problems, and the Leninist Komsomol, which organizes Soviet youth as a reliable aid and reserve of the party. Democracy

has become the characteristic and inalienable feature of the socialist way of life.

The CPSU exercises control over all these bodies, organizations and processes, and directs the efforts of the whole nation towards the accomplishment of the current and long-term tasks required for the building of communism. In this way the party welds together all links in the political chain of socialist society and directs them towards one goal. The role of the party today increases as it continues to solve the complex and varied problems involved in the creation of the material and technical basis of communism, the gradual transformation of socialist social relations into communist social relations and the people's education in the spirit of communist consciousness.

The international position of the Soviet Union has also changed significantly, and its prestige and influence abroad has grown immeasurably. The formation of the world socialist system has put an end to the capitalist encirclement of the Soviet Union. The all-round cooperation of socialist states has strengthened, and dozens of new sovereign states have appeared on the political map of the world. All of this has resulted in a complete realignment of forces: the positions of the capitalist system have grown weaker and those of the socialist system stronger.

All these profound transformations have led to the construction of a developed, mature socialist society, whose basic characteristics have been concisely reflected in the new Constitution of the USSR.

Having assessed the results of constitutional development in the USSR and the fraternal socialist countries, the Fundamental Law of the Soviet state and society has given this experience new meaning in accordance with the demands of the present epoch. The new Constitution is the fourth constitution in the history of the Soviet Union. The first Constitution of the Russian Soviet Federative Socialist Republic, which was adopted in 1918, gave legislative force to the gains of the October Revolution of 1917 and determined the class essence of the Soviet state as the state of the dictatorship of the proletariat. The 1924 Constitution of the USSR determined the principles of formation of the federal socialist state. The 1936 Constitution proclaimed the victory of socialist social relations and set out in accordance with this the whole system of the organs of authority and administra-

tion and the electoral system. It worked out the constitutional framework for the development of socialist society, which had stood the test of time. The present Constitution of mature, developed socialism preserves the Leninist principles, which were enshrined in the earlier Soviet constitutions, expands and develops many of the democratic institutions of Soviet society, and introduces a number of new legal principles and standards.

The nation-wide discussion of the draft Constitution of the USSR, which took place between June and October 1977, and the participation in that discussion of workers, peasants and intellectuals, including a considerable number of specialists, and party, public and state officials, have made it a document permeated by the wisdom and generalized experience of the whole people, a symbol of justice, reason, creativity and progress.

The new Fundamental Law of the Soviet state and society promulgates the creation in the USSR of developed socialist society and affirms the building of a classless communist society as the highest goal of the Soviet state. It underlines the fact that all power in the Soviet Union belongs to the people and that the Soviet state is a socialist state of the whole people. The new Constitution retains the all-important principle that the foundation of the economic system of the USSR is socialist ownership of the means of production. It further develops the democratic principles governing the formation, structure and work of the Soviets which, in conformity with the popular essence of the state, have been given a new official title. They are now called Soviets of People's Deputies, whereas previously they were called Soviets of Working People's Deputies.

The main features of the national-state structure of the USSR, which have justified themselves in practice, are preserved in the new Soviet Constitution.

A new feature of the 1977 Constitution is the chapter on foreign policy, which gives legislative force to the Leninist principles of peace, security of nations and broad international cooperation.

The new Constitution reflects the progress of social development in the Soviet Union, reveals the significance and potential of socialist democracy and shows its aims and prospects. Socialist society is the first in history to place all natural and social resources at the service of the people,

of the individual. It thus proclaims real democracy and consistently implements democratic principles in all spheres of social life. Socialism and democracy are indivisible. In the course of socialist transformation the conscious creativity of the masses broadens and the conditions arise for the wide expansion and development of democracy. The main thing is that socialism creates the material basis for such democracy insofar as it promotes the development of the socialist economy—a single economic complex which embraces all levels of social production, distribution, consumption and exchange. The economy under socialism is based on the social ownership of the means of production. The ability of the people to engage in joint, concerted activity and man's feeling of involvement in the common cause are rooted in the collective organization of the relations of production.

History has shown the impossibility of a radical renewal or expansion of the democratic institutions without corresponding changes in the mode of social production, property relations and the distribution of the national income. Property inequality has always given rise to social and political inequality. Large-scale private property ensures the power and influence of those who possess it. The formally democratic laws and institutions of such a society overtly or covertly function in the interests of plutocracy. In the words of Lenin, "as long as there are exploiters who rule the majority, the exploited, the democratic state must inevitably be a democracy for the exploiters".¹ The economic system of contemporary capitalism, which implies the exploitation of man by man, is clearly anti-popular in character because it is incapable of providing a basis for the genuinely democratic development of society.

Socialism makes fundamental changes in the social function of the democratic institutions.

Socialist democracy—and this is its prime social function—becomes the means for solving the problem of society and the state; it is a factor linking social and state principles. From being an instrument of social oppression, the state has been transformed under socialism into an instrument of service to society, a means for implementing the vital creativity of the people. The socialist revolution began

¹ V. I. Lenin. *Collected Works*, Vol. 28, p. 250.

this process, which Marx, in analyzing the experience of the Paris Commune, characterized as 'the reabsorption of state power by society'.¹ The final aim, of course, is the withering away of the state under communism, that is to say its complete dissolution into forms of communist social self-government. From the very earliest stages of the building of socialism there has been an increasingly apparent tendency for society and the state to draw closer together and for the forms and methods of state administration and social self-government to merge and interact closely with one another. In this process democracy acts as the fundamental principle of unification and the basis for the closer unity of society and the state. The latter directs social life in accordance with the broad requirements of democracy, whereas society, for its part, exerts a democratic influence on state administration through a variety of channels. These are, chiefly, the system of party control over the state bodies, the mass public organizations, the forms of direct democracy, the institutions of people's control over the state apparatus, etc. Under socialism society and the state draw closer together on the basis of the broadest expansion of democracy.

This underlies the formation of a monolithic political organization of socialist society, which includes both public and state bodies. These provide for the organizational guarantees of the working people's interests in exercising political power, and their smooth functioning ensures the strengthening of socialism and the successful building of communism. As society develops, greater coordination of effort, firmer strengthening of links and deeper penetration of the principles of democracy are required in relations between all levels of the political system.

Socialism has altered the scale of democracy and broadened the sphere of activity of the democratic institutions and the corresponding norms of social life. Democracy in a socialist society has crossed the boundary of politics and gone beyond the framework of the state. It has become an integral part of socialism, the inherent expression of its way of life. Democracy has penetrated all aspects of social life in the socialist state—economic, political and cultural, and provided the conditions for the all-round development of the individual. The abolition of private ownership of the

¹ K. Marx and F. Engels. *On the Paris Commune*, Moscow, 1976, p. 153.

means of production and the establishment of socialist property as the economic basis of the new society have offered unlimited possibilities for the development of productive forces and created real conditions for the successful democratization of all aspects of social life. The principles and requirements of democracy are to an increasing extent permeating the economy, science and culture, and exert daily influence on social practices and the social consciousness of the people. They are thus increasingly becoming part of everyday life. Nor has the family been left out of the framework of expanding democracy, for it is the cell or unit in which man learns to respect democratic order in society and the dignity of other people. He learns to feel free to develop his creative gifts and at the same time comes to understand his duties as a citizen and his responsibility to society. Under socialism relations between members of society take on a democratic character and democracy becomes part of man's behavior and mentality.

The process of democratization in the various spheres of social life is dependent on the general level of material well-being of society, as well as the political maturity, educational and cultural standards of its members. Any step taken in the interests of democratizing one or another of society's institutions implies not only its provision by the necessary material guarantees, but also a corresponding increase in the consciousness, discipline and responsibility of its members. On the other hand, the process of democratization, which embraces not only the political, but also the economic, social and cultural life of society, manifests itself in different ways in the different spheres though in a close interrelationship and unity of the basic trends of development.

The socialist system has completely new criteria by which to judge democracy, criteria which are unknown to any exploitative society. In the final analysis these criteria relate to the needs and interests of the all-round development of the individual and to ensuring that each member of society acts as a free individual and is the master of his own destiny. The quality and level of the institutions and norms of democracy are determined by the way in which they promote the development of all forms of social activity, the outlet they provide to man's latent talents and the help they furnish in realizing man's creative potential in all walks

of life. Democracy is a mass phenomenon, but at its centre stands man with his own peculiar characteristics and individual capabilities. The worth of democracy under socialism comes from the supreme value it places on man and this shows the real humanism of socialist society and its political system.

The socialist political system is constructed in accordance with the interests of man, which are the highest criterion of the development of democracy. Hence follows the basic democratic requirement in the sphere of politics that each man should actively participate in managing the affairs of society and the state and in implementing the functions of government, legislature, control, judiciary, and so on. Lenin set and scientifically substantiated this task when he demanded "systematically drawing an ever greater number of citizens, and subsequently *each and every* citizen, into direct and *daily* performance of their share of the burdens of administering the state".¹ Faithfulness to this behest of Lenin's has been a characteristic feature of the policy of the CPSU and the Soviet state.

Speaking at the 16th Trade Union Congress of the USSR, L. I. Brezhnev said: "The central thing for us in this respect has been, and will be, what is literally expressed in the word democracy, namely, rule of the people, that is, participation of the masses in running government and social affairs, 'genuine self-government by the people' of which Lenin spoke."² Exceptionally important from this point of view is the right, established by the new Constitution of the USSR, for every Soviet citizen to take part in the running of social and state affairs. This is the most important political right in contemporary society. Participation by every citizen in managing common affairs is the essence of the Marxist-Leninist conception of democracy. In this respect it stands opposed to the contemporary bourgeois theories of "minority democracy" and "elitist democracy" and to the various technocratic conceptions widely current in the West. The representatives of these theories try to characterize the orientation of socialist democracy on the broad massive participation in government as a form of ungrounded maximalism.

¹ V. I. Lenin. *Collected Works*, Vol. 27, p. 156.

² L. I. Brezhnev. *The Trade Unions—an Influential Force of Soviet Society*, Moscow, 1977, p. 20.

They hold that bringing large sections of the population into politics is unnecessary and impossible. The interests of the enterprise in a technologically developed society, they claim, demand that decisions should be taken by a small group of qualified specialists with professional training and a high degree of competence. But this immediately prompts the question: what are these "interests" that require curtailing democracy and excluding millions from active participation in social and state life? The technocrats refer to the economic effectiveness of decisions, but in the realities of capitalist society this only serves to hide such interests as monopolies' super-profits and the growth of their influence and power.

Socialist society has eliminated the cause of any clash between professional government and the principle of democratic mass participation, because the specialized forms of government are developed within the framework of socialist democracy. This makes it possible to select executive cadres from the widest circle of trained personnel, maintain the continual renewal of such cadres and exercise a democratic control over the activities of the government apparatus. Under socialism there are no other interests than those founded on the interests of the working people. Everything that society creates is intended for man, his well-being and his overall development. This is why the participation of each working man in administration, through which he realizes his own creative potential and reveals his capabilities and talents, is also in the interest of the enterprise, this great and highly important enterprise bequeathed to us by Lenin.

Socialist democracy implies the continued development of the individual, who is capable of achieving an increasingly higher level of culture and political awareness. The educational significance of democracy under socialism has been clearly demonstrated in the formation of a new type of individual. This is the type of man without whom democracy cannot exist, just as he cannot exist without socialist democracy. This is a man in whom socialism has bred creative aptitudes, devotion to the ideals of communism and intolerance of everything that is hostile to social progress, justice and peace on earth.

Socialist democracy is the democracy of the working people, and this fact also determines a number of important

features of the socialist individual. Work is man's prime vital need. The principle that the socially useful work and its results determine the status of man in society has been incorporated in the new Soviet Constitution. Industry and diligence as human qualities are highly valued, for at their basis lies a conscious attitude to work as the source of all social progress as well as of social and individual well-being. The development of socialist democracy has strengthened the link between man and the work collective, and improved the means of educating the individual in the collective in an atmosphere of friendship and comradesly mutual assistance, mutual support and encouragement, and socialist emulation. Socialist democracy needs the fully developed individual who combines a practical approach to and efficiency in his work with advanced world outlook and devotion to communist ideals and values, who is aware of his own rights and possibilities, but has a keen sense of responsibility to society.

The rights and freedoms of Soviet man are a thing he can be truly proud of. That section of the Constitution which sets out the rights of man shows quite clearly what a great transformation has taken place in the history of mankind under the socialist system. For the first time the state has ceased to function as an instrument of violence and oppression of the working people and has become the means of satisfying their material and cultural needs and achieving their genuine freedom. Under socialism the state no longer oppresses, no longer opposes or stands above the individual, but is there at his service.

The Constitution proclaims and—what is especially important—actually guarantees the genuine rights and freedoms of Soviet citizens.

Human rights can be genuine only in truly democratic social conditions. The degree of their genuineness is far from being determined by the good wishes, promises and assurances which are generously showered by the leaders of the various bourgeois parties, state officials and ideologists in the West. It is determined instead by the degree to which the actual possibilities exist for people to enjoy the benefits, achievements and values of society and the degree to which social life itself guarantees the realization of these possibilities. It is precisely this which constitutes one of the most important characteristics of socialist democracy, which as distinct from bourgeois democracy, not only proclaims, but

actually guarantees these rights. In so doing socialist democracy is primarily concerned with their practical implementation. These rights and freedoms are founded on the socialist economic and political system, the power and sovereignty of the people and the firm and consistent implementation of the demands of socialist legality by all state and public organizations and all their functionaries.

In promoting the creation of the material and technical basis and culture of communism, socialist democracy thereby makes an important contribution to strengthening citizens' rights and freedoms.

Raising real incomes chiefly in the form of increased payment for work done, enlarging the minimum wage, expanding education, increasing pensions and student grants, developing housing and social amenities and providing the necessary conditions for work, leisure and physical education—all these go to show that the Soviet people's social rights are really and effectively guaranteed. The systematic raising of the living standards of the Soviet people and the guaranteeing of their fundamental democratic rights, such as the right to work and pay in accordance with its quantity and quality, the right to rest and leisure, health protection, maintenance in old age, in sickness, incapacity or loss of the breadwinner, the rights to housing, free education and free medical aid, to enjoy cultural benefits, and the freedom of scientific, technical and artistic work—all these express the unity of interests between society and the individual, which exists only in conditions of socialism.

Together with their social and economic rights Soviet citizens are granted broad political rights, the value and significance of which is determined by the fact that they promote activity and initiative on the part of the people. Such rights are the right to participate in election campaigns and to be elected to the Soviets of People's Deputies at all levels, the right to participate in the management of state and public affairs, to submit proposals to state bodies for the improvement of their functioning, to criticize shortcomings in their work and supervise their activities. Furthermore, Soviet citizens are guaranteed freedom of speech, of the press, and of assembly, meeting, street processions and demonstrations; they have the right to associate in public organizations, the right to freedom of conscience, to protection of the family and to inviolability of person and

home, to privacy of correspondence, telephone conversations and telegraphic communications, to legal protection against encroachments on life and health, property and personal freedom, honor and reputation.

Thanks to these rights and freedoms Soviet citizens have every opportunity to take active part in the building of communism and in the social, political, economic and cultural life of the country. Citizens' rights and freedoms under socialism primarily serve to satisfy their personal requirements, but at the same time they are in the interests of the collective, society and the state, inasmuch as they express the unity of fundamental personal and social interests in socialist society. The state, whose entire organization is based on the principle of the active participation of the working people in public affairs, is concerned with securing broad democratic rights and freedoms, for their implementation helps achieve the fundamental aims of society.

It is precisely for this reason that the state concerns itself not only with raising the people's living standards but also with developing them culturally. In a special chapter of the Constitution, entitled "Social Development and Culture", it is stated that the state concerns itself with developing education, science and the arts, with improving working conditions, raising incomes and increasing and justly distributing the social consumption funds.

In turn, the exercise of rights and freedoms granted to the individual by the state encourages his participation in the social, political and cultural life of society, thus contributing to his development and improvement.

Thus the famous words of the Manifesto of the Communist Party, written by Marx and Engels, that "the free development of each is the condition of the free development of all" have been given flesh and blood, and this principle has been written down in the Constitution of the USSR.

It is obvious that the citizens' rights and freedoms cannot and must not be used against the Soviet social system or to the detriment of the interests of the Soviet people. Citizens' exercise of their rights and freedoms is inseparable from the performance of their duties and obligations. Citizens of the USSR are obliged to observe the Constitution of the USSR and Soviet laws, comply with the standards of socialist conduct, and uphold the honor and dignity of Soviet citizenship; it is their duty to work conscientiously, preserve and streng-

then socialist property, protect the interests of the Soviet state, strengthen its power and prestige, defend the socialist Motherland, respect the national dignity of other citizens, and strengthen friendship between the nations and nationalities of the Soviet Union. The Soviet citizens are also obliged to respect the rights and lawful interests of other persons, be uncompromising towards anti-social acts, contribute in every possible way to the maintenance of public order, concern themselves with the upbringing of children, protect natural riches, historical monuments and other cultural values, promote friendship and cooperation with peoples of other lands, and maintain and strengthen world peace.

The unity of rights and duties characterizes the humane legal status of the Soviet citizen, which creates the necessary conditions for the strengthening of socialist legality and the rule of law in the country.

An exceptionally important aspect of the development of Soviet democracy is the improvement of the socialist state. This book reviews a wide range of problems linked with the further democratization of the political system, the state apparatus, the organs of popular power, and the management of social processes. In a developed socialist society all principles of the organizational structure and functional dynamics of the socialist political system have been put into practice, primarily the principle of democratic centralism, which includes the electiveness of all organs of state power from top to bottom, their accountability to the people, and the obligation of lower bodies to observe the decisions of higher ones.

As a result of this principle the structure of the bodies and institutions of the political system becomes the most expedient and the methods employed by them the most effective, which allows a single policy to be pursued at the centre and in the localities with decisive participation of broad sections of the people. Democratic centralism combines central leadership with local initiative and creative activity and with the responsibility of each state body and official for the work entrusted to them.

The source of the strength and effectiveness of socialist democracy consists in the fact that all processes in the social and political development of socialist society are directed by the Communist Party. The new Constitution gives a detailed definition of the CPSU as the leading and guiding

force of Soviet society, and the nucleus of its political system and all state and public organizations. L. I. Brezhnev said: "Genuine democracy permeates all spheres of our society, effectively ensuring both the interests and rights of the entire people and the interests and rights of each citizen. Our Leninist Party is the chief vehicle of the principles of socialist democracy, the guarantor of its progressive development."¹

The Communist Party is the highest form of organization and activity and a model for all other workers' organizations and associations. The party is the guarantor of the successful progressive development of socialist democracy and the guiding light and bond of unity between all working people's organizations, both state and public. As such it ensures their unity of action in the building of communism.

The CPSU determines the general lines of development for society and the foreign and domestic policy of the Soviet Union. It guides the tremendous creative efforts of the Soviet people and makes their struggle for the victory of communism planned and scientifically based.

These and other features and characteristics of socialist democracy demand its comprehensive study. The authors of the present work have limited their task to reviewing the basic problems and trends in the development of socialist democracy at the contemporary stage of communist construction. First of all they examine the part played by the Communist Party in the development of Soviet democracy and show its tremendous constructive efforts to provide conditions for the exercise of citizens' rights and freedoms and for their active participation in the work of state and public organizations, in the building of communism.

The book analyzes the political leadership and the basic democratic institutions in the political system of mature socialism and examines the major clauses of the new 1977 Constitution. Here attention is focussed on the socialist state as the main instrument in the building of socialism and communism. The Soviet socialist state is primarily able to fulfil this role successfully owing to its genuinely popular nature. The book examines the essence and historical evolu-

¹ L. I. Brezhnev. *Following Lenin's Course. Speeches and Articles (1972-1975)*, Moscow, 1975, p. 446.

tion of socialist popular power, both in the period of the state of proletarian dictatorship and particularly in the period of its growing over into the state of the whole people, and points out the leading role of the working class at all stages in the development of the socialist state. Particular attention is given to an examination of the interaction between the working people's state and mass organizations, as well as to representative and direct democracy and the creative participation by the broad masses of the working people in the formulation and conduct of party and state policy. The scientific management of socialist society on the basis of democratic centralism is only possible thanks to the genuinely democratic nature of the Soviet state and social system. The book defines the nature of scientific management, its socialist principles, and the mechanism of interaction between state administration and party leadership, pointing out the lines of future expansion of democracy and the strengthening of centralism in the work of management. The examination of these questions logically evolves into the analysis of the correlation between professionalism and democratism in management. Here a detailed account is given of the mechanism of democratic control as a form of the working people's participation in the process of management as well as the democratic methods of selection and placement of the top managerial personnel.

The book gives a detailed description of the position of the individual and the work collective under Soviet democracy. It substantiates the Marxist thesis that freedom consists in men's domination over the natural and social conditions of their being, which is achieved as a result of the cognition of necessity together with action in accordance with the cognized necessity, performed in the interests of society. Thus it follows that freedom depends on the real conditions in which it is exercised. The material and cultural preconditions for freedom under socialism are therefore thoroughly examined in the book, together with the legal status of the Soviet citizen, for it is on the basis of these that the individual is able to fulfil himself in productive and socio-political activity. In this context emphasis is placed on the growing role of the work collective in management, in the development of socialist democracy and in the communist education of its members. Here the authors look at one of the latest forms of working people's activity and

initiative, which has become widespread throughout this country in recent years—the planning of the social development of work collectives.

The concluding section of the book is devoted to an analysis of the essence and social implications of the scientific and technical revolution, its correlation with management, democracy and the prospects of social progress in conditions of developed socialism. The statement of these problems and their solution as presented in this work are accompanied by an examination of the crisis of democracy in the capitalist countries and a critical analysis of the relevant bourgeois and revisionist theories of democracy.

This book is, therefore, a study of the fundamental and current problems facing Soviet democracy in their entirety.

Chapter I

THE LENINIST PARTY—BEARER AND GUARANTOR OF SOVIET DEMOCRACY

The All-Round Development of Soviet Democracy Is One of the Fundamental Objectives of the CPSU Policy

Marxism-Leninism and the experience of history show that genuine democracy is impossible without the overthrow of the exploiting classes and the seizure of political power by the working class. From the moment society becomes divided into classes and the state comes into existence, the social and political system takes on a class character. In the slave, feudal and capitalist societies the state expresses the interests of the dominant exploiter classes who control the means of production. In a society made up of antagonistic classes, the state is always the means whereby the exploiting minority dominates and oppresses the exploited majority—the millions of working people. “In the final analysis, every kind of democracy, as political superstructure in general (which must exist until classes have been abolished and a classless society established), serves production and is ultimately determined by the relations of production in a given society.”¹

Therefore, when political power is in the hands of the exploiter classes, there can be no genuine democracy, such as would guarantee the active participation of the working people in running the state and in the accomplishment of economic, social, political and ideological tasks in the interests of the people. The only way of emancipating the workers from the yoke of capitalism and guaranteeing genuine popular democracy is the revolutionary transition from capitalism to socialism.

¹ V. I. Lenin. *Collected Works*, Vol. 32, p. 81.

The main tasks of this transition, which also constitute the main content of the socialist revolution, are the following ones:

—the overthrow of the bourgeoisie and the seizure of power by the working class with the broad support of the popular masses. Irrespective of its form, the capitalist state is in essence a dictatorship of the bourgeoisie and monopoly capital. It is an instrument for the oppression and subjugation of the working people. As opposed to this, the political basis of the dictatorship of the proletariat is the union of the working class and the peasantry with all the working people. The socialist state expresses the interests of the working class and all the working people and serves as the main instrument of revolutionary change and the building of a new society;

—the abolition of capitalist relations of production, which constitute the economic basis of bourgeois society, and the creation of fundamentally new, socialist relations of production which guarantee the planned development of the economy and social production so as to raise the living standards of the workers and the population as a whole;

—the abolition of the exploiter classes and establishment of the moral and political unity of society;

—the carrying over of a cultural revolution, designed to raise the educational and cultural level of the working people, acquaint them with the achievements of national and world culture and involve them in the struggle to establish Marxist-Leninist ideology in place of bourgeois ideology and educate a new type of man.

These revolutionary measures would put an end to the main contradiction of capitalist society—that between the social character of production and the private capitalist form of appropriation of the means of production and product of labor. These steps would guarantee the necessary conditions for the development of genuine popular democracy.

The experience of the Soviet Union and the other socialist countries shows clearly that certain general laws are inherent in the transition from capitalism to socialism and the building of a new society. The most important general law of the building of a new society, based on genuinely democratic principles, is the dominant role of the Communist Party—the vanguard of the working class, which is the leading force of all working people in their struggle for

the revolutionary transformation of the world. The leading role of the working class in the building of socialism and communism is an objective law in the emergence and development of the communist socio-economic formation. Because of the position it occupies in capitalist society, primarily in the system of production, the proletariat is the most organized and revolutionary class whose interests in the main coincide with those of all working people. This provides an objective basis for uniting all working people under the leadership of the working class with the aim of overthrowing capitalism and building socialism and communism.

This historical mission can only be effected by the working class under the leadership of the Marxist-Leninist party—the organized vanguard of the working class, which is armed with Marxist-Leninist theory. The party is the highest form of the class organization of the proletariat.

What is most important in Marxism-Leninism is its teaching on the world historical mission of the working class and its communist vanguard. For more than a century the course of world history has corroborated the correctness of this teaching and today brings more and more proof of its powerful, vital, transforming force. The thesis on the world historical role of the working class has found its incarnation in the continually growing and strengthening world socialist system and in the international communist and working-class movement. In the last twenty years alone fourteen new communist parties have been formed. There are now communist parties in 90 countries, that is to say in virtually all the countries where there is an organized working class. Over the same period the total number of Communists rose by 20 million to reach a figure today of 60 million people.¹

Communists are in the vanguard of the class battles of the working class and all the working people in many of the capitalist countries. This struggle is continually growing. Thus from 1919 to 1939 the total number of strikers in the capitalist world amounted to 81 million, from 1946 to 1961—150 million, and from 1961 to 1975 the figure was in excess of 800 million.²

¹ See *International Working-Class Movement* (Reference book), Moscow, 1976, p. 51 (in Russian).

² *Ibid.*, p. 76.

The biggest class battles against the yoke of capitalism were waged in industrialized capitalist countries. In the US, for example, despite all manoeuvres by the monopolists and the conciliatory policy of the leadership of the American Federation of Labor and the Congress of Industrial Organizations, there were 18,800 strikes between 1965 and 1969 involving 11.5 million people, while from 1970 to 1974 there were some 27,500 strikes involving 13 million.¹

These and other data disprove revisionist allegations that the working class of today has lost its leading role in the revolutionary process and is increasingly being dissolved in other social groups.

Drawing on an all-round analysis of the real processes of social development in the modern world, the International Meeting of Communist and Workers' Parties of 1969 noted in its Document that "powerful revolutionary processes are gathering momentum throughout the world. Three mighty forces of our time—the world socialist system, the international working-class and the national liberation movement—are coming together in the struggle against imperialism. . . . *In the citadels of capitalism the working class, as recent events have shown, is the principal driving force of the revolutionary struggle, of the entire anti-imperialist, democratic movement*".²

These questions were thoroughly examined at the 25th Congress of the CPSU at which more than 100 delegations from communist, workers', national-democratic and socialist parties of 96 countries took part. The Report of the Central Committee of the CPSU, which was delivered by L. I. Brezhnev, emphasized that we are living in an epoch of radical revolutionary change, in which socialism continues to strengthen and expand. The working people wage an increasingly tense struggle against monopolist oppression and exploitative order and, at a time when acute and deep economic crisis has shaken the capitalist world, the working class there is stepping up its struggle against big business, the main culprit of social calamities. "The strike wave, which involves diverse sections of working people, has risen to the highest level in the past several decades. The strength and prestige

¹ See *International Working-Class Movement* (Reference Book), Moscow, 1976, p. 269.

² *International Meeting of Communist and Workers' Parties, Moscow, 1969, Prague, 1969, pp. 11, 24.*

of the working class are greater, and its role of vanguard in the struggle for the interests of working people, the true interests of the nation, has increased.”¹

The history of the Soviet Union and the other socialist countries proves irrefutably that it is only the working class and its vanguard, the Communist Party, that are able to abolish the exploitative social system that oppresses the working people and denies them human rights, and give them a new life, guaranteeing genuine freedom and satisfaction of material and cultural requirements, together with the overall development of their creative potentialities and talent and the unity of the interests of each with the interests of all.

The strength of the Communist Party lies in the fact that it is armed with the most advanced and genuinely scientific theory—Marxism-Leninism—which enables it to gain a deep insight into the laws of social development and, on this basis, to work out a scientifically based program, strategy and tactics of the struggle of the working class and all the working people. This enables the Communist Party to stand at the head of the masses.

In all its work the party relies on the mass of people, primarily the working class, in whose hands lies the further social, political, economic and cultural development of the country and the building of communism.

The Communist Party starts out from the basic proposition that the emancipation of the masses from capitalist oppression and the building of socialism and communism are only possible through the efforts of the people themselves. As Lenin pointed out, “the greater the scope and extent of historical events, the greater is the number of people participating in them, and, contrariwise, the more profound the change we wish to bring about, the more must we rouse an interest and an intelligent attitude towards it, and convince more millions and tens of millions of people that it is necessary”.²

At each stage in its historical development the party worked out its program, which determined its strategy and tactics, proceeding from the interests of the people and

¹ *Documents and Resolutions. XXVth Congress of the CPSU*, Moscow, 1976, p. 34.

² V. I. Lenin. *Collected Works*, Vol. 31, p. 498.

being guided by the need to develop the vital creativity of the masses and involve them in vigorous social activity. The first of these programs was drawn up under the direct guidance of Lenin and adopted in 1903 at the Second Congress of the RSDLP.¹ It became a guide to action for the party, the working class and all the working people of the country in the three Russian revolutions (of 1905-1907, February 1917 and October 1917).

Owing to objective historical conditions, Russia's working class and its Leninist party were the first to pave the way to socialism and communism. Led by the Communist Party headed by Lenin, the Great October Socialist Revolution triumphed in the country. It was the first revolution in history to crush the exploiter social system and usher in a transition from capitalism to socialism on a world scale. A dictatorship of the proletariat was established, which represents a new type of state, the socialist state.

In the new situation Marx and Engels' teaching on the dictatorship of the proletariat was creatively developed by Lenin. During the first Russian revolution of 1905-1907 a previously unknown type of political organization arose as a result of the creative activity of the working class and popular masses—the Soviets of Workers' Deputies, which were immediately followed by Soviets of Peasants' and Soldiers' Deputies. A resolution of the CPSU Central Committee "On the 70th Anniversary of the 1905-1907 Revolution in Russia" (1974) said in part: "Lenin brilliantly foresaw in them [the Soviets] the prototype of Soviet power and the state form of the dictatorship of the proletariat. The Great October Socialist Revolution and the history of the USSR have fully corroborated the vital force of Lenin's teaching on the Soviets as massive bodies of genuinely popular power and the expression of genuine democracy."

¹ RSDLP—the Russian Social-Democratic Labor Party. A political party of the proletariat formed in Russia in 1898. At the Second Congress of the RSDLP in 1903 a split took place between two factions—the Bolsheviks (those in the majority) and the Mensheviks (those in the minority). The Bolsheviks, headed by Lenin, pursued a consistent revolutionary policy, whereas the Mensheviks were opportunists and on the eve of the Great October Socialist Revolution went over to the counter-revolutionary bourgeoisie. In 1918 the Bolshevik Party became the Russian Communist Party (Bolsheviks)—RCP(B)—and in 1925 the Communist Party of the Soviet Union (Bolsheviks)—CPSU(B). The present title, Communist Party of the Soviet Union—CPSU—was adopted in 1952.

The establishment of the dictatorship of the proletariat in the form of Soviets signified the replacement of bourgeois democracy by the democracy of developing socialism and the transition to real popular rule. The working people were offered considerable opportunities for participation in the running of the state and the economy and in the development of culture. The construction and development of the new society was aimed at eliminating social and national oppression, care for the interests of the working people and raising their living standards and cultural level.

Among the first measures of the Soviet state was Lenin's Decree on Peace, which proclaimed new principles of relations between peoples and countries and announced a struggle against war for the establishment of peace throughout the world. These principles included respect for the equality and sovereignty of all states, non-interference in their internal affairs, the development of mutually advantageous cooperation and abolition of colonialism. By resolutely denouncing the imperialist policy of plunder and violence in international relations, the Decree on Peace was consonant to the interests of all nations. It was a manifestation of the deep humanism and democracy of the October Revolution.

The victory of the Great October Socialist Revolution and the formation of the world's first socialist state signified the implementation of the party's first Program.

The party's second Program, which was also drawn up under the direct guidance of Lenin and adopted by the Eighth Congress of the RCP(B) in 1919 set the task of building socialism in the USSR. The implementation of this Program involved the most important measures taken by the Party for the development of socialist democracy. It was at this time that the firm and consistent policy was adopted to draw the working people into the running of society and the state, and to educate the Soviet people in the spirit of high political consciousness and devotion to the great ideals of communism.

Lenin's plan for the building of socialism in the USSR embraced all aspects of the revolutionary transformation of society: economic, social, political and cultural. Under the guidance of the party the people started to implement Lenin's plan. The building of socialism took place in conditions of bitter class conflict within the country and hostile

capitalist encirclement without. No help was forthcoming from abroad, and the country had no previous experience to draw upon in the building of socialism.

Guided by Lenin's teaching and relying on the support of the masses, the party firmly, step by step paved the way to socialism. In doing so it started out from Lenin's instructions to the effect that socialism is built for the people and by the people. This meant that the party had to do everything in its power to develop democratic principles in all spheres of the creative work of the masses, that their consciousness be raised and their organization improved, that the working class and all the working people be drawn into the process of state administration and the solution of all problems affecting society. In building a new society, the working people became convinced from their own experience that they were the genuine masters of their country and came to realize the high degree of responsibility that devolved upon them not just for their own particular task, but for the success of the common cause, for the course of building socialism. It is these factors that lay behind the unprecedented labor and political enthusiasm, heroism and persistence shown by the Soviet working people in carrying out profound social and economic transformations in the country.

The victory of socialism secured the establishment of the socialist relations of production and the socialist economic system in the USSR. All remnants of the exploiter classes were liquidated and Soviet society became morally and politically united. It now consisted of friendly classes and social groups: the working class, the collective-farm peasantry, and the people's intelligentsia, firmly united around the Communist Party.

As a result of the implementation of Lenin's nationalities policy, the formerly backward peoples in the fringe areas of the USSR came onto the political scene, achieved state independence and overcame their economic and cultural backwardness. A socialist brotherhood of friendly peoples, nations and nationalities was established in the USSR.

One of the greatest achievements of socialism has been the emancipation of women, who were given equal rights with men in all spheres of life. Soviet women were guaranteed the right to raise their educational and cultural level and actively participate in all spheres of social life.

The deep social, economic and cultural transformations in the life of society brought about changes in the people's views, psychology and mutual relations. There evolved a new life-style, the socialist way of life, which differed radically from the bourgeois.

The historic gains of socialism were given legislative force in the Constitution of the USSR which was adopted by the Extraordinary 8th Congress of Soviets in 1936. This Constitution gave broad social freedoms and rights to Soviet citizens and established the system of direct, equal and universal suffrage, through which the organs of central and local government were elected by secret ballot. This was coupled with wider representation of all Union and autonomous republics, autonomous regions and national areas at the Supreme Soviet of the USSR. Thus the political superstructure was brought into conformity with the economic basis of socialism.

The new Soviet Constitution of 1977, which reflects the features of developed socialist society and is firmly based on the Leninist principles of state development, maintains the continuity of Soviet constitutions.

All this clearly goes to demonstrate the great humanism and democratism which socialism guarantees the workers, and the indisputable advantages of the new social system over capitalism, and the socialist democracy over the curtailed bourgeois democracy.

The historical achievements of the world's first socialist country convincingly demonstrate the powerful transformative force of Marxism-Leninism, its teaching on the leading role of the Communist Party as the most important law of the revolutionary transition from capitalism to socialism and the triumph of the ideas of communism.

The first socialist society built in the USSR has shown its great vitality and superiority over capitalism both in conditions of peace and during the bitter armed struggle against the united forces of imperialism. The Soviet people led by the Leninist party bore the brunt of the war against fascist Germany and its allies. In an unprecedentedly heroic struggle they not only upheld the gains of the October Revolution and the honor and independence of their Motherland, but radically altered the course of the Second World War in favor of the forces of peace, democracy and socialism, and saved the peoples of the world from the threat of fascist enslavement.

The third Party Program, adopted at the 22nd Congress of the CPSU in 1961 is the program for the building of communist society. The most important conditions for the achievement of this historic aim are the creation of the material and technical basis of communism, the formation of communist social relations and the education of the new man.

The main direction in the development of the socialist state during the period of the building of communism was stated in the Party Program to be the "*all-round extension and perfection of socialist democracy, active participation of all citizens in the administration of the state, in the management of economic and cultural development, improvement of the government apparatus, and increased control over its activity by the people*".¹ The measures envisaged by the Program for increasing the role of the Soviets and improving the whole system of state and public organizations have helped to broaden and strengthen socialist democracy and promote the growth of the political activity of the masses.

Under the tested leadership of the Leninist party the Soviet people have achieved enormous success in communist construction, particularly in the field of socialist democracy.

A major result of the revolutionary creative activity of the Soviet people led by the Communist Party was the building of a developed, mature socialist society in the USSR. The 24th Party Congress in 1971 and the 25th Party Congress in 1976 gave a summary characterization of developed socialist society and pointed out its limitless possibilities.

Developed socialist society is a natural stage on the road to communism. At this stage, when socialism is developing on its own foundations, the creative forces of the new system and its advantages over capitalism are becoming increasingly evident, and the working people are more and more widely employing the fruits of their great revolutionary gains. The new Constitution makes a point that developed socialist society is a society in which the greatest productive forces and advanced science and culture have been created, in which the workers' standard of living is continually rising

¹ *The Road to Communism*, Moscow, 1962, p. 548.

and more and more favorable conditions are being provided for the all-round development of the individual.

As in previous periods the work and policy of the CPSU in conditions of mature socialism is focussed on the development of the economy, which is the decisive factor in the onward movement of society towards communism and the strengthening of the international position of the socialist state. In working out the plan for the construction of socialism and supervising its implementation, Lenin said that "economic matters are our common concern. These are the politics that interest us most".¹ Speaking at the 8th All-Russia Congress of Soviets in 1920, Lenin described the GOELRO² plan as the Second Program of the party. He demanded that congresses and conferences should become "bodies that will verify our economic achievements, bodies in which we can really learn the business of economic development".³

The Communist Party constantly abides by these instructions. Economic policy was among the central problems in the work of the 25th Party Congress, as well as of previous congresses. The CPSU Central Committee report to the Congress noted that this was one of the decisive areas of the struggle for communism, and the main effort of the party and the people was concentrated on it.

The Soviet economy today has reached colossal proportions. A tremendously powerful economy has been created, based on a multi-sectoral industry, large-scale socialist agriculture, modern science and technology, and highly qualified manpower and management. Ten times as much social product is being put out today as was produced at the end of the 1930s. The tasks set out and tackled by the party today have no parallel in those accomplished at the previous stages of socialist construction.

Socially and politically developed socialism is characterized by the fact that all classes and social groups have drawn closer together on the basis of Marxist-Leninist ideology and the ideals of communism. The working class takes a lead,

¹ V. I. Lenin. *Collected Works*, Vol. 32, p. 430.

² GOELRO was the first long-term plan for rehabilitating and developing the Soviet economy on the basis of electrification. It was drawn up by the State Commission for the Electrification of Russia (GOELRO) on the orders of Lenin.

³ V. I. Lenin. *Collected Works*, Vol. 31, p. 514.

as it did before, in the class structure of society and in socialist social relations, insofar as it is the principal productive force of society and is a revolutionary, highly organized, disciplined and collectivist class.

A historically new community of people, the Soviet people, has taken shape in the process of building socialism and communism in the USSR. This community is based on the unbreakable union of the working class, the peasantry and the intelligentsia, with the working class playing the leading role, and on the friendship of all the nations and nationalities of the USSR. The leading and directing force of Soviet society and the nucleus of its political system and of all state organizations and public organizations is the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, which exists for the people and serves the people.

The Communist Party, armed with Marxist-Leninist theory, determines the general perspectives of the development of society and the course of the home and foreign policy of the USSR, directs the great constructive work of the Soviet people, and imparts a planned and scientifically substantiated character to their struggle for the victory of communism.

The state of the dictatorship of the proletariat has turned into the state of the whole people, which serves to express their interests and will. As declared in the Constitution of the USSR all power in the country belongs to the people, who exercise it through Soviets of People's Deputies, which constitute the political basis of the USSR. The Soviets and the mass organizations of the working people have come to play a more prominent role in the country and this guarantees the further development and expansion of socialist democracy.

Of vital importance, as before, for the further development of socialist democracy is Lenin's policy of all-out effort to involve the workers in running society and governing the state, and enhance their activity in all spheres of social life. Today, when Soviet society has entered the stage of mature socialism it is even more necessary than before to develop and expand democracy. The success of every major enterprise is determined by the organization and self-discipline of the working people, their mobilization for the solution of the tasks in hand and their activeness and initiative.

New social conditions have arisen, which objectively require a higher level of socialist democracy. The growth of

the economy, the transition to intensive methods of economic management, the raising of quality standards of production in industry and agriculture, and the changes in the sphere of distribution have all been reflected one way or another in the character of the political relations of Soviet society and enriched their socialist nature. New institutions and traditions have appeared in Soviet democracy, thus making it more diverse and mature. Under the new Constitution the principal direction in the development of the political system of Soviet society is the extension of socialist democracy, namely broader participation of citizens in managing the affairs of society and the state, continuous improvement of the machinery of state, enhancing the activity of public organizations, strengthening the system of people's control, consolidation of the legal foundation of the functioning of the state and of public life, greater openness and publicity, and constant responsiveness to public opinion.

As far as concerns intellectual development, mature socialism is characterized by the establishment of Marxist-Leninist ideology in society, high organizational capacity, ideological commitment and class consciousness of the working people, who are both patriots and internationalists, the growth of education, culture and intellectual requirements of people and consolidation of the standards of communist morality.

Mature socialism and its gradual development into communism enhance the significance of ideological education and the formation of the new man. The party holds that devotion to the communist ideals on the part of the Soviet people incorporates their knowledge, convictions and actions. The higher the ideological level of the Soviet people, the more powerful will be their country, the more dynamic their economy, the higher their standard of living and the more active their participation as a whole and each one in particular in running society and solving the practical questions connected with the building of communism.

The generalized expression of mature socialism is the socialist way of life. It is marked by genuine collectivism, the unity and ever-strengthening friendship between all nations of the Soviet Union and the moral health of the people. The socialist way of life has for the first time united

the interests of the individual and those of the collective, the whole of society. Concern of all for the good of each and concern of each for the good of all is the law of life in mature socialist society.

The CPSU's efforts to build communism and expand democracy in all spheres of society are indissolubly linked with its foreign policy. The Peace Program adopted by the 24th Congress of the CPSU, and its consistent implementation are designed to attain the most humane aims and desires of the peoples of the whole world. The main purpose of the Peace Program is to achieve a turn in international relations with reliance on the might, unity and dynamism of world socialism, on its closer alliance with all progressive and peace-loving forces—a turn from cold war to peaceful coexistence of states with different social systems.

The Leninist party consistently pursues a policy of struggle for peace throughout the world and works to ensure that the principles of peaceful coexistence of states with different social systems, principles of equality, mutually advantageous cooperation and non-interference in the internal affairs of other states become a firmly established norm in inter-state relations. The principled struggle which the CPSU is conducting together with the fraternal parties of other socialist countries and all democratic and peace-loving forces has helped improve the international climate.

However this road is by no means a smooth one. The forces of war, reaction and aggression have not abandoned their attempts to undermine and impede the positive processes taking place in the world. They instigate the arms race, oppose the settlement of outstanding international crises and rudely intervene in the internal affairs of other countries, trying to thwart the struggle for national liberation and democracy and discredit the policy of peaceful coexistence.

The Party's Leninist foreign policy is a dependable instrument in the struggle for peace and security, against aggression and imperialism. Reflecting the nature of socialism and its lofty ideals, it promotes the realization by the people of the advantages of the new social system, which are particularly apparent against the background of the present economic crisis and other upheavals in the capitalist world.

The All-European Conference in Helsinki has opened up new possibilities for solving the central problem of our time—the consolidation of peace and security of nations.

These goals can be attained through cooperation on a European scale with strict observance of the laws and traditions of each country. But the most important condition for a really firm and stable peace in Europe is the materialization of detente.

The 25th Congress of the CPSU reviewed Soviet foreign policy over the previous five years, 1972-1976, and noted its considerable achievements. The main result of the party's foreign policy was that the international position of the Soviet Union was firmer than ever before. Everything possible had been done for the peaceful building of new life in the USSR and the fraternal socialist countries and for the strengthening of peace and security throughout the world. For more than three decades now the Soviet people have enjoyed peace. The positions of socialism have strengthened and detente has become the main trend. Soviet foreign policy has received the respect and support of millions of people throughout the world, for it is a policy that serves the vital interests of all peoples everywhere.

The source of the great power of attraction inherent in the party's foreign policy, as in its domestic policy and practical work as a whole, lies in the class character of these policies. In his report to the 25th Party Congress, L. I. Brezhnev noted the positive changes that have taken place in the world and said that "detente and peaceful coexistence have to do with inter-state relations. This means above all that disputes and conflicts between countries are not to be settled by war, by the use or threat of force. Detente does not in the slightest abolish, nor can it abolish or alter, the laws of the class struggle. No one should expect that because of the detente Communists will reconcile themselves with capitalist exploitation or that monopolists will become followers of the revolution".¹ "We make no secret of the fact," L. I. Brezhnev continued, "that we see detente as the way to create more favourable conditions for peaceful socialist and communist construction. This only confirms that socialism and peace are indissoluble."²

The 25th Congress of the CPSU affirmed the stability of the party's foreign policy and stated that it was aimed at

¹ *Documents and Resolutions. XXVth Congress of the CPSU*, p. 39.

² *Ibid.*

curbing the forces of war and aggression, strengthening world peace and guaranteeing the people's right to freedom, independence and social progress.

**Strengthening the Bonds Between the Party
and the People—an Essential Factor
in the Building of a New Society
and the Development of Socialist Democracy**

The activity of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union is indissolubly linked with the life, work and vital interests and strivings of the people. The unity of the party and the people becomes stronger in the course of building communism, acting as the decisive factor in the development of socialist democracy. Building a new society demands broader and stronger links between the party and the people and a thorough analysis and consideration of their practical experience.

The close bonds that unite the party and the people and the approval and support they give to its policy are a very important Leninist principle of the work of the Communist Party. Even before the October Revolution Lenin wrote that "to do service to the masses and express *their* interests, having correctly conceived those interests, the advanced contingent, the organisation, must carry on all its activity among the masses, drawing from the masses all the best forces without any exception, at every step verifying carefully and objectively whether contact with the masses is being maintained and whether it is a live contact. In this way and *only* in this way, does the advanced contingent train and enlighten the masses, expressing *their* interests, teaching them organisation and directing *all* the activities of the masses along the path of conscious class politics".¹

The party is only able to lead the people if it makes a careful study of all aspects of their daily life, assimilates the experience of the working class and all working people, and generalizes and interprets this experience in the light of the urgent requirements of social development. Referring to the leading role of the party in society that builds socialism, Lenin said that "we can administer only when we express

¹ V. I. Lenin. *Collected Works*, Vol. 19, p. 40.

correctly what the people are conscious of. Unless we do this the Communist Party will not lead the proletariat, the proletariat will not lead the masses".¹

Having regard for the experience and level of consciousness of the people does not mean, of course, that the party should adapt itself to that level, for it is the vanguard of the working class and its task is to lead the people.

The victory of socialism and the construction of a developed socialist society in the USSR prove irrefutably that the Communist Party is honorably fulfilling its role of the political leader and guide of all the working people, and leading the Soviet people along Lenin's course. In its third Program the party formulated the important conclusion that the people are the decisive force in the building of communism and that "*the Party exists for the people, and it is in serving the people that it sees the purpose of its activity*".²

The CPSU considers the further expansion and strengthening of its ties with the people as a necessary condition for the successful building of communism. The party regularly consults with the people over important questions of domestic and foreign policy and relies on them in all its work. It believes that the more socialist democracy expands and develops, the more intense and varied should be its work among the working people and the stronger its influence over the masses.

The great successes achieved in the building of communism are a tribute to the close bonds of unity between the party and the people. This is a clear example of the profound democratism of the Soviet social and state system.

At the 24th Party Congress L. I. Brezhnev said: "The unity of interests between the Party and the entire Soviet people makes our society invincible and gives it the ability to withstand any test. It is the indissoluble unity between the Party and all the working people that allows us to forge confidently ahead and resolve the most complex tasks. Our Party values and treasures the trust of the working people above all else. To strengthen our great Party in every way, to deepen its bonds with the people, with the masses—that is the behest left to us by the great Lenin—and we shall be true to this behest of Lenin's!"³

¹ *Ibid.*, Vol. 33, p. 304.

² *The Road to Communism*, p. 587.

³ *24th Congress of the CPSU*, Moscow, 1971, p. 125.

History shows that parties which have lost the support of the people inevitably disappear from the political arena. An example of this are the Mensheviks, the Socialist-Revolutionaries¹ and other parties and groups that existed during the first years of Soviet power. Only the Communist Party, which is closely united with the people and enjoys their complete trust, has fully stood the test of time and is today at the height of its creative power.

The people have such great trust in the Communist Party because its policy and practical activity express their thoughts and aspirations and the objective requirements of social development.

The work of the party and its efforts are directed to doing everything for the good of man, in the name of man. It is precisely this inspiring humane aim which relates the party to the people, uniting it with them in firm unbreakable bonds. The people trust the party and fully support its domestic and foreign policy. This multiplies the party's strength manifold and is the source of its inexhaustible energy.

In its role as the guiding force of Soviet society and the vital center of the political system of socialism, the party considers its main task to be the elaboration of the general perspectives of the development of society according to a correct political line, and the organization of the working people for its implementation.

The strength of any political party that claims to lead the masses does not come from its declarations but from its practical activity. History knows no other party to have exerted such an influence on the course of social development as the party of Lenin. Sixty years ago the Great October Socialist Revolution took place, and six decades is less than man's average life-span. But in that period the Soviet Union has travelled a way equal to centuries. It has created a new society, the like of which mankind has never seen. It is a society with a crisis-free, steadily growing economy, mature socialist relations and genuine freedom. It is a society where the dominant ideology is scientific materialism.

¹ *Mensheviks*—see note on p. 28; *Socialist-Revolutionaries*—a petty-bourgeois party formed in Russia in late 1901 and early 1902. The Socialist-Revolutionaries were ideological opponents of Marxism and after the October Revolution actively fought against Soviet power. In the 'twenties the leaders of the Socialist-Revolutionaries emigrated and the party disbanded.

It is a society of firm confidence in the future, of radiant prospect of communism. It is a society before which extends the limitless expanse of future progress.

Another important result of the way traversed by the Soviet Union is the socialist way of life that has taken shape in the country. It is characterized by an atmosphere of genuine collectivism and comradeship, the continually growing solidarity and friendship of all nations and nationalities of the country and a healthy moral climate.

Finally, the third important result is the formation of Soviet man himself who, having passed through the severest tests and trials, has changed unrecognizably. He now unites ideological conviction with tremendous vital energy, culture, knowledge and the ability to make practical use of his talents. Soviet man is an ardent patriot and a consistent internationalist.

The victory of the Great October Socialist Revolution and the historic achievements of the Soviet Union in the building of a new world under the leadership of the Leninist party have exerted an enormous influence on the world revolutionary process. The Soviet Union today is rightly regarded throughout the world as the bulwark and standard-bearer of peace. At the 25th Congress of the CPSU L. I. Brezhnev declared: "We have done and will continue to do all we can to safeguard and consolidate peace, and to rid mankind of new destructive wars!"¹

Thus the CPSU defines its policy and goals on the basis of the interests of the people, who carry them out under the party's guidance. This is primarily the basis for the unity between the CPSU and the people and the limitless support rendered by the people for its policies and work.

The bonds between the party and the people are further secured by the social composition of its ranks. Though the CPSU remains in essence a party of the working class, in conditions of developed socialism it has also become a party of the whole people. From the moment of its creation it has travelled a glorious path from a comparatively small underground organization to a powerful, united army of Communists. After the 24th Congress alone 2.6 million joined the party, which now has a membership of some 16 million. Of these 41.6 per cent are industrial workers, 13.9

¹ *Documents and Resolutions. XXVth Congress of the CPSU*, p. 106.

per cent collective farmers, nearly 20 per cent representatives of the technical intelligentsia and more than 24 per cent workers in science, literature, the arts, education, public health, management and the military sphere. These data clearly show that all classes and social groups of Soviet society are represented in the party. Furthermore, 55.5 per cent of the total membership are front-rank workers and collective farmers. It is notable that among those entering the party 58 per cent are industrial workers. Some 80 per cent of newly-admitted party members are engaged in the sphere of material production. All this ensures the organic link between the party and the people.

The party today is a powerful and complex organism. It includes 14 Central Committees of the Communist Parties of the Union republics, 154 territorial and regional committees, 10 area committees, 4,243 city and district committees, and 390,000 primary party organizations including 150,000 at enterprises in industry, construction, transport and communications, collective farms, state farms and other production units. In fact there is not a single production collective or population center in the country without its party organizations. At the grass roots level there are the primary party organizations. They stand in the front rank of economic and cultural construction and work directly among the people. The whole of their active effort helps combine the party's policy with the vital creativity of the people, promoting the accomplishment of economic, political and ideological tasks.

Another connecting link between the party and the people is the system of state organizations—the system of socialist democracy. The party acts as the guiding force in respect of all state and public organizations, which does not mean that it in any way supplants these organizations, but rather serves to strengthen them and increase their role in the life of society.

A most important component in the political structure of Soviet society are Soviets of People's Deputies. These are organs of genuinely popular power and, as such, the fullest embodiment of the democratic character of the Soviet state. More than 2.2 million deputies are elected to the Soviets and they are responsible for the entire running of the Soviet state of the whole people. They are aided in their work by tens of millions of activists attached to the Soviets. Im-

proving the functioning of the Soviets and strengthening their contacts with the people has always been a matter of great concern to the party.

An important function in the Soviet political system is performed by the people's control bodies, in which millions of industrial workers, collective farmers and office employees participate.

One of the largest mass organizations in the political system of the Soviet state are the trade unions. In 1932 they comprised 16.5 million industrial and office workers. Now they have a membership of more than 107 million and virtually unite the whole working class and intelligentsia of the country, as well as many collective farmers. Under developed socialism there has been an ever greater increase in the role of the trade unions as a school of administration, a school of economic management and a school of communism for millions of workers, for all the working people. The 25th Congress of the CPSU set the task of enhancing the role of the trade unions and raising the level of their work. It stated that the work of the trade unions directly furthers the exercise of democracy in production, the basic sphere in which man's creative efforts are applied.

The role and importance of the Komsomol as a reliable aid to the party and its direct reserve has likewise increased. Komsomol membership rose from 4.5 million in 1933 to 35 million in 1976.

An important link between the party and the people and one which is rapidly broadening is the system of people's correspondence. The number of letters addressed to party and state organs has been steadily increasing and their content bears witness to the continuing growth of consciousness among the Soviet people, their social involvement, political maturity, concern for the further development of their Motherland, their complete trust in the Communist Party and support for its Leninist policy.

At the end of April 1976 the Central Committee of the CPSU adopted a resolution, "On Improving the Work with People's Letters in the Light of the Decisions of the 25th Congress of the CPSU". The resolution stressed that improving the forms and methods of response to workers' correspondence grows in importance with the continuing development and expansion of socialist democracy and the increased strengthening of ties between the party and the

people. The Central Committee of the CPSU made it incumbent upon party and state organs, trade union and Komso-mol organizations, and directors of enterprises and institutions to adopt a considerate, principled and business-like approach to each letter received and an attitude of respect to correspondents and their opinions and inquiries. It was also suggested that strict disciplinary measures should be taken against officials guilty of violation of the established procedure for dealing with workers' correspondence. This is yet one more clear example of the genuinely humane character of socialist democracy, whose development is the constant concern of the Communist Party.

Developed socialism guarantees the necessary objective conditions for the all-out growth of the people's role in implementing the tasks of building communist society, and for unfolding the varied talents of the Soviet people, and their productive initiative and political involvement.

But even the most favorable conditions of mature socialist society do not automatically mean the development of popular initiative.

The work of the party among the people is a most reliable indicator of the development of socialist democracy. Upholding the creative initiative and guiding the constructive work of the people can only be carried out from among their very midst.

The 25th Congress of the CPSU stressed that "the dynamic development of Soviet society, the growing scale of communist construction, and our activity in the international arena insistently require a steady *raising of the level of Party guidance of economic and cultural development, the education of our men and women, and improvement of organisational and political work among the masses*".¹

The Central Committee of the party thoroughly analyzes the relevant problems of the economic, social and political development of society, lays down the country's foreign policy and strengthens its defense. It makes a careful study of the experience of the local party organizations and summarizes its results. It thoroughly analyzes the experience of labor activity of the masses and examines ideological and educational work carried out among them. The decisions taken by the Central Committee of the CPSU as a result of

¹ *Documents and Resolutions. XXVth Congress of the CPSU*, p. 79.

circumstantial and collective discussion provide the party and state organs and the broad sections of the people with a clear-cut orientation and precise directives, giving priority to those tasks which demand the maximum concentration of effort.

In the party's general undertakings, great importance is attached to the work of the republican, territorial, regional, area, city and district party organizations. It is no exaggeration to say that they bear the main responsibility for conducting party policy in the localities. They do everything in their power to promote massive popular initiatives and encourage the broad movement for fulfilling and overfulfilling plan assignments.

The approval by the Central Committee of initiatives coming from work collectives and their associations, as well as from individual workers, has become an integral component of party work. As a rule, when dealing with these questions the Central Committee takes special decisions which contain concrete proposals for developing particular initiatives in the appropriate collectives.

The party expresses the thoughts and aspirations of both the people as a whole and of all classes and social groups, nations and nationalities that form the Soviet people. By virtue of this, various forms and methods for the expression of public opinion and the party's consideration of the desires and will of the people have been developed in social and political life. An increasingly widespread form for the expression of popular opinion is the broad, open and frequently nation-wide discussions of the most important draft resolutions of the Communist Party and the Soviet state.

One of the clearest examples of this was the discussion of the draft directives of the CPSU Central Committee, entitled "Guidelines for the Development of the National Economy of the USSR for 1976-1980", which took place before the 25th Party Congress. Soviet working people expressed their opinions and gave suggestions on questions of economic and social policy and on the prospects and ways of the development of the Soviet economy. The draft Guidelines were discussed everywhere at workers' meetings, in the press and in the party organizations. This clearly shows the extent of socialist democracy and its indisputable advantages over bourgeois democracy. "Such a discussion is altogether inconceivable in any country of the capitalist world even if

only because of the limited class character of bourgeois democracy and the lack of political and socio-economic aims uniting the whole of society,"¹ said A. N. Kosygin.

The experience gained by the CPSU and the other fraternal communist and workers' parties proves irrefutably that the strength of the party, its influence on social development and the success of its struggle for building socialism and communism are determined by the degree of firmness of its contacts with the working class and the mass of people. In its turn the success of the struggle of the masses against the domination of the exploiting classes, and their creative energy displayed in effectuating the revolutionary transformations of society and building a new life can only be fully manifest under the guidance of a party armed with Marxist-Leninist theory.

The Democratic Foundations of the Life and Work of the Leninist Party

The Communist Party of the Soviet Union, which consistently pursues a policy for the all-round development of the principles of democracy in all spheres of Soviet society, is a source of inspiration for all working people's organizations. The democracy of the Leninist party is determined by its class nature and objectives as a proletarian party of a new type, which stands for the liberation of man from social and national oppression and for the building of communist society—the most democratic and humane society in world history.

All the life and work of the party are based on Marxist-Leninist teaching and are characterized by a high degree of organization, extensive democracy and a high level of consciousness and discipline.

Marxist-Leninist teaching is the ideological base for the unity of all party members, and the foundation for its program, policies, strategy and tactics. The ideological unity of party ranks is one of the decisive preconditions for its role as leader and teacher of the working people.

However, ideological unity alone is insufficient for the firm implementation of party policy. Ideological unity must

¹ *Documents and Resolutions. XXVth Congress of the CPSU*, p. 114.

be secured by sound organization. "...No political party can exist without an organization,"¹ Engels said.

Relying on the ideas of the founders of scientific communism Lenin comprehensively worked out the organizational principles of the new type of proletarian party. "...The proletariat," he wrote, "can, and inevitably will, become an invincible force only through its ideological unification on the principles of Marxism being reinforced by the material unity of organisation, which welds millions of toilers into an army of the working class. Neither the senile rule of the Russian autocracy nor the senescent rule of international capital will be able to withstand this army."² Only a high degree of organizational capacity can turn a party into a strong and efficient fighting unit and give it many times the force of its membership. "Organization," Lenin said, "increases strength tenfold."³

Ideological and organizational unity are incompatible with disorder and factionalism. Lenin insisted on safeguarding the steadfastness, consistency and purity of the party and demanded the continued raising of the rank and importance of party membership. In Lenin's understanding a party member is a model example in the struggle for the ideals of communism and in fulfilling party and civic duties. Lenin emphasized that "every Party member is responsible for the Party, and that *the Party is responsible for every one of its members*".⁴

The most important principle of the organizational structure of the party and the vital condition for its leading role as the political organization of the working class is the principle of democratic centralism. The essence of this principle lies in the fact that the leading organs of the party at all levels are elected, and accountable to their own organizations and the superior committees. Strict party discipline, binding on all Communists, exists within the party ranks and the minority submits to the majority. Decisions made by higher organs are binding on lower organs and on all party members.

¹ K. Marx and F. Engels. *Selected Works* in three volumes, Vol. 1, Moscow, 1973, p. 388.

² V. I. Lenin. *Collected Works*, Vol. 7, p. 415.

³ *Ibid.*, Vol. 19, p. 406.

⁴ *Ibid.*, Vol. 6, p. 503.

The principles of centralism and democracy exist in an organic unity and express the class nature of the Communist Party, which has been called on to lead the working class, all working people fighting for the abolition of social and national oppression and for the creation of a humane and democratic society. Lenin said in this context: "The Russian Social-Democratic Labour Party is organised on democratic lines. This means that all the affairs of the Party are conducted, either directly, or through representatives, by all the members of the Party, all of whom without exception have equal rights; moreover, all officials, all leading bodies, and all institutions of the Party are subject to election, are responsible to their constituents, and are subject to recall."¹ Centralism means that all the work of the party is carried out on the basis of a single Program and single Rules. The guiding body is the Party Congress and in the intervals between congresses—the Central Committee. This makes the party a united organization capable of solving the most complex problems. The party has uniform discipline binding on all, leaders and rank-and-file members alike.

The consistent implementation of the principle of centralism in the party and the observance of strict party discipline serves to guarantee, as Lenin put it, the transformation of the power of ideas into the power of authority and the subordination of lower party bodies to higher ones.

Democratic centralism allows the party to take fully into account and utilize the experience and opinion of all of its members and organizations and make use of local initiatives and the diverse ways and means towards the common goal.

The genuinely democratic character of the party's activity also manifests itself in the principle of collective leadership. Political leadership over the masses, particularly in the period of revolution and the building of new society, is an exceptionally complex and responsible task which is beyond the capabilities of any one individual, however brilliant he may be. Success can only be assured in collective leadership. In Lenin's understanding of the term, collective leadership implies that "*everyone* is held *personally* responsible for a definite, strictly and precisely defined job or part of a job".²

¹ V. I. Lenin. *Collected Works*, Vol. 11, p. 434.

² *Ibid.*, Vol. 30, p. 142.

Collective leadership means that all members of the party without exception participate, in various forms, in working out party policy, taking important decisions and translating them into reality. This means that every Communist is obliged to thoroughly study and generalize the experience of the masses, know their sentiments and requirements. Only the joint experience and ideas of millions of workers can tackle the multitude of problems that arise in the practice of building communism.

Of exceptional importance is the consistent observance of such norms of party life as criticism and self-criticism. "A political party's attitude towards its own mistakes," Lenin noted, "is one of the most important and surest ways of judging how earnest the party is and how it fulfils *in practice* its obligations towards its *class* and the *working people*. Frankly acknowledging a mistake, ascertaining the reasons for it, analysing the conditions that have led up to it, and thrashing out the means of its rectification—that is the hallmark of a serious party; that is how it should perform its duties, and how it should educate and train its *class*, and then the *masses*." ¹

Criticism and self-criticism are the tried and tested means of exposing and eradicating mistakes and shortcomings in work and the correct way to train cadres and improve party activity. While it does all in its power to develop serious and principled criticism and self-criticism, the party at the same time opposes all forms of demagoguery, slander against or discrediting its workers. The history of our party and other fraternal parties knows numerous instances where under the guise of criticism a policy was pursued aimed at the revision of the fundamental propositions of the Marxist-Leninist theory, the principles of party development and the norms of party life. This, in particular, is the case of the Trotskyites, right and left opportunists and Maoists. Marxists-Leninists give a resolute rebuff to such "criticism".

The CPSU has boldly and openly revealed its mistakes and shortcomings. It firmly condemned the personality cult and took steps to overcome its consequences, such as manifestations of voluntarism and subjectivism. Measures were adopted whereby the Leninist norms and principles of party life and party and state leadership were strictly observed.

¹ *Ibid.*, Vol. 31, p. 57.

All this served to improve the organizational and political work of the party bodies among the masses.

An important condition for the success of the party leadership has been the Leninist style of work. This style eschews subjectivism and adopts a scientific approach to all social processes. Its characteristic feature is a high degree of exactingness with respect to oneself and to others.

Of principal significance in this respect is the resolution of the Central Committee of the CPSU, "On Criticism and Self-criticism in the Tambov Regional Party Organization" (1975). The resolution stresses that not only those who make mistakes should be criticized, but also those who do not take advantage of all available methods for increasing production and do not show initiative. With the aim of increasing the validity of criticism the Central Committee of the CPSU demanded strict supervision over the prompt elimination of all shortcomings and the eradication of all causes of such negative phenomena as well as a decisive stop to be put to all instances of the suppression of criticism, and disciplinary action to be taken against those workers who take the wrong attitude to criticism or who look upon just reproof as undermining their authority and thereby put their own personal pride above the interests of society. In the eyes of the working people a Communist is a representative of the party and this lays a burden of great responsibility upon the shoulders of each party member, requiring that he have a high degree of consciousness and moral worth, be principled in all matters, approach every question from a common party position, and actively pursue the policies of the CPSU.

The functions and responsibility of the party member are continually increasing today. Every Communist must have a high ideological level, and be an active fighter and a front-ranker among the builders of communism. Following Lenin's behests the CPSU is consistently conducting a policy of further raising the title of party member and invigorating the work of Communists and party organizations in their efforts to fulfil its tasks and plans.

Proletarian internationalism is a most important principle on which the life and work of the Leninist party is based.

Speaking on behalf of the whole party, L. I. Brezhnev once more underlined in the report of the Central Committee

to the 25th Congress of the CPSU, that the party is faithful to the principle of proletarian internationalism. He noted that it is one of the main principles of Marxism-Leninism. Unfortunately, however, there are certain functionaries who distort the essence of proletarian internationalism, some of whom even going so far as to openly reject it, declaring that the internationalism of Marx, Engels and Lenin is obsolete. "But as we see it, to renounce proletarian internationalism is to deprive Communist parties and the working-class movement in general of a mighty and tested weapon. It would work in favour of the class enemy who, by the way, actively coordinates its anti-communist activities on an international scale. We Soviet Communists consider defence of proletarian internationalism the sacred duty of every Marxist-Leninist."¹

¹ *Documents and Resolutions. XXVth Congress of the CPSU*, p. 37.

Chapter II

POLITICAL GUIDANCE AND THE FUNDAMENTAL INSTITUTIONS OF DEMOCRACY

Political Guidance: the Idea and the Instruments

Political leadership or guidance is an important factor in the development and functioning of the political system of socialism as a system of genuine democracy, and it is internally inherent in that system. It is important to note that in socialist society political guidance is exercised within the existing political structure through certain definite political institutions.¹ The sum-total of interacting fundamental political institutions which, together with the object of political guidance, form the political system of socialist society, serves at the same time as the means for the exercise of political guidance.²

Each of the political institutions in the system of political guidance fulfils a different function. The structure of the socialist political system has components that function as the principal instruments for exercising political guidance. Taken together, these instruments form a generalized system of the political guidance of society.

¹ The term "political institution" refers to political bodies, organizations, and other democratic political establishments and their totalities which represent political bonds that differ in their character and scope.

² A similar twofold significance and role of the components of the socialist political system (or its individual subsystems) has already been noted. According to Wolfgang Weichelt, "the socialist state is both an expression and component of socialist democracy and, at the same time, an instrument for its further development". W. Weichelt. *Der Sozialistische Staat—Hauptinstrument der Arbeiterklasse zur Gestaltung der sozialistischen Gesellschaft*, Staatsverlag der Deutschen Demokratischen Republik, Berlin, 1972, S. 53.

In the socialist political system this function is fulfilled by its three main components, viz. a) the organizational—that is, the system of political organizations and institutions (the political organization of society); b) the ideological—the system of political ideas and attitudes (political ideology); c) the normative—the system of social norms operating in society.¹

The political system of socialism is continually improving, expanding and comprising new components with the increasing complexity of building socialism and communism, the further development of the state, the enhanced role of public organizations, and increasing political and labor activity of the working people.²

But, in our opinion, this does not mean a continuous and massive quantitative change in the structure of the political system of socialism. In fact, the system of the principal instruments ensuring political guidance of society is characterized by a quantitative stability of its components, which possess a high degree of generality. All components of the political system—organizations, political consciousness and attitudes, and norms—serve as fundamental instruments of political guidance in socialist society at all stages of its development. As for changes in their interrelationship—the disappearance of some components and the appearance of others—these take place within the components mentioned above as well as within the socialist political system as a whole. An example of this might be the considerable growth in the function and place of the work collective in the system of the democratic organization of developed socialist society, the increasingly important role played by socialist legal consciousness in its political ideology and the growing importance of communist morality in the system of its ethical norms.

¹ Together with “organizations” and “institutions”, scholars of the socialist countries identify “movements” as a special component of the political system of socialist society, such as the National or Patriotic fronts (see *Wörterbuch zum sozialistischen Staat*, Berlin, 1974, S. 223). Some writers include the mass media (press, radio and television) as part of the political system of socialist society. See *Scientific Communism*, Moscow, 1975, p. 345 (in Russian).

² B. N. Topornin. *The Political System of Socialism*, Moscow, 1972, p. 11 (in Russian).

The political guidance of socialist society is a highly complex phenomenon. It exerts a purposeful influence on the interrelationship between all the basic components and institutions of the socialist political system.

The function of political guidance is to implement the policies of the Communist Party and the socialist state which represent the vital interests of the working class and all the working people. The whole point of political guidance is to ensure conditions and guarantees for the revolutionary transformation of society on communist principles. This above all is the essence of the political character of party and state leadership.

In sociological literature it is customary to treat the concept of leadership or guidance together with that of control or management.

The term "direct management" expresses the direct nature of the link between the agent and object of management. In direct management the agent makes use of its own instruments of administration, whereas guidance implies the absence of "one's own" administrative apparatus, and, consequently, it is for the most part indirect and mediated in character.

The differences which do exist between "guidance" and "management" are contained in the divergence between their aims and objectives. It is the task of management chiefly to ensure the optimal functioning of the object, whereas guidance is to ensure its development. The aim of guidance is thus to secure the progressive development of society towards communism, i.e. to direct social progress along the path of transition from the lower stage of communism to the higher.

In studying the relationship between the concepts of "guidance" and "management", it is useful to compare their structural-functional characteristics. Management is predominantly an organizational activity, consisting in a set of operations or actions on the part of the managing agent, which correspond to the successive stages of the management cycle.

The structure of guidance is more complex. Organizational activity is only one of its parts or aspects. An important place in the structure of guidance is taken by ideological work, and this is the really distinguishing characteristic that separates it from management.

A number of writers justly see one of the qualifying attributes of guidance in its link with power.¹ According to F. M. Burlatsky, the distinctions between the concepts of guidance, management, organization and control are based on "the different levels of delegating authority, which is the greatest in the case of guidance".² Of course, guidance is "higher" than management in the sense that it also extends to the managerial process.

In recent years, much attention has been given in sociological literature to the question of power. This is explained first of all by the need to understand the new features and manifestations of power which have come to light during the establishment of developed socialist society.

In conditions of mature socialism one of the aspects of political power which existed during the period of transition from capitalism to socialism—the political domination of the proletariat over the bourgeoisie, has disappeared completely. Developed socialism is characterized politically by a further strengthening of the social and political unity of society. The socialist state of the whole people knows no political or class oppression. At the same time, however, another aspect of political power has been further developed in it, namely the political guidance of society by the working class and the Communist Party.

However, this by no means implies that contemporary social and political development leads to the identification of "power" and "guidance" or "leadership". In Soviet society guidance has never been exercised by authoritarian methods and instruments alone. It rather relies on moral, political and ideological means of influence in the period of communist construction. For example, the party's leading role is based primarily on its ideological influence over the people. Guidance means the ability to impose will by influence in various ways. Of course, guidance is bound up with the exercise of certain authoritative functions and powers, but it never amounts just to the exercise of power alone. Guidance

¹ See I. Y. Farber and V. A. Rzhnevsky. *Questions of the Theory of Soviet Constitutional Law*, Issue 1, Saratov, 1967, p. 85 (in Russian); L. A. Grigoryan. "Socialist State Power and the Representative Form of Its Exercise", *Sovetskoye gosudarstvo i pravo* (Soviet State and Law), 1969, No. 3, p. 83.

² F. M. Burlatsky. *Lenin, the State and Politics*, Moscow, 1970, p. 84 (in Russian).

may be based exclusively on moral authority, on the recognition of the corresponding functions vested in the leaders.

Furthermore, guidance is a functional category. It cannot be a "latent" quality or aptitude on the part of the individual leader. It is always an aptitude or ability that is realized in activity, in work. In this sense the concept "political guidance" is analogous to the concepts "politics", "political activity" and "political strategy and tactics".

While dealing with the relationship between the concepts of guidance and management, we mean political guidance and political management. Political guidance is exercised in the sphere of politics, within the framework of the socialist system of democracy.

Insofar as guidance, as well as management, is a functional category, the relationship between party and state guidance should be analyzed primarily by delimiting the functions of the Communist Party from those of the socialist state.

Determining the correct correlation between the functions of party and state is of considerable importance for the work of the whole political system of socialism.

Lenin and the Communist Party devoted great attention to this question. In 1922 Lenin wrote: "It is necessary to delimit much more precisely the functions of the Party (and of its Central Committee) from those of the Soviet government."¹ Earlier still (1919) a special section of the resolution "On the Question of Organization", passed by the Eighth Party Congress, was devoted to questions of relations between the party and the Soviets. From that time the party has frequently treated this question, specifying and enlarging Lenin's well-known theses with reference to the appropriate stage in the development of socialist society.

Basic to the delimitation of the functions of the party and the state is the totality of such attributes (criteria) as the nature and content of these functions as well as the special characteristics of the forms and instruments of their exercise.

By their character the functions of the political guidance of the Communist Party serve as the most general strategic directions and aspects of the management of socialist society. Under socialism the general character of party guidance

¹ V. I. Lenin. *Collected Works*, Vol. 33, p. 253.

does not mean guidance "in general". The use of the term "general" is not intended to oppose the strategy of management to the concreteness, specificity of guidance. At the 25th Party Congress L. I. Brezhnev said of the party's guiding role in a developed socialist society: "The Party's guiding and mobilizing role is not an abstract conception. It is life itself, it is our day-to-day practice."¹ This principle stems from the concreteness of party guidance. Thus the term "general", as applied to party leadership explains not so much its content as its character.

As was mentioned above, the general character of the guidance by the CPSU of the state organs means rejection of their petty tutelage. By this the party guarantees the independence and broad initiative of the Soviet state organs and increases their responsibility.²

Of course, the party as distinct from the state does not possess a special apparatus for managing society. It guides the building of socialism and communism through state and public organizations. By virtue of this scholars have good reasons to distinguish between party guidance as a special, indirect type of political and social management, and state administration as a direct form of management. At the same time the differences between party and state management should not be made absolute: guidance and direct management are inherent in the functioning of all the fundamental structural links in the political organization of socialist society. For example, both guidance and direct management are characteristic of the socialist state as a governing system. What is more, the guiding function of the socialist state is most evident in its participation in making policy.

In implementing policy the socialist state exercises both direct management and guidance or direction; the object of state direction is not only the individual components of the state apparatus itself, but some public organizations as well. For example, according to the Constitution of the USSR, the Council of Ministers of the USSR ensures, within the confines of its powers, direction of the economic, social and cultural development; exercises general direction of the development of the Armed Forces of the USSR and of re-

¹ *Documents and Resolutions. XXVth Congress of the CPSU*, p. 82.

² See V. I. Lenin. *Collected Works*, Vol. 33, p. 253.

lations with foreign states, etc. The Council of Ministers of the USSR also coordinates and directs the work of all-Union and Union-republican ministries, state committees of the USSR and other bodies subordinate to it. Such work can hardly be described as just direct management—it is also guidance. To a much greater degree this applies to the work of the Supreme Soviet of the USSR, which is empowered to deal with all matters referred by the Constitution to the jurisdiction of the USSR, and to the work of the higher bodies of state power in the Union and autonomous republics, as well as the local Soviets.

In directing the development of socialist society the Communist Party makes use both of guidance and direct management. "The Party," Lenin said, "is the leader, the vanguard of the proletariat, which rules directly."¹

The party does not in any way serve to supplant the state organs (Soviets, etc.), but neither does it overburden them with its own functions. These functions, which are to be mentioned later, are carried out by the party directly through its own apparatus.

Thus we can draw the conclusion that state administration is not only direct management, and that Communist Party guidance, which is chiefly exercised through the system of state and public organizations, does not exclude its direct management of the social processes. Guidance and direct management are dialectically combined in the work of both party and state. This ensures the development of the organizational fusion of party and state direction on the basis of the overall political guidance by the Communist Party as the general principle of socialist management.

The Political Organization of Soviet Society

The political guidance of socialist society is exercised, as has already been pointed out, through its democratic institutions, primarily its political organization.

The political organization of socialist society is a complex system which includes the party, state and public organizations participating in the political life of the country and interacting with one another in the process. Political organ-

¹ V. I. Lenin. *Collected Works*, Vol. 32, p. 98.

ization is both a structural part of the political system of socialism and an independent system in its own right. In its relationship to the socialist political system as a whole, political organization functions as its structural subsystem or subdivision. Here we are considering political organization as an independent system.

When treating the political organization of socialist society as an independent system, it should be borne in mind that its independence is relative, insofar as its structural elements interact not only with one another, but also with the other components of the political system of socialism. Thus the party is connected with political ideology, and the state with socialist law, etc.

The political organization of socialist society is the most active and dynamic component of the socialist political system. An analysis of the political organization of society must determine its essence and the form in which it appears externally.

Depending on the stage of its development the socialist political organization is essentially either the system of the dictatorship of the proletariat or the system of the power of the whole people. The form of the political organization is the system of socialist democracy. The latter, also depending on the stage of development, is either democracy for the working majority or democracy for the whole people. Being the form of the political organization of society, socialist democracy is also a definite principle, method and regime for the life and functioning of the socialist political system. According to the Soviet Constitution, the extension of socialist democracy is the principal direction in the development of the political system of Soviet society.

As a complex, multi-faceted social phenomenon, the political organization of socialist society demands comprehensive study of its structure and the interaction of its basic components.

Of great theoretical and practical importance are the functional characteristics of political organization. They help to give a more accurate and complete analysis of its structure. They consist of two parts—internal connections and external connections. The former are the interaction of the elements of the internal political organization of society, while the latter go beyond the bounds of political organization proper, coordinating its relationships and those of its

separate elements with other components of the socialist political system and the system of socialist democracy. Each component of the political organization of socialist society (as also the organization as a whole) has its own specific function.

A horizontal analysis of the structure of the political organization of socialist society shows three levels: (a) the political organization of society as a whole; (b) party, state and public organizations as political groups at the higher level of generality; (c) state and non-state organs, institutions and organizations as political groups at the lower level of generality.

In this way, in the contemporary structure of the political organization of Soviet socialist society one must first of all distinguish three more general components: (1) the Communist Party, (2) the socialist state of the whole people and (3) the mass public organizations. The political organization of socialist society can therefore be defined as the interacting totality of the party, the state and the public organizations, as their system.

Such an understanding of the political organization of society is based on Lenin's statement on organization in the broad and narrow sense of the word. "The word 'organization'," he wrote, "is commonly employed in two senses, a broad and a narrow one. In the narrow sense it signifies an individual nucleus of a collective of people with at least a minimum degree of coherent form. In the broad sense it signifies the sum of such nuclei united into a whole."¹ The political organization of socialist society is a system of organizations in the broad sense of the word. Neither the party nor the state, as part of the political structure of socialist society, lose the characteristics of organizations in the broad sense of the word, that is of those organizations which themselves are a system of organizations. On the other hand, the various party, state and social bodies, institutions and organizations under all conditions remain organizations in the narrow sense of the word.

The development and improvement of the political organization of mature socialist society is expressed in the increasing role and significance of all its fundamental sub-

¹ V. I. Lenin. *Collected Works*, Vol. 7, p. 257.

sections in the building of communism. At the same time the increasing significance and role of one link in the political organization of society in no way detracts from the role and significance of its other structural links.

The growing role of the basic components of the political organization of socialism is not a mechanical extension of their functions and powers. The grandiose task of building communism demands a continual increase in the scale of activity of both state and public organizations. This results in the appearance of new and the redistribution of the old functions of the individual subsections of the political organization of socialist society. Nevertheless, the increased role of the party, the state, the trade unions, the Komsomol and all mass organizations is characterized by qualitative rather than quantitative indicators. The former include primarily the increase in responsibility on the part of each link in the political organization of society, the higher level of their political work and the growth of their effectiveness in the practical solution of the problems involved in building communism. This refers, firstly, to the Communist Party—the guiding core in the political system of socialist society.

The leading and guiding role of the party in the political system of socialist society is conditioned both by the objective nature of socialism as a social system and by the nature of the party itself. Outside the party there is no other political organization which is so indissolubly linked with the people and so fully and correctly expresses their vital interests.

The function of the party as the guiding force in the political organization of socialist society is twofold. In the first place, the party, as the nucleus of the political system of Soviet society, directs and coordinates the work of the socialist state and the public organizations and collectives, and ensures their development. The social and political objective of the party is to guarantee the optimal functioning and development of the political organization of society as a whole. Secondly, the party is the guiding nucleus of all organizations of working people—both public and state—within the political organization of society. The Communist Party exercises political leadership over the work of each separate public and state organization. It unites the efforts of all the working people, and ensures that their work is in the interests of building socialism and communism.

However, the party's political guidance of society is not confined within the framework of the latter's political organization as a system of working people's associations. It covers the interaction of classes and social groups, nations and nationalities. A necessary means for the development of relations between people are the various forms of their organization. "...The objective maximum ability of the proletariat to unite in a class is realized through living people, and only through definite forms of organization."¹

The Communist Party is the highest form of organization. The organizational unity in combination with ideological and political cohesion ensure that the party is in a position to effectively fulfil its functions as the political leader of the whole of society.

The chief functions of the party, taken in the generalized form, are determination of the overall prospects for the development of society and the correct policy to be pursued (program function); organizing the workers in order to implement the determined policy (organizational function); and the political education of the workers (ideological function). Added to these are its functions in determining foreign policy.

All these functions interact with and supplement one another. The interaction of the various functions of the party is of substantial importance, for only when the political line is accompanied by skilful and effective organizational and educational work can the party successfully fulfil its role as the leading and guiding force in society.

The most important function of the party is determination of the political line and the scientific formulation of the overall prospects of society at each stage of its development. The policy, which is laid down by the party, lies at the basis of all the work done by the working people's associations and the whole political organization of society. This policy is a comprehensive program for the work of the party and the people.

Laying down policy as a party function includes setting out the fundamental tasks which accord with the objective requirements of a given stage in the development of socialist society and determination of the ways and means to fulfil these tasks. The organizational function of the party con-

¹ V. I. Lenin. *Collected Works*, Vol. 13, p. 104.

sists in the selection, placement and training of cadres and supervision over the implementation of party decisions by all organizations and individual Communists.

The political and educational function of the party consists in ideological work, i.e. the Marxist-Leninist education of the Communists and the development of communist world outlook in all working people. The Soviet people are educated in a spirit of political awareness, socialist patriotism and proletarian internationalism, intolerance of bourgeois ideology and a strict observance of the standards of communist morality. The party today attaches great importance to spreading a party style of work and the formation of such qualities as increased responsibility, initiative, business-like approach, socialist enterprise, conscious discipline and intolerance of shortcomings. "The decisive condition for our advance in all directions," L. I. Brezhnev said, "is, ultimately, the growth of the working people's ideological conviction, of their political consciousness."¹

It should be pointed out that neither party work as a whole nor its separate aspects or fields can be confined within the framework of any single function; on the contrary, they embrace all functions of political guidance in one way or another.

At the basis of any party function lies theoretical work. For example, the scientific basis for the determination of party policy is the revolutionary theory of Marxism-Leninism. Marxism-Leninism is the only reliable basis for determining the correct strategy and tactics. It gives an understanding of the historical perspective and helps to determine the lines for the social, economic and political development for years ahead and correctly to find orientation in international events. The force of Marxism-Leninism lies in its constant and creative development. The 25th Party Congress, noting the growth of the party's ideological and theoretical work and the improvement of the Marxist-Leninist education of the Communists, emphasized that "at the present stage in the country's development, the need for further creative elaboration of theory, far from diminishing, has, in fact, been growing".²

¹ L. I. Brezhnev. *Following Lenin's Course. Speeches and Articles (1972-1975)*, p. 569.

² *Documents and Resolutions. XXVth Congress of the CPSU*, p. 87.

Among the party's other functions are coordination of the varied and specific interests of the classes and social groups of socialist society, their accurate reflection and consideration in the formation of state policy, and coordination and unification of the work of all state and public organizations. The great significance of this function is predetermined by the place and role of the Communist Party in the socialist political system and its place as the political core of this system.

The Communist Party exercises political leadership over all the main spheres of social life. The party's functions thus serve to conduct its policy in the economic, social, political and ideological fields. Another important aspect of party work is foreign policy.

Revisionists are trying to limit the guiding role of the party to certain aspects of society only, particularly the sphere of ideology. However the historical experience of all socialist countries shows otherwise. The growth of the party's guiding role in economic and cultural construction and in the political and ideological life of society, i.e. in all its basic aspects, is an objective law of social development.

The question of the function of the state in the socialist political organization is twofold. The socialist state serves, firstly, as the basis and, secondly, as the chief and most dynamic element in the system of the political organization of society.¹

Contact with state power and the state is daily made by the numerous mass associations of the working people which, together with the Soviet state and the Communist Party, form the single system of the political organization of socialism. The relations of cooperation between the public and state organizations are, of course, political relations. The political character of social relations with the state was frequently noted by Lenin. Politics, according to Lenin, embraces "the sphere of relationships of *all* classes and strata to the state and the government".²

In stressing the significance of the socialist state in the system of the political organization of society and the system of democracy, it would, of course, be wrong to underestimate the role played by the non-state forms for

¹ See *The Marxist-Leninist General Theory of the State and the Law. The Socialist State*, Moscow, 1972, p. 118 (in Russian).

² V. I. Lenin. *Collected Works*, Vol. 5, p. 422.

the development of democracy,¹ which the above-mentioned contacts between the state and the public organizations make a great contribution to.

The socialist state is the main instrument for the transformation of society on socialist and communist principles. This is its most general functional characteristic. In a developed socialist society the creative, constructive role of the state increases still more. Mature socialism sets new tasks before the state. The historic mission and the social purpose of the state of the dictatorship of the proletariat consisted in the fact that it was the instrument for building the foundations of socialism and then of mature socialism, whereas the state of the whole people is the main instrument for building communism. As declared in the preamble to the Constitution of the USSR, the supreme goal of the Soviet state is the building of a classless communist society.

In conditions of mature socialism priority is given to the economic, organizational, cultural and educational functions of the state governing a society that is building communism. In developed socialist society the economic and organizational functions are directed in the main to accomplishing the chief economic task of the Communist Party and the Soviet state—the creation of the material and technical basis of communism. The main purpose of the cultural and educational function is to educate the new man. Under mature socialism the social activity of the state is growing apace—a fact which has been reflected in a special chapter of the Soviet Constitution, headed “Social Development and Culture”. This activity is chiefly directed to the solution of problems facing the state in the social sphere, primarily to the formation of communist social relations. The socialist state of the whole people also preserves the function of maintaining law and order. The main direction for the work of the socialist state in this field is the utmost protection of the rights of the individual and the collective and the firm and resolute struggle against such social evils as crime and anti-social behavior.

The solution of the fundamental problems that face the socialist state can only be guaranteed by the exercise of all its functions. Such tasks as the creation of the material and technical basis of communism, the formation of the

¹ See Chapter III of this book.

social homogeneity of society, the raising of living standards, the education of the new man and the all-round development of socialist democracy are all connected in one way or another with the functions of the socialist state.

The growth of the creative, constructive role of the state is a characteristic feature of developed socialist society. It is conditioned not only by the gigantic scale of the tasks involved in building communism in all spheres of social life, but also by the action of a number of political factors, above all by the all-round development and improvement of democracy as the main direction for the development of the socialist state during the building of communism.¹

The optimal functioning and development of the socialist political system demands the active participation of all citizens in the exercise of power and in the running of state affairs. However, socialist democracy is not limited to the political and state spheres alone. The level of development of democracy is an indicator of the maturity of socialism as a social system.² At the same time the development and improvement of socialist democracy is one of the main directions of the party's work to strengthen the organization of Soviet society. Thus the current level of democracy in the USSR demonstrates the maturity of the political system of socialist society.

Political Ideology, Socialist Law and Morality as Instruments of Implementing Policy

Political ideology is an important instrument for the political guidance of society. In scientifically expressing the interests and aims of the working class and all the working people guided by it, Marxist-Leninist ideology as a sum-total of philosophical ideas has had a class and party character at all stages of its development.

To define the place and role of ideology in the system of the political guidance of society means to establish its social purpose, orientation and specifics.

¹ See *The Road to Communism*, p. 548.

² See G. Haney. *Die Demokratie—Wahrheit, Illusionen und Verfälschungen*, Berlin, 1971, S. 198.

The stage of developed socialism is characterized by the increased role of the ideological instruments of political guidance. Political ideology above all helps accomplish such tasks in the building of communism as the education of the new man. Its specifics as an instrument of political guidance consists in the fact that it is directed towards the consciousness of the people. In other words, ideology serves chiefly as an instrument for exercising the political-educational and ideological functions of the Communist Party and is realized in the main in its ideological and political work.

Ideological influence is based on persuasion. However, influencing the consciousness is characteristic not only of ideology as an instrument of the political guidance of society. For example, normative regulation is implemented by influencing the individual consciousness. The difference between the ideological and normative influences on the consciousness is expressed, in our view, primarily in the different ways in which they are realized. Being based on education and persuasion, ideological influence precludes force. On the other hand, the normative instruments of political guidance imply not only persuasion, but also coercion. This characteristic is expressed with particular clarity in the law, for, according to Lenin, the law is nothing without an apparatus capable of enforcing the observance of its standards.¹ This classical characteristic fully pertains to the socialist law of the whole people, i. e. to the law of developed socialism. At the same time, the possibility of state coercion in the process of enforcing the law does not mean, of course, that the state automatically and necessarily applies force in each case. It would therefore be wrong to identify the "legal" with the "coercive".

The relationship between the socialist law and the socialist political system has certain identifiable characteristics. As was noted above, the basic instruments for implementing policy and exercising the political guidance of society are at the same time the structural components of its political system. It is therefore completely justified to include socialist law and the other norms operating in society within the framework of the socialist political system.

Thus, together with the other social norms, socialist law functions as an instrument of policy and thereby as a com-

¹ See V. I. Lenin. *Collected Works*, Vol. 25, p. 471.

ponent of the socialist political system. In connection with this a number of important theoretical and practical questions arise.

It will be recalled that in socialist society a number of different types of social norms operate.¹

Included in the socialist political system are those social norms which serve as a means for the political guidance of society. The subject of their regulation are political relations and above all those which are linked one way or another with the exercise of political power. These norms are chiefly there to regulate those relations which arise within the socialist political system. But they also regulate the relations arising from the interconnection and interaction of the socialist political system with the other social systems of socialism.

The various types of social norms have different functions and significance in the system of the normative regulation of political relations under socialism. Prominent among the social norms of the greatest political importance are the norms of socialist law.

The political character of the norms of socialist law is conditioned by the organic and inseparable link between the law and the state. Neither the nature, social purpose nor the functions of socialist law can be ascertained in isolation from the state. Essentially, socialist law expresses the will of the state, which in itself mediates the interests of the working class and all the working people. Socialist law is an effective instrument for the implementation of the home and foreign policy of the party and the state.

Socialist law is one of the main instruments for implementing policy with the help of its own specific means. However, it does not only serve to define and legally secure the results of political development. Socialist law actively promotes the strengthening of the Soviet state and the political organization of society as a whole as well as the development and expansion of socialist democracy.

Politically the function of socialist law is chiefly expressed in the regulation of political relations and in its influence on the people's political awareness. Regulation of polit-

¹ See *The Marxist-Leninist General Theory of the State and the Law. Socialist Law*, Moscow, 1973 (in Russian).

ical relations, that is relations within the socialist political system, may be described as the political function of socialist law.¹ This function is only manifest in the purely political sphere, or in other words, within the framework of the socialist political system. However, politics (as well as economics and ideology) can be identified as a special sphere of social relations, and the political function of the law will correspond to this.

The fundamental legal form of political guidance under developed socialism is the laws. With the aim of further improving legislation there has been a wide expansion of codification (systematization) of current legislation in the form of all-Union Fundamentals (Fundamental Principles) and republican codes. In recent years the Supreme Soviet of the USSR has passed the Fundamentals of labor, land and water legislation, legislation on education and health, and on marriage and the family, etc.

On the instructions of the Politbureau of the CPSU Central Committee the appropriate organs are drawing up recommendations for the further improvement of labor and administrative legislation and certain other laws so as to keep up with new developments in social life.

Laws hold the leading place among the normative enactments of the Soviet Union. In this connection it is usually pointed out that laws possess supreme juridical force in relation to all other legal measures. But it is not only the legal nature of laws which conditions their leading role in the system of the legal regulation of socialist social relations. Equally important is the fact that, among the numerous legal measures adopted by the organs of the socialist state, laws possess the greatest moral and political prestige, which is primarily due to their democratic character. As is clearly stated in the Soviet Constitution only the Supreme Soviet of the USSR can enact laws. Just as the organs of popular representation—the Soviets—embody most fully the democratic character of the Soviet state, so the measures of these organs of popular power and particularly laws, embody the democratic character of Soviet legislation.

¹ Some jurists classify the functions of the socialist law as (a) specific (purely juridical) and (b) social (social and political). This classification is, in our opinion, acceptable insofar as it expresses the different aspects of the functional characteristics of socialist law.

The democratic character of Soviet laws is displayed in all their aspects—their nature, their method of adoption and implementation, and their content.

In their nature (or essence), laws in a developed socialist society are an expression of popular will, that is the will of the entire Soviet people as a new historical community. This is primarily guaranteed by the fact that the Supreme Soviet, which enacts laws, is an organ of genuinely popular representation. It reflects the interests of all classes and social groups, nations and nationalities which go to make up the united Soviet people.

The expression of the will of the whole people is also guaranteed by the democratic methods by which the laws are adopted. In this connection special mention must be made of the nation-wide discussion of the drafts of certain highly important laws. It has now become firmly established for the press to print the draft laws for the purpose of free and open discussion. This type of discussion is an effective form of involving the people in the process of legislation and demonstrates the deeply democratic character of legislation in the USSR.

Mention should also be made of another democratic feature—the expanding range of individuals and bodies that can initiate legislation. According to the Soviet Constitution legislative initiative in the Supreme Soviet of the USSR resides with its chambers (the Soviet of the Union and the Soviet of Nationalities), the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet, the Council of Ministers of the USSR, the Union republics as represented by their higher organs of state power, the commissions of the Supreme Soviet of the USSR, the standing commissions of its chambers, the deputies of the Supreme Soviet of the USSR, the Supreme Court of the USSR and the Procurator General of the USSR. The right to legislative initiative is also enjoyed by the mass public organizations in the form of their all-Union organs. Investing the mass organizations with the right to legislative initiative both in relation to all-Union and republican legislation is a concrete manifestation of the democratization of the process of legislation in the USSR.

The renewal and improvement of Soviet legislation that has been carried out over the last few years was, as it were, crowned by the adoption of the new Constitution of the USSR. In the expressive words of L. I. Brezhnev, all

these legislative acts had become the bricks from which many of the articles of the new Constitution were built.

A highly characteristic feature of Soviet laws is the fact that they deal with problems which are of immediate concern to the public at large. They are thus in accord with the vital interests of the people and the development of their democratic rights and freedoms.

The improvement of Soviet legislation, now set on the basis of the new Constitution, is one of the main directions for the development of the normative regulation of socialist social relations under mature socialism.

The CPSU attaches great significance to the question of ethics and morals. Communist morality is becoming an integral part of all the basic political institutions of socialist society.

In a developed socialist society the interconnection between law and morality becomes much closer. The norms of socialist law and communist morality contain many of the same requirements. For example, work is not only a right, but also the legal obligation and moral duty of every able-bodied citizen on the principle that conscientious labor is the duty of, and a matter of honor for every able-bodied Soviet citizen. These coincidences of requirements are based on the unity of objectives between the law and morality, the further improvement of social relations and the establishment of the principles of communism.

During the period of the building of communism standards of law and morality draw closer together. The essence of this process is mutual enrichment. On the one hand, the legal norms lose their juridical nature and acquire a moral character, and on the other, communist morality begins to act not only as an orientation for legal development, but also forms the basis for legal enactments. What takes place is not the "juridicization" of moral standards, but, on the contrary, the strengthening of moral principles in socialist law. Thus, one of the instruments for developing the law is its "saturation" not only with the norms of morality, but also with separate moral concepts and categories. This is the dialectics of the convergence of socialist law and communist morality—two of the most effective regulators of social relations in the current historical period.

Chapter III

THE FORMS OF DEMOCRACY

The Class Nature of Socialist Democracy

The political system of Soviet society expresses the sovereignty of the Soviet people. This is objectively conditioned both by the character of socialist society and by the social nature and objectives of its political system.

In the socialist countries there exists genuine popular sovereignty, real democracy. Only the working people, headed by the working class and its party, possess full, absolute power, and are its source, bearer and performer.

Socialist democracy has a clearly expressed class nature. The Marxist-Leninist theory rejects any abstract, non-class conception of "the people" or "popular sovereignty". It attaches decisive importance to the social and political essence of these conceptions and sees them as closely linked with the struggle for social progress.

"The people" is not a frozen social category, but a concrete historical community that has undergone numerous changes at different stages of social development. "In using the word 'people,'" wrote Lenin, "Marx did not thereby gloss over class distinctions, but united definite elements capable of bringing the revolution to completion."¹ In an antagonistic class society the people are in the main the working masses, i.e. the overwhelming majority of the population. Depending on concrete historical conditions the social framework of the people may slightly widen if broader sections of the population become involved in the struggle for social progress. Thus during the period of the fight against fascism

¹ V. I. Lenin. *Collected Works*, Vol. 9, p. 133.

and the establishment of a people's democratic system in the countries of Central and Southeast Europe not only the working class and the toiling peasantry took part in the resistance movement, but also members of some non-working social strata. But in all situations the chief and decisive part of the people has been the working people as the real makers of history and the chief productive force of society.

With the victory of the socialist revolution the working class establishes its power in alliance with the toiling peasantry and other sections of the working people. It is genuinely popular power, which expresses the will and secures the vital interests of all the working people—the overwhelming majority of the population. It is also the instrument wielded by that majority.

During the period of transition from capitalism to socialism a few remnants of the exploiting classes, whose interests and aspirations are antagonistic to the vital interests of the overwhelming majority of the population still remain in society alongside the working classes and social strata. In these conditions socialist democracy takes the form of the dictatorship of the proletariat. "The dictatorship of the proletariat means the replacement of democracy for exploiters by socialist democracy for the working people, the beginning of the epoch of genuine government by the people."¹

As has been mentioned, during the years of socialist construction a new historical community—the Soviet people—has arisen in the USSR. "New, harmonious relations," said L. I. Brezhnev, "relations of friendship and cooperation, were formed between the classes and social groups, nations and nationalities in joint labour, in the struggle for socialism and in the battles fought in defence of socialism. Our people are welded together by a common Marxist-Leninist ideology and the lofty aims of building communism."² This pre-determines the nature of democracy in a developed socialist society, which is characterized not only by the absence of antagonistic classes, but by the genuine socialist character of all classes and social groups. In these conditions the state of the dictatorship of the proletariat has grown into the state

¹ *On the Centenary of the Birth of V. I. Lenin. Theses of the Central Committee, Communist Party of the Soviet Union, Moscow, 1969, p. 22.*

² *24th Congress of the CPSU, p. 92.*

of the whole people, while the power of the working people headed by the working class expresses the will and basic interests of the whole of society.

At the present stage of developed socialism the role of the people in governing society and the state has significantly risen and the social basis of the Soviet state expanded. This process reflects the further development of the Soviet state, without altering its nature. The democratic apparatus of the people's power, created under the dictatorship of the proletariat, has been consolidated and is continuing to develop under the state of the whole people. In the course of the building of the new society, socialist democracy thus undergoes a certain evolution, but essentially it always functions as the power of the working people headed by the working class.

In view of this, the power that is exercised throughout the whole period of building socialism and communism may be characterized as government by the people at different stages of its development.

Right revisionists propagate petty-bourgeois theories about people's power, denying the leading role of the working class and its party in the building of a new society. But it is precisely this leading role that predetermines the socialist character of people's power and its purpose in social development. Furthermore, as it leads the struggle of the working people for the building of socialism and communism, the working class is expressing its own interests as well as the vital interests of all sections of the working people. That is why its leading role not only does not contradict popular sovereignty, understood as the real absolute power of the working people exercised in the interests of building a new society, but is also its necessary precondition.

It should further be remembered that the leading role of the working class by no means signifies that it exercises political power in isolation. On the contrary, it exercises it in close contact with the peasantry and the other sections of the working people. Although during the period of transition from capitalism to socialism the working class of necessity makes use of the instruments of oppression against the remnants of the exploiting classes, it cannot operate in the same way in relation to the working people. It rather draws them into active participation in the building of a new society.

The alliance of the working class with the peasantry and the intelligentsia forms the social basis of socialist democracy. This class union under the leadership of the working class and existing for the purpose of building a new society was defined by Lenin as an essential feature of the dictatorship of the proletariat, and the alliance of workers and toiling peasants as its supreme principle of vital importance for retaining power.¹

In this way the dictatorship of the proletariat essentially functions as a highly democratic form of government. This constitutes the basis for the development of the state of proletarian dictatorship, after the complete and final victory of socialism, into the state of the whole people which expresses the will of the whole people. Developed socialism is characterized by the moral and political unity of society, which further goes to strengthen the sovereignty of the people.

The historic mission of the working class is the socialist transformation of society and the building of communism, which implies the rapid development of the productive forces and a steady increase in the people's living standards and culture. It is impossible to accomplish these deeply humane tasks without relying on the mass of the working people in whose interests they are performed. Lenin pointed out that it was impossible to defeat capitalism and build a socialist society "without enlisting the entire mass of the working people, the proletarians, semi-proletarians and small peasants, for the democratic organization of their ranks, their forces, their participation in state affairs".²

Proceeding from the Marxist-Leninist thesis on the decisive role of the people in social development, the communist and workers' parties attach immense significance to involving large sections of the working people in the running of the country. The state and the whole political structure of socialism are successfully solving the problems that face them precisely because they rely on the creative initiative and activeness of the working people guided by the communist and workers' parties.

Objectively, socialism means the creation of the real conditions for every citizen to participate in discussing the laws of his state, in choosing his representatives and in carrying

¹ See V. I. Lenin. *Collected Works*, Vol. 29, pp. 380-81; Vol. 32, p. 490.

² V. I. Lenin. *Collected Works*, Vol. 23, p. 25.

out the state laws in practice. According to the Constitution of the USSR Soviet citizens are guaranteed the right to participate in the running of state and social affairs. Soviet citizens elect and can be elected to the Soviets of People's Deputies, take part in discussion and elaboration of draft laws and decisions of national and local significance, work in state organs, cooperative and other public organizations or supervise their activity, and participate in production management, in running the work collectives, and in meetings at their place of residence. The working people are the only source of political power, and all power in the socialist countries is so structured that it is in the hands of the people. This finds legislative expression in the various constitutional acts of the socialist states.

In the Address of the Second All-Russia Congress of Soviets "To the Workers, Soldiers and Peasants"—the first juridical act of the Soviet state—it was emphasized that the Congress assumed all power, "backed by the will of the vast majority of the workers, soldiers and peasants...". It was further stated that "all power in the localities shall pass to the Soviets of Workers', Soldiers' and Peasants' Deputies...".¹ Thus for the first time in world history all power in the country, from top to bottom, was legally vested in the working people.

Socialist democracy was boldly proclaimed by the Declaration of Rights of the Working and Exploited People, adopted by the Third All-Russia Congress of Soviets, which later became an integral part of the first Soviet Constitution—the Constitution of the RSFSR of 1918. It was said in the Declaration that "power shall belong wholly and exclusively to the working people and their plenipotentiary representatives—the Soviets of Workers', Soldiers' and Peasants' Deputies".² Analogous clauses were contained in the constitutional acts of the other Soviet republics. Workers' power was also proclaimed in the 1924 and 1936 Soviet Constitutions.

With the building of mature socialism and the transition of all sections of the population to the ideological and political position of the working class, the Soviet state, which arose as the dictatorship of the proletariat, has evolved into

¹ *Ibid.*, Vol. 26, p. 247.

² *History of the Soviet Constitution. A Collection of Documents, 1917-1957*, Moscow, 1957, p. 46 (in Russian).

a state of the whole people. This was written into the new Constitution of 1977, which states that the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics is a socialist state of the whole people, expressing the will and interests of the working class, peasantry and intelligentsia, of all the nations and nationalities of the country. All power in the USSR, says the Constitution, belongs to the people. The people exercise state power through Soviets of People's Deputies, which constitute the political foundation of the USSR. Similar articles are to be found in the current constitutions of the Union and autonomous republics. In the early constitutions of the other socialist countries, which were adopted in the 'forties, democracy or government by the people was expressed in the formula: all power comes from the people and belongs to the people. This formula meant in practical terms the sovereignty of the people. Later constitutions of the other socialist countries use the formula—all power belongs to the workers in town and country, to all the working people (the Constitution of Poland, 1952; of Czechoslovakia, 1960; of the GDR, 1968, and of Hungary, 1972). The constitutions of Rumania, 1965, and Bulgaria, 1971, state that power belongs to the people and fix the class nature of the state as a state of the working people headed by the working class. The Polish and Rumanian constitutions also stress that the basis of popular power is the union of workers and peasants. The Hungarian, GDR and Czechoslovak constitutions proclaim the alliance of the working class with the peasantry, the intelligentsia and other sections of the working people. The Yugoslav Constitution of 1974 establishes the sovereignty of the people and the power and self-government of the working class and all the working people.

The sovereignty of the working people is a cardinal principle of the whole political system of socialism. The Soviet scholar S. Kravchuk singles out the following characteristics of people's power in the socialist countries.

"...All power ... belongs to the people and to the people alone.... A free nation is the master of its own destiny;

"the people alone hold absolute power over all their material and cultural resources and use them in their interests;

"the people themselves govern the state and society and themselves decide all matters of state and social life:

“the people freely express their will and make it commonly binding upon all.”¹

In very general terms these features taken together reflect the nature of socialist democracy. Of course both its class essence and its various forms need to be taken into consideration as well.

The social basis of socialist democracy is a union between the working class and the toiling peasantry, the intelligentsia and all other sections of the working people under the leadership of the working class, while its economic basis is socialist ownership of the means of production. In the socialist countries the working people not only possess political power, but all the social wealth which is their common national property. The sovereignty of the working people is real and effective precisely because, free from any form of exploitation, they do not only exercise political power, but also dispose of the social wealth in the interest of the continued development of socialist production and the steady rise of living standards.²

State Power—the Basic Form of Socialist Democracy

The chief expression and main guarantee of socialist democracy is state power. Throughout the whole history of the building of socialism and communism, when society is still divided into classes (and in the period of transition from capitalism to socialism there are still some remnants of the exploiting classes), when the communist formation emerges in a class-divided world and when the class struggle is dominant on the international scene, socialist democracy must inevitably assume the character of political power and take on the form of the state. That is why right up to the creation of a complete communist society state power must remain the chief form of socialist democracy, its essential embodiment.

State power is a fundamental issue in the socialist revolution. Without state power the working class is unable to fulfil its historic mission—the building of socialist and then

¹ *The State Law of the USSR*, Moscow, 1967 (in Russian).

² See *Constitutional Law of the Socialist Countries. Collected Articles*, Moscow, 1963 (in Russian).

communist society. Of course, even before the socialist revolution the working class and other working people create their own political parties, trade unions and other public organizations. But while state power remains in the hands of the bourgeoisie, the working people are unable to direct society's development in their own interests. Only when they have acquired state power can the working people, headed by the working class, become the real masters of their own destiny and have a real opportunity to manage public affairs and processes of social development. Thus socialist state power is essentially popular power, that is power belonging to the working people headed by the working class.

State power also functions as the chief form of socialist democracy because the state, as its bearer, holds the dominant, central position in the political structure of socialism. The socialist state is an all-embracing organization of the working people, expressing the will and common interests of all sections of the working population and governing the whole of society. The socialist state acts in the name of the people as the owner of the means of production, and uses the immense material resources it possesses to develop the national economy in the interests of social progress. Throughout the building of socialism and communism the state is the most reliable and effective instrument for directing economic and cultural development and organizing socialist economic management and education. The socialist state has the most effective means of regulating social relations and its bodies issue normative enactments which are binding upon all. The state governs relations with foreign countries and has at its disposal all necessary means for ensuring the defense of the country, including the armed forces. Thus the socialist state is the chief instrument for the building of socialism and communism.

It is natural that in these circumstances popular sovereignty is expressed in state sovereignty. "The sovereignty of the people is expressed in state power. By virtue of this it possesses all the necessary attributes of sovereignty."¹

Under socialism popular sovereignty becomes, for the first time in history, the source of state sovereignty. The situation is quite different in capitalist society, in which there can be no unity of popular and state sovereignty, for at the basis

¹ *The Soviet State Law*, Moscow, 1974, p. 107 (in Russian).

of state sovereignty lies the sovereignty of the ruling capitalist class. Being only fictitiously reflected in bourgeois constitutions, popular sovereignty is replaced under imperialism by the power of a small group of monopolies. The unity of state and popular sovereignty comes about only with the establishment of socialist democracy, when the working people headed by the working class become the sole source of state power. One can say in this context that in the socialist countries popular sovereignty coincides with state sovereignty, being an expression of the absolute power of the working people.

This, of course, does not mean that popular and state sovereignties are identical. Yet there is a definite relationship between the two. State sovereignty is based on popular sovereignty, which reflects the absolute power of the people and manifests itself in state power.

In revealing the relationship between popular and state sovereignty under socialism it must be realized that popular power and state power are not two different types of power, but simply the one power through which the people exercises its sovereignty. Only socialist state power guarantees the real exercise of genuine popular sovereignty. The holder of state power is, in the first instance, the people themselves. The people exercise control over state power, but this does not limit the latter's sovereignty. Under socialism this controllability by the people expresses the class nature of the state and its social basis. But it by no means signifies any limitation of state sovereignty. The supremacy of state power as its most important sovereign attribute in socialist society expresses the sovereignty of the people and in no way serves to limit it.

Thus under socialism popular and state sovereignties do not contradict each other, but exist in a close organic unity, state sovereignty being inalienable from popular sovereignty. The sovereignty of the Soviet people is primarily expressed in the fact that they are the only source and bearer of Soviet socialist state power.

At all stages of its development socialist state power has a clearly expressed class character. In the period of transition from capitalism to socialism it exists as the instrument of the dictatorship of the proletariat. Under developed socialism state power no longer functions in this capacity, but this does not mean that it becomes "extra-class" or "supra-

class" in character. As the power of the working people guided by the working class, it continues the cause of the dictatorship of the proletariat, carrying out the building of communism and waging class struggle against imperialism internationally.

The class character of socialist state power also predetermines the nature of relations between the socialist states. Here the guiding principle is that of socialist internationalism. It implies the sovereignty of each socialist state, respect for each other's territorial integrity, mutual equality and non-interference in each other's internal affairs. It also implies close cooperation between the socialist states, mutual help and solidarity in the common struggle for communist ideals and the readiness to make a contribution to the strengthening of world socialism.

Thus the principle of socialist internationalism is organically linked with the sovereignty of socialist state power, that is the sovereignty of the socialist state, which includes its right to determine, in conformity with national and other conditions, the forms and methods of socialist construction and incurs the obligation to carry the full responsibility for this to the people. At the same time the need to ensure the sovereignty of each socialist state obliges it to uphold and defend the power of the working class and all the working people and all the revolutionary gains of the socialist system. "In that sense," said Gustáv Husák, General Secretary of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Czechoslovakia, "the class content of the sovereignty of a socialist state is linked unbreakably with its international responsibility to the community of socialist countries and the world communist and revolutionary movement... The slogan of sovereignty devoid of class content is a refined and very effective weapon of the right opportunist, revisionist and anti-socialist forces."¹

Thus socialist state power is the embodiment of the sovereign power of the people in the new society. It expresses the will of the working class and all the working people of the country and is exercised exclusively in the interests of the working people. The work of all state organs is devoted to this aim. Finally, state power is exercised

¹ *International Meeting of Communist and Workers' Parties, Moscow, 1969*, p. 412.

with the direct and active participation of the working population.

The fact that the working people have sovereign state power predetermines its exercise by consistently democratic methods and enables it to embrace all major aspects of social life. In this sense the working people, being the sovereign of power, exercise self-government in the running of public affairs. Popular self-government therefore in no way contradicts state power or functions as its social antipode. On the contrary, it is its essential attribute. Social self-government is an organic element of the socialist state.

Incompatibility between state power and social self-government is a characteristic feature of exploitative society, in which political power and the means of production belong not to the working people but to a handful of exploiters. On the other hand, under socialism with its genuine democracy (government by the people), the working people headed by the working class themselves manage their affairs, relying primarily on state power which is theirs. Thus one can say that under socialism state power is the state self-government by the people.

The deeply democratic essence of socialist state power, as Lenin pointed out, predetermines the fundamentally new—in comparison with the previous types of state—character of the working people's state. Emphasizing that the proletarian state was "democratic in a new way (for the proletariat and the propertyless in general)",¹ i.e. for the whole of the working people, Lenin considered that it was no longer a state in the proper meaning of the word, but a "semi-state".² Speaking on the radical difference between the Paris Commune and a bourgeois state, he wrote that "democracy, introduced as fully and consistently as is at all conceivable, is transformed from bourgeois into proletarian democracy; from the state (= a special force for the suppression of a particular class) into something which is no longer the state proper".³

The consistently democratic character of the socialist social and state structure consists precisely in the fact that it creates real conditions for the active participation in the

¹ V. I. Lenin. *Collected Works*, Vol. 25, p. 412.

² *Ibid.*, pp. 457, 463, 474 et seq.

³ *Ibid.*, p. 419.

government of the country by the majority and ultimately by all the members of society. The broad social base of the socialist state does away with the former alienation of the state from society; it brings the state and society gradually closer together and finally leads to their fusion with the completion of the building of communist society.

Summing up the results of the Paris Commune, Marx said that it was "...the reabsorption of the state power by society as its own living forces instead of as forces controlling and subduing it, by the popular masses themselves, forming their own force instead of the organized force of their suppression—the political form of their social emancipation, instead of the artificial force . . . of society wielded for their oppression by their enemies".¹ This lies at the basis of the evolution of socialist democracy into communist, when the socialist state and the whole political structure of society are transformed into communist social self-government.

Thus under socialism the state functions as an organization of the masses, guaranteeing their active participation in the running of the country. There is, consequently, an organic unity between state power and self-government. Therefore, the ideas of certain bourgeois theoreticians, who consider that self-government can develop under socialism only at the expense of a weakening of state power, appear very strange indeed. Only those who disregard the fundamental difference between the socialist and the bourgeois state could draw such a conclusion. According to this conception all states are a kind of "evil" which must be exorcized as quickly as possible. Hence the slogans of "de-etatization" and "self-governing democracy".

But the whole point is that the socialist state is not something that is imposed on society from outside, as it were. It is, as we have seen, an all-embracing organization of the working people headed by the working class. The power of the socialist state consists not only in the fact that it relies on the support of the whole population, but also that increasingly large sections of the working people take part themselves in the running of the country. This is what is meant by democracy. By virtue of this, self-government under socialism develops not at the expense of or in contra-

¹ K. Marx and F. Engels. *On the Paris Commune*, p. 153.

diction to the state, but through a strengthening of the democratic foundations of state power and the increasingly wider involvement of the working people in government.

Socialist Democracy and Public Organizations

Socialist democracy or government by the people cannot be reduced to its state forms alone. This would hardly reflect the whole wealth and variety of shapes which it assumes in socialist society. Under socialism state power, being the main form of socialist democracy, harmonizes with the work of the various mass public organizations. Such a relationship came into being literally from the first days of Soviet power.

As early as the Second All-Russia Congress of Soviets a Decree on the Formation of a Workers' and Peasants' Government of October 26 (November 8, new style), 1917 set the task of ensuring the "implementation of the program proclaimed by the Congress in close unity with the mass organizations of the male and female workers, sailors, soldiers, peasants and office employees".¹ This policy has been consistently pursued by the Soviet government at all subsequent stages of its development and has become a characteristic feature of socialist democracy. The public organizations are an integral part of the Soviet political system. Altogether they involve nearly the whole of the country's adult population and are one of the important channels through which citizens are enabled to participate in running the affairs of society.

The state primarily expresses the common basic interests of all the working people, their common will, while the public organizations express the specific interests and requirements of individual sections and groups of the working people. They also serve to ensure that those sections of the working people they represent are able to participate in running the affairs of society and the state.

The public organizations are linked in many ways with the state organs, cooperating with them and influencing

¹ *Collection of Laws of the USSR and Decrees of the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet of the USSR, 1938-1967*, Vol. 1, Moscow, 1968, p. 32 (in Russian).

their work. The state in turn relies on the public organizations, legally sanctions their work, and directs and supervises some of them, e.g. cooperatives. A complex system of interconnections between the state and the public organizations has developed in the socialist countries. This system, headed by communist (workers') parties, forms the political organization of society.

It is natural that under socialism the nature and features of the state are determined not only by its own structure but also by the summative action upon it of all elements of the political system as a whole. In this sense one can refer to the public organizations as "participants" in state power.

The role and place of the public organizations in a developed socialist society continues to grow, and it is worth while attempting to define it within the system of socialist democracy. For this purpose the following propositions should be taken as starting points:

- 1) The various types of public organization interact with state organs and involve the working people in running the state affairs, being in this sense active participants in exercising state power.

- 2) By carrying out their work among the population and managing their own internal affairs, the public organizations are a form of social self-government by the working people.

Under socialism all activities of public organizations are a form of socialist democracy and not an independent social power existing alongside the state power or authority.

At the same time we consider it correct to say that socialist state power is the *main* form of popular power during the building of socialism and communism. It is the main form (insofar as the socialist state, the holder of state power, serves as the main instrument of the building of socialism and communism), but it is not the only one, for this would mean state monopoly over all aspects of social life, which is neither in accordance with the theory of scientific communism, nor the practice of socialist construction.

On the basis of this the following conclusions can be drawn about the relationship between state power and social self-government within the system of socialist democracy:

- 1) As an all-embracing political organization of the working people headed by the working class, the socialist state is the leading organization responsible for managing the socialist economy, developing social and cultural construc-

tion and involving the masses in running society; it has a wide social base, relying on the public organizations. The basis of the state apparatus are, of course, the Soviets, which combine the features of both state and public organizations. Therefore in socialist society state power becomes the embodiment of popular self-government.

2) Social self-government finds its expression in the work of the public organizations. In this way popular self-government through the state system is supplemented by the system of independent non-state organizations.

Socialist democracy essentially means popular self-government which until the complete building of communism is chiefly government by the state. At the same time state direction and purely social self-government overlap to some extent, with some systems of administration combining state and public features (people's control in the USSR, GDR and Bulgaria, and cultural management in Bulgaria). The very nature of socialist democracy thus contains the seeds of its growing over into social communist self-government as the appropriate preconditions for this are maturing.

The Communist Party, armed with knowledge of the laws of social development, acts as the guarantor of this process. It is only the party that can ensure the continued strengthening of the democratic foundations of the political system of socialism according to the current level of maturity of the new society and prevent a premature or too hasty substitution of social forms for state ones. While never losing sight of the prospects for the formation of communist social self-government at the present stage of development, the CPSU concentrates on the full utilization and improvement of the state institutions, which still for a long time to come will be the instruments for governing society.

Representative and Direct Democracy

Socialist democracy is exercised in various ways. State-law studies usually divide these into two—direct and representative. Some authors consider that the work of the professional management apparatus constitutes a third form.

In the socialist countries the direct and representative forms of the government by the people are organically combined. In approaching the problem of direct and representative democracy it is necessary to distinguish between the

social content and the political form of democracy. Obviously, here it is not only possible but necessary to combine various democratic forms.

Such a combination appeared during the socialist revolution, which itself represents the highest act of direct democracy. The socialist revolution consists in broad masses of the working people rising against their bourgeois oppressors and for the establishment of a new society which would be free from exploitation and oppression. It was during the revolutionary uprisings that the power of the Soviets—the elective and genuinely representative bodies of the people—was established. Furthermore it was these very Soviets that arose as the result of revolutionary initiative by the workers, peasants and soldiers. Thus from its very beginning socialist democracy was both direct and representative. This combination Lenin saw as one of the decisive advantages of the Soviet apparatus, which “makes it possible to combine the advantages of the parliamentary system with those of immediate and direct democracy”.¹

Popular representation as one of the forms of working people’s power possesses an ordered structure, is based on the principle of democratic centralism and is known to be effective. It guarantees that the interests and will of the people are made known and given legal expression. However, any weakening of mass control over the functioning of popular representation bodies may result in elements of formalism, sham efficiency and bureaucratism appearing in their work.

Direct democracy ensures the fullest possible involvement of the masses in the government of the country and allows for the creative work of all members of society but prevents the setting up of a permanent and centralized organization of government.

The combination of direct and representative democracy gives the advantages of both forms and avoids their disadvantages. An organic synthesis of these forms is an objective necessity.

The direct and representative forms of exercising power are given legal expression in the constitutions of the socialist countries. “The people exercise power through freely elected representative organs—the People’s Assembly and

¹ V. I. Lenin. *Collected Works*, Vol. 26, pp. 103-04.

the people's councils—or else directly," it is proclaimed in Article 2 (2) of the Constitution of the People's Republic of Bulgaria. The constitutions of other socialist states do not expressly point to a direct exercise of power by the people, but emphasize that the state organs rely on the direct participation of the working people. Article 2 (2) of the Constitution of the Czechoslovak Socialist Republic declares that "the working people exercise state power by means of representative institutions elected by them, supervised by them and responsible to them". Para. 4 of the same article makes it binding on representative institutions and all other state organs to rely in their work on "the creative initiative and direct participation of the working people and their organizations".

The combination of direct and representative democracy has two basic aspects in the mechanism of the socialist government by the people. In the first place, this mechanism contains elective, representative state organizations of the working people together with such forms of direct democracy as referendums, nation-wide discussions, citizens' meetings, etc. Secondly, direct and representative democracy are combined in the organizations of the working people.

Characteristic of the organization and work of the Soviets—the representative organs of state power in the USSR—are, for example, the election of deputies by the adult population, the adoption by electors of instructions to their deputies, the deputies' accountability to the electors, the electors' right to recall their deputies. All these are the direct expression of the people's will and are part of direct democracy. They are supplemented by the work of the permanent voluntary helpers of the Soviets, which in the USSR comprise tens of millions of people.

The combination of direct and representative democracy is characteristic not only of the Soviets as organs of state power but also of the working people's public organizations. These combine the taking of decisions at general meetings in the primary organizations with the work of the elective organs built on the principle of democratic centralism and relying on the support of voluntary helpers. Both direct and representative democracy are widely manifest in the work of the public activity bodies.

Various forms of direct democracy have taken shape in the course of socialist construction.

The first Soviet Constitution—the Constitution of the RSFSR of 1918—declared that wherever feasible in rural localities, managerial decisions shall be made by a general meeting of the constituents of a given village directly (Article 57) and that in these circumstances the general meeting shall possess supreme authority in the given area (Article 60). During the first years after the Revolution local polls were frequently held on nationality questions. In a number of socialist countries national referendums have been held on questions of crucial importance for the life of the country. Thus in 1945 the Mongolian People's Republic held a plebiscite on the question of state independence. In 1946 Bulgaria held a referendum on the abolition of the monarchy and the proclamation of a People's Republic. Poland in the same year held a referendum on abolishing the senate, approving the agrarian reforms, nationalizing the main industries and establishing the national borders at the Baltic, the Oder and the Neisse. The new constitutions of the German Democratic Republic (1968), the People's Republic of Bulgaria (1971) and the Republic of Cuba (1976) were approved by referendum.

Referendums, the election of deputies, adoption of the electors' instructions to their deputies, decisions on the deputies' reports and the recall of deputies belong to the mandatory, imperative forms of direct democracy. They are combined with consultative forms, such as nation-wide discussion of draft laws, preliminary discussion of draft resolutions of the local government bodies by the population, discussion of draft economic plans at workers' meetings, etc.

The discussion of the draft laws (bills), economic plans and other measures has become widespread in the socialist countries. Some of these practices have been written in Articles 114 and 115 of the Soviet Constitution, which declare that the most important matters of state may be submitted for nation-wide discussion and made the subject of a nation-wide vote (referendum). An excellent example of this was the nation-wide discussion of the draft constitutions—the fundamental laws of the socialist states. More than 140 million people discussed the draft of the Soviet Constitution of 1977, as a result of which the Constitutional Commission made a number of changes and amendments in the text. Some 11 million people took part in the discussion of the draft of the 1968 Constitution of the GDR at meetings and

conferences all over the country. As a result the Constitutional Commission introduced 118 changes into the preamble and 55 articles. Over 10 million people participated in the discussion of the draft of the 1952 Constitution of the Polish People's Republic and more than 3 million in the discussion of the draft of the 1971 Constitution of the People's Republic of Bulgaria.

Numerous other examples could be cited of a broad public discussion of the most important bills, which has become a tradition in the political life of the Soviet Union, Bulgaria, the GDR, Poland and the other socialist countries. In recent years, following a wide discussion by the public the Supreme Soviet of the USSR adopted the Fundamentals of Land Legislation of the USSR and the Union Republics, the Fundamentals of Legislation of the USSR and the Union Republics on Marriage and the Family, the fundamentals of labor, public health and public education legislations, etc. In the GDR mass discussion was held of bills concerning the local government bodies and youth.

As in the USSR this tradition has been enshrined in the constitutions of a number of other socialist countries. Thus Article 65 (4) of the Constitution of the GDR declares that the draft fundamental laws shall be put to nation-wide discussion before they are adopted and that the results of these discussions must be considered in working out the final text of the laws.

This broad social discussion of the most important bills is an excellent example of the organic unity between direct and representative democracy, for the highest representative organ of state power makes its final decision on the draft of a law relying on the opinion and will of the population expressed in a nation-wide discussion. This tradition, born of socialist democracy, is continuing to develop. The Program of the CPSU says: "Discussion by the people of draft laws and other decisions of both national and local significance must become the rule. The most important draft laws should be put to a nation-wide referendum."¹ This recommendation has now been given the force of law in the 1977 Constitution of the USSR.

Of considerable importance are the institutions of direct democracy in work collectives. They not only promote dem-

¹ *The Road to Communism*, p. 550.

ocratic methods in the primary cells of socialist society but also help make the optimal managerial decisions and develop the self-management skills among the people.

"Democracy is just an empty word," L. I. Brezhnev said, "if it does not cover the surroundings in which the person does his daily work, applies his creative energy. It is therefore of fundamental importance to strengthen democratic principles in production."¹

The tremendous significance of direct democracy does not mean that with the further development of socialist and communist construction it will gradually supplant representative democracy. In a modern state it is simply impossible for all the social management decisions to be taken directly by the citizens. Direct democracy will, however, continue to develop, while representative democracy will remain the leading type of socialist democracy.

The Soviets of People's Deputies² are the organs of state power in the USSR and the political foundation of the Soviet state. In Lenin's words, they are the "permanent and only foundation of state power, the entire machinery of state".³ In its work the CPSU has been unswervingly guided by this definition.

The Soviets are one of the most representative organizations of the working people. They comprise more than two million members, most of whom work at factories and plants, and scientific and cultural institutions. Among the deputies of local Soviets elected in June 1977, 68.4 per cent are workers and peasants; 49 per cent are women; 33 per cent of members are under 30. Members and candidate members of the CPSU account for 43.2 per cent of people's deputies.

The CPSU and the fraternal parties of the other socialist countries pay constant attention to increasing the role and improving the work of the organs of popular representation. In recent years the rights of district, urban, rural and set-

¹ L. I. Brezhnev. *Following Lenin's Course. Speeches and Articles (1972-1975)*, pp. 446-47.

² The socialist state expresses the interests of the working class, the peasantry, the intelligentsia and all nations and nationalities of the country. Therefore the Soviets, which were formerly known as the "Soviets of Working People's Deputies", are now called, according to the 1977 Constitution, "Soviets of People's Deputies".

³ V. I. Lenin. *Collected Works*, Vol. 28, p. 465.

tlement Soviets have been extended, their material and financial base strengthened and the Soviet apparatus supplemented by trained personnel. The Supreme Soviet of the USSR and the Supreme Soviets of the Union Republics have increased their control over the ministries and departments and over the key sectors of economic and cultural construction. The work of the Soviets has become more vigorous and varied.

Constitutional legislation of the socialist countries establishes the leading position of the representative institutions in the state apparatus (Article 3 of the Constitution of the USSR, Article 5 of the Constitution of the GDR, Article 4 of the Constitution of the Socialist Republic of Rumania). The 1968 Constitution of the GDR states that citizens exercise political power through the offices of people's representatives and points that under no circumstances can any other organs exercise state power than those mentioned in the Constitution.

Socialist theory and practice of state development reject the bourgeois concept of the "division of powers" and the resulting system of restraints and counterpoises in relations between the state organs. Constitutional legislation in the socialist countries establishes the principle of the unity of power, which belongs indivisibly to the working people under the leadership of the working class. Although this unity does not exclude a delimitation of competence between state organs, it demands the concentration of the fundamental state powers in the hands of bodies like the Soviets, which are organs of direct representation of the working people.

Communists have always considered the absolute power of popular representation as a most important means of ensuring the supremacy of the people within the state. "We cannot imagine democracy," wrote Lenin, "even proletarian democracy, without representative institutions."¹ Under socialism popular representation functions as a form of the expression of popular sovereignty, and popular sovereignty as a source of popular representation.

The representative organs in the socialist countries embody a single state power and occupy the dominant position in the state apparatus. "Popular representations are the basis of the system of state organs," declares Article 5 (2) of the Constitution of the GDR. The representative institu-

¹ *Ibid.*, Vol. 25, p. 424.

tions "invest other state organs with powers," says Article 2 (3) of the Constitution of Czechoslovakia. It is the representative organs which take major state decisions and determine the guidelines for the economic, social and cultural work of the state apparatus. It is the representative institutions which directly or indirectly form all other state bodies which in one degree or another are responsible and subordinate to them. They determine the tasks of these bodies, and guide and control their work. The sovereignty of the representative organs is an important condition for ensuring that the bearer of state power—the working people—controls the state apparatus with their help.

Thus the representative institutions hold the main threads of state guidance of society and it is in this that their sovereignty is expressed.

All this goes to explain the role of representative democracy as the main form for the exercise of socialist democracy and show why there can be no separation between representative and direct democracy, which are organically combined in the socialist political system.

Another form in which socialist democracy is exercised is the work of the professional administrative apparatus. It is closely linked with the above-mentioned forms. This is conditioned by the following.

In the first place, the work of the professional apparatus relies on the various means of the participation of the working people and their representatives in running the state. This is a distinguishing feature of the socialist type of state structure. Under socialism, Lenin said, "for the first time in the history of civilized society, the *mass* of the population will rise to taking an *independent* part, not only in voting and elections, *but also in the everyday administration of the state*".¹

Such participation takes various forms. It is effected by millions of voluntary helpers to the executive organs of the local Soviets, nearly six million members of the production committees² and nine million members of the peo-

¹ V. I. Lenin. *Collected Works*, Vol. 25, p. 487-88.

² The standing production committees which operate at every factory and plant are a form of workers' participation in socialist management. Their main concern is raising production efficiency. The new statute on the standing production committees approved by the Council of Ministers of the USSR and the All-Union Central Council of Trade Unions considerably extends the powers of the

ple's control bodies. Then there are the congresses and conferences of working people's representatives, held in the branches of management at the all-Union, republican and provincial levels, and the participation of the public organizations (e.g. the trade unions) in solving many of the problems of state administration.

In the second place, the professional administrative apparatus has certain inherent characteristics of a representative nature. The whole socialist state organization can be called a representative system, and the system of representative democracy is embodied in the entire mechanism of the socialist state, which on the whole has a representative character.

This by no means signifies an erasure of the boundaries between the professional apparatus and the representative organs proper. It is rather that the democratic character of the socialist political system predetermines such a place and role of the professional apparatus in the mechanism of socialist democracy which allows it neither to be underestimated and so replaced by other forms, nor alienated from these forms, and in the final count from society.

Under the scientific and technical revolution the role of the professional administrative apparatus increases, and the tasks it faces become more difficult. At the same time its scope grows, its structure is altered and modernized, and its demand for more qualified personnel increases. This is coupled with a growing importance of the democratic foundations of its organization and functioning. During the building of communism the principles of electivity, accountability to the representative organs and the electorate, and the periodic replacement of functionaries are being applied on a growing scale. At the same time increasingly wider sections of the working people gain experience in administration and management. This is, of course, only to be expected for as the building of communism proceeds the cultural and educational level of the masses rises and their political consciousness and social activeness grows.

Thus the forms of exercising socialist democracy develop not through the replacement of one by another, but through

committees. Their work now covers a wide range of matters from participation in drafting, discussing and fulfilling current and long-term plans to the cultural development and everyday life of the working people.

their close interaction. This is the high road to the formation of social communist self-government. When socialist democracy has developed into communist democracy, the state power and the work of public organizations will fuse into a single, communist, non-state form of popular self-government, which will obviously be exercised in the form of direct (non-political) democracy, of popular representation, and of professional administrative apparatus. Of course, these forms will differ significantly from the present ones, but they will have developed from them.

In guiding the exercise of socialist democracy through the political organization of society, the CPSU and the other fraternal parties give constant attention to the development and improvement of democracy in all its forms.

Insofar as it expresses and firmly upholds the vital interests of the working class and all the working people, the Communist Party functions as the nucleus of socialist democracy and as the main guarantor of the sovereignty of the people.

Chapter IV

**POLITICS,
DEMOCRACY AND THE PEOPLE**

Mass Involvement in Politics

The democratic traditions that are growing from strength to strength in Soviet society could never have existed under the previous exploitative socio-economic formations. The organizational forms, principles and norms of socialist democracy have brought about a radical transformation in social relations. This, of course, has primarily taken place in the sphere of politics—a scene on which the relations between classes and nations and between the numerous social groups and individuals manifest themselves, an arena where under capitalism there has been constant conflict and struggle between the interests of antagonistic classes and where under socialism there is a unity of class interests for the purpose of political cooperation in the building of a future classless society. Behind each of these interests stand large sections of the population which is why politics, according to Lenin's definition, begins where not thousands, but millions are involved in activity in order to secure their class interests.¹

Knowledge of the laws of politics has become possible thanks to the materialist and dialectical approaches to the study of social reality and the Marxist-Leninist understanding of the essence of the political factor and its function in society. The historical materialist explanation of politics has opened the way to the practical mass participation in political life and in the running of society and the state, while the Marxist-Leninist methods of analyzing social rela-

¹ See V. I. Lenin. *Collected Works*, Vol. 27, p. 100.

tions from the angle of social interests and class conflict took on particular importance.

In an exploitative society politics, as a sphere of social life, acts in the final analysis to the detriment of the working people. The political system is so structured as to work in the interests of the dominant class, allowing it to make extensive appropriation of the labor of the exploited majority, enrich itself at the latter's expense and keep firm control of the economic, cultural and other spheres of social life.

Marx, Engels and Lenin developed a theory on the class nature of every political system, which was to have tremendous significance for the scientific theory of the management and transformation of society. They revealed the organic link between politics and the material and economic processes of social development, which made it possible to determine a number of political laws governing each type of production. We shall point to some of the results of the classical Marxist-Leninist theses on the social and economic nature of political processes:

—insofar as material and social relations are the source of political processes, then politics cannot be considered a sphere of accidental or spontaneous phenomena. It is subject to certain objective laws, determined by scientific investigation;

—insofar as the laws of political development are real and politics is a completely cognizable social factor, then in principle every man is capable of acquiring reliable knowledge of political problems and acting in accordance with it. This is why the materialist understanding of the essence of politics is the only possible philosophical basis for the construction of a scientific theory of political democracy. Politics is the real activity of millions of people, and it can only be such in a socialist society, where any political content is inseparable from its democratic form;

—insofar as political laws are real and cognizable, then politics is open to the creative energies of the masses and allows the effective construction of new progressive forms of social life. In a developed socialist society the effectiveness of conscious influence on the political processes and control over them are determined by the degree to which the problems of politics have been scientifically worked out. Today there exist vast possibilities for planning political devel-

opment, making well-grounded forecasts and concentrating efforts on the solution of the most important problems. According to the Marxist-Leninist understanding, political progress is just as possible and necessary as progress in other spheres of social activity. Therefore the aim of the CPSU to develop and expand the democratization of political relations in Soviet society is completely realistic and scientifically grounded.

The significance of the subjective factor in the development of politics is continually increasing in socialist society. This, of course, does not mean that politics is becoming a matter of subjective judgement, divorced from the material conditions of society and free from the necessity to accurately reflect real processes. The Marxist-Leninist thesis on the economically determined nature of political phenomena and on politics as the concentrated expression of economics is the key to the understanding of the essence of political relations in a developed socialist society. The policies of the CPSU and the Soviet state are both forceful and convincing because they are based on the truth of social development and because the political decisions coming from them serve as the instruments for establishing this truth in social life. "To understand this truth, to express it, 'to show things as they actually are', is the fundamental task of socialist policy as distinct from bourgeois policy, the principal aim of which is to conceal, to gloss over this truth."¹

The politics and political ideology of socialism reject project-mongering, fanciful ideas and utopian dreams. The principles on which a subjective attitude to political problems is based under socialism are real: practical, business-like approach, a sober account of class interests, scientifically grounded decision-making, etc. The ability to put political consciousness and activity on a serious and practical basis Lenin considered to be a sign of the political maturity of a party, which frees it from such infantile disorders as phrase-mongering, abstract slogans, vagueness, diffusiveness and irresponsibility in politics. He demanded an unconditional increase in the level of party politics and frequently stressed that success in this was only possible on the basis of a generally high level of culture both among Communists, the political vanguard of society, and among the people

¹ V. I. Lenin. *Collected Works*, Vol. 23, p. 179.

as a whole. The cultural and humane values present in socialist society and the application of resultant criteria for appraising political realities are able to rid politics of any indefiniteness, instability or pendulum swings of extremism.

The realism of socialist politics and political ideology is by no means a down-to-earth realism, empirically hide-bound and fearing to go beyond the framework of current social practices. Socialist political consciousness does not make a fetish out of practice. It is not only determined by it, conforming to its demands, but in its turn acts upon it, functioning as the instrument of its organization according to the principles of Marxist-Leninist theory.

Considerable importance in the political consciousness of society attaches to the political ideal embodying human dreams of nobility, perfection and beauty in human relationships. This ideal, in expressing that which should be, is directed towards the future, which the agent of political consciousness compares with the present, preferring it as a more perfect reality and working for its speedy achievement. Only a true understanding of the contemporary political situation and the laws of its development can make a political dream into something real, constructive, and projected into the future.

The highest ideal of the socialist social consciousness is the building of a communist society, which is the source and determinant of the foundations for the political program of developed socialism today. The idea of communism in the form in which it can be consistently developed from the materialist principles of Marxist-Leninist social science, possesses intransient humanist value. Communism, according to Marx, is the highest form of humanism, "it is the *genuine* resolution of the conflict between man and nature and between man and man—the true resolution of the strife between existence and essence, between objectification and self-confirmation, between freedom and necessity, between the individual and the species. Communism is the riddle of history solved. . .".¹ This characterization provides the basis for understanding the humanist position taken by Communists in the struggle for a better future of mankind and for the elimination of all that distorts and degrades man, and against all natural and social evils and misfor-

¹ K. Marx and F. Engels. *Collected Works*, Vol. 3, pp. 296-97.

tunes. Hence it follows that humanism is not simply an ideal or one of many principles by which a man who sincerely wishes to bring happiness to others is guided. It is an integral philosophical position for the agent of social consciousness and social practice and a consistent program of socially purposeful action in which an organic unity is achieved between the objective and the subjective, the real and the ideal.

Prior to Marx and Engels humanism was purely an ideology, and furthermore an illusory ideology that was incapable of having any progressive influence on social relations. With the victory of socialism, however, and the establishment of the socialist way of life humanism has become a practical factor in the social emancipation of man.

Marxism-Leninism actively asserts a new, revolutionary and practical humanism, whose first commandment is principled intolerance of inhuman living conditions and of all forms of exploitation and social and national oppression.

From the point of view of revolutionary Marxist-Leninist humanism every struggle with the exploitative social and political institutions, which sets genuine liberatory objectives, is historically justified and necessary. The involvement of wide sections of the working people in politics and the political struggle in bourgeois society has always been one of the most important aims of the communist and workers' parties. The working man's participation in the political life of the state under an exploitative social system not only serves to educate him politically, give him valuable experience and sophistication in political matters, but also brings him real gains in the form of democratization of political institutions and legislation, which facilitates the future struggle.

Marx, Engels and Lenin came out firmly against ultra-left and anarchist theories, which called upon the workers to abstain from politics in the bourgeois states. In the 1870s such slogans were advanced by anarchists who demanded that the proletariat should abstain from participation in any form of political activity. "But the mass of the workers," wrote Engels, "will never allow itself to be persuaded that the public affairs of their countries are not also their own affairs; they are naturally *politically-minded* and whoever tries to make them believe that they should leave politics alone will in the end be left in the lurch. To preach

to the workers that they should in all circumstances abstain from politics is to drive them into the arms of the priests or the bourgeois republicans.”¹ This Marxist polemic against the ultra-left and anarchist principles has not lost any of its force today.

The proletarians involved in the active social and political struggle in bourgeois society may expect, given a successful turn of events, to make certain advances and change their condition from near poverty to moderate wealth. It is possible that certain sections of the workers will find their new condition satisfying and refrain from further activity against the bourgeoisie. Communists believe that this is where continual and painstaking work is necessary to explain to the workers the ultimate objectives of their class struggle and encourage them to be dissatisfied with the social achievements they have gained under bourgeois society. The reason for this is that however significant these gains may be, they are always relative and can be undermined so long as the private ownership of the means of production, capital and exploitation continue to exist. At the same time Communists never oppose policies which can bring the workers better democratic institutions and improve their social status and living conditions. To reject such a policy would contradict the humanist essence of communist philosophy.

For “left” revolutionaries and anarchists any progressive change in the position of the workers is bad, because it supposedly “weakens” their revolutionary spirit. Hence the desire to isolate the mass of “potential revolutionaries” from the state policies that can sometimes bring about such changes. At the basis of this lies the fear that a certain section of the population will lose interest in further revolutionary struggle and at the same time, of course, in the leaders of that struggle. The leftists need the masses only as material for “revolutionary” experiments. For Marxists-Leninists, on the other hand, man is the aim of all revolutionary struggle and the transformations which follow the socialist revolution. For leftists and anarchists man is a pawn whom revolutionary strategists and leaders can play around with. They pretentiously demand from their followers voluntary acceptance of this role in the name of the revolution, des-

¹ K. Marx and F. Engels. *Selected Works* in three volumes, Vol. 2, p. 425.

pite the fact that the latter loses any constructive meaning when it is divorced from the concrete vital interests of the working people.

Ultra-left doctrines and trends do colossal damage to the revolutionary liberation movement. In the first place they dehumanize the revolutionary process, replacing its sensible humanistic nature with a spontaneous play of forces and turning it into a sensational spectacle with heroic roles for the leaders and the millions playing crowd scenes. All this is shown again and again in the contemporary political struggle that is going on in the developed capitalist countries. The bourgeoisie has long since understood the immature pseudo-revolutionary political tactics of the "new Left" and the anarchists and is fairly tolerant of their extremism. Furthermore, it tries where possible to set the communist parties and the ultra-left elements against each other and use the latter to discredit the effective forms of the political struggle of the working class within the bourgeois political system which are supported by the communist parties.

One of the most dangerous forms of left radicalism and petty-bourgeois revolutionism is Maoism. Here too revolutionary phrase-mongering stands in the foreground, while the Maoist idea of a revolution is deprived of any human content. Concern over the well-being of the people and the all-round development of the individual has essentially been omitted from the Maoist program on the pretext of the need to fulfil some revolutionary super-tasks. Great efforts are being made to turn people into fanatics without any interests, thoughts, feelings or attachments of their own, and ready to blindly follow commands from above.

Maoism is not an accidental phenomenon. It has combined all the ugly features of left radicalism. Extreme and irresponsible revolutionism has become the official ideology of those who rule over a multi-million-strong nation. As a matter of fact, it is manifested in adventuristic policies and is a guise for certain notorious political aims pursued by the Maoists.

In their political ideology and practice, which is essentially anti-popular, the Maoists do not even try to conceal their contempt for the masses. They scorn the great humanist values of world culture and deny the very idea of democracy. Their ultra-leftist attitudes towards democracy are the log-

ical source of nihilism. The Maoists try to completely depersonalize man in politics. All the major democratic institutions in China have therefore been done away with, the constitution has been revised, the anti-democratic order has been given the force of law, citizens' rights and freedoms flouted, and no proper system of law and order exists. All this goes to show the terrible consequences of a policy hidden by resounding revolutionary phrases but deprived of the fundamental elements which give force to revolutionary theory and practice. These elements include the organic link with the people, concern for their real interests and desire to involve the masses in the active making of history and in building a society of free and conscious workers.

The force of conviction exerted by scientific communism and its power of attraction are rooted in the deeply humanist character of the program for social transformations which is put forward by Communists. The Marxist-Leninist theory of politics is imbued with genuine humanism, particularly such an important aspect of it as the teaching on the revolution. Politics is not, as the Left would claim, the business of leaders and heroes, who have striven to record their names in the annals of history and, in so doing, to bestow blessings on humankind. The people, the classes and the parties are drawn into the revolution and furthermore "*the class that can lead the mass of the population must triumph historically*".¹ Consequently the most important strategic aim of the revolutionary class is to involve the mass of the working people in the political struggle against the exploiters.

Socialist society has gained tremendous experience in solving this problem both in theory and practice. Under socialism democracy, for the first time in history, becomes genuinely humane and massive. Socialism lays new paths for harmonious and just social relations in politics. Only socialism can give society the most perfect forms of broad political democracy and create its material foundations by developing the socialist economy based on social ownership of the means of production.

Bourgeois ideologists may glorify their own political institutions and show off what they consider to be the effective mechanisms of bourgeois democracy. But since capitalism

¹ V. I. Lenin. *Collected Works*, Vol. 30, p. 177.

means private ownership and the corresponding forms of distribution, its "democracy" is in reality nothing but an illusion.

Capitalist society is marked by huge imbalances in the distribution of property and income. Western sociologists have estimated that 0.5 per cent of the US population own 22 per cent of the country's wealth. In West Germany 74 per cent of the means of production are in the hands of 1.7 per cent of the population, and the position is no better in France, Canada, Sweden, Japan, etc. Property inequality always and inevitably begets political inequality, while private property gives power and influence to those who possess it. In such circumstances the formally democratic institutions function overtly or covertly in the interests of plutocracy, i.e. government by the wealthy. The economic system of bourgeois society ensures the domination of capital and acts against the interests of the people. It is therefore unable to produce genuine democracy.

Marxism-Leninism is a scientifically based theory providing answers to all questions concerned with the transformation of unjust social relations such as are characteristic of capitalism into a new type of social system, which is a historically inevitable stage of development and whose advantages are increasingly being recognized by ever broader sections of the population. The contemporary political world gives irrefutable proof that a large section of mankind is dissatisfied with the conditions of its existence and longs for social change.

There are many ways of understanding these phenomena and various methods of political action for those forces opposing the bourgeois social order. It is quite clear, however, that Marxism-Leninism has become an influential political theory in the modern world and that socialism has been accepted by millions of people as the only alternative to a society dominated by monopoly capital.

The bourgeois scholars also seek to oppose socialism ideologically by distorting the theoretical foundations of politics and interpreting political problems in the light of relativism and technicism. They try to dissolve the problems arising from the global confrontation of the two socio-economic systems in the spontaneous and irrational sphere of politics, in the uncertainty and vagueness of political demands and the pluralism of political forces.

A Critique of Bourgeois Elitist and Pluralist Models of Political Democracy

In bourgeois sociology the question of popular involvement in politics or in the exercise of democracy is one of the most confused. The variety of answers suggested by bourgeois ideologists is frequently attested as proof of the pluralistic nature of contemporary capitalism and the special complexity of its social structures. But no hint is ever given that the problem of democratic order under imperialism is essentially insolvable. So long as the holy of holies of the capitalist mode of production—private ownership of the means of production and exploitation of wage labor—remains intact, bourgeois democracy will perfectly conform to its characterization by Lenin as curtailed, half-hearted and intended for the rich and against the poor. Alterations and modernizations of the bourgeois political institutions under the current scientific and technical revolution do not change their class nature or oppressive character and certainly do not make them any more democratic.

The difficulties facing the political system of the industrial societies are frequently described by bourgeois political scientists as a "crisis of democracy". In fact this crisis flows from the absence of any genuine democracy as well as the faults, deficiencies and sterility of the majority of bourgeois political institutions. The scientific and technical revolution provides all the necessary conditions for the development of democracy by raising educational standards, widening horizons, bringing people closer together and arousing interest in social creativity and active cooperation. However, the political system of capitalism is incapable of using the people's experience and knowledge in the interests of social progress. Consequently the more industrialized capitalist society becomes, the greater is the contradiction between the need for democratizing the political relations and the real possibilities for achieving this.

Contemporary bourgeois political scientists are stubbornly trying to find a way out of the present crisis in the political system of capitalism and give an optimistic evaluation for the prospects of bourgeois democracy. Two main trends can be distinguished in their thinking, depending on how they answer the question of the essence of democracy and the

opportunities for citizens' participation in it. One of these is the elitist theory of democracy which is now fairly widespread in the United States and other capitalist countries. The other is connected with the concept of a pluralist democracy, which clearly reflects the desire of the liberal bourgeoisie to confront the different political forces and manoeuvre among them, making wide use of pseudo-democratic phraseology for the purpose. We shall briefly describe these two trends which demonstrate clearly that the bourgeoisie has no intention whatsoever of encouraging genuine mass democracy.

There are many bourgeois theories that try to show that democracy, even in the form it existed among the ancient Athenians, is impossible in the modern world. Gone, they claim, are the times of noisy democratic gatherings, when everyone could give his opinion and cast his vote. The power to make decisions must now reside with individuals or small groups, who have come to lead society in a "natural" way. The advocates of such views maintain that the people are incapable of making political decisions and incompetent to judge important social issues, for the thoughts of the man-in-the-street, so they say, are primitive and superficial and his behavior conditioned by spontaneous psychic reactions such as fear, hunger, the destructive instinct, etc. Thus a creative elite must rule society, which it can only do if it is in a position to dominate the people.

Elitist political theories are many and varied both conceptually and ideologically, ranging from the conservative to the liberal, but they all hold one thing in common which is a division of society into those who have power (the elite) and those who are subjected to it (the people).

These theories have a long history. But just confining ourselves to contemporary elitist theories, particularly those developed in the United States is sufficient to show that they have been strongly influenced by reactionary doctrines that came into being in the atmosphere and under the patronage of the fascist regimes that once existed in Europe. This was a time when reactionary political views were widely current, people were held in contempt and heroes and leaders idolized. The Spanish philosopher Ortega y Gasset placed his hopes for the future of Western civilization on the ability of a cultured elite to rule the masses. The people, he believed, should be made passive and respectful for this in ac-

cordance with the mediocrity of their nature. A dyed-in-the-wool reactionary, Gasset passed haughty judgement on the masses who "by their very nature cannot and must not manage their own existences, let alone govern society".¹

In the 'twenties and 'thirties two Italian sociologists, Vilfredo Pareto and Gaetano Mosca, developed elitist theories that were fundamentally hostile to the democratic development of society.² They both saw democracy as a myth, which nevertheless might become "dangerous" as a catalyst of socialist revolution. Every use of democratic slogans they considered an act of irresponsible political demagoguery. It is generally considered that Mosca was the first to formulate many of the catch-phrases of democratic elitism, which are now met frequently in the works of a number of bourgeois political scientists.

All societies, claimed Mosca, have two classes—the rulers and the ruled. "The first class, always the less numerous, performs all political functions, monopolizes power and enjoys the advantages that power brings, whereas the second, the more numerous class, is directed and controlled by the first, in a manner that is now more or less legal, now more or less arbitrary and violent. . . ." ³ The elite, according to Mosca, are better organized and have intellectual and moral superiority over the masses. Like Pareto, Mosca was upholding the absolute right of the elite to manipulate the masses and freely dispose of the wealth created by them.

At first glance it is not exactly clear why judgements of this kind should be designated by bourgeois sociology as a theory of elitist democracy. What we in fact have is a pattern of a complete anti-democratic doctrine. The point, however, is that Mosca nevertheless recognized general elections as an act giving rise to the powers of the elite. It is

¹ José Ortega y Gasset. *La rebelión de las masas*, Ediciones de la Revista de Occidente, Madrid, 1968, p. 61.

² Contemporary Western literature on the political views of Pareto and Mosca is very considerable. See James H. Meisel. *The Myth of the Ruling Class. Gaetano Mosca and the "Elite"*, Ann Arbor, University of Michigan Press, 1958; Suzanne Keller. *Beyond the Ruling Class. Strategic Elites in Modern Society*. Random House, New York, 1963; George C. Homans and Charles P. Curtis, Jr. *An Introduction to Pareto. His Sociology*, Alfred A. Knopf, New York, 1934.

³ Quoted from Peter Bachrach. *The Theory of Democratic Elitism. A Critique*. University of London Press Ltd., London, 1969, pp. 11-12.

true that Mosca himself never attached much importance to elections,¹ but other theoreticians of political elitism like the American economist Joseph Schumpeter, stress in the concept of democracy the opportunity for the people to pick their elite. According to Schumpeter's theory, there are always several elites in society vying with each other for the electors' votes. "Democracy means only that the people have the opportunity of accepting or refusing the men who are to rule them".² The public at large only enter the political arena at election time, outside of which they have no opportunity for bringing any pressure to bear upon the elite, even by means of letters or telegrams. No deals between the elite and the people are considered by Schumpeter to be desirable.³ However, at the following elections the public can change its mind and elect a new elite.

The principles of elitist democracy have also been advanced in the various theoretical works of Walter Lippmann. There are two circumstances, he believes, preventing the man-in-the-street from taking part in the political life of society: first, his inability to understand politics properly, because the ideas that people have in their heads do not automatically correspond to reality and so their judgement is distorted; secondly, people are inclined to think in stereotypes.⁴ Very few members of society have sufficient experience, ability and knowledge or, in fact, time to bring their ideas up date with the modern world in all its complexity. The only ones who can are the professional politicians, the elite who are capable of ruling society and more or less successfully overcoming "epistemological difficulties". The elite, he believes, should enjoy a fair degree of independence from the people. It gives people "not what they

¹ "What happens," writes Mosca, "in other forms of government—namely that an organized minority imposes its will on the disorganized majority—happens also and to perfection, whatever the appearance to the contrary, under the representative system. When we say that the voters "choose" their representative, we are using a language that is very inexact. The truth is that the representative has himself elected by the voters..." (Peter Bachrach. *Op. cit.*, p. 12).

² Joseph A. Schumpeter. *Capitalism, Socialism and Democracy*, George Allen & Unwin Ltd., London, 1959, pp. 269, 284-85.

³ See *Ibid.*, pp. 272, 294-95.

⁴ See Walter Lippmann. *Public Opinion*, The Macmillan Co., New York, 1954.

want but what they will learn to want".¹ The people enter into politics only in crisis situations, but not in order to decide political issues in substance. Their task is only to neutralize, as it were, arbitrariness which makes the normal political regulation more difficult. In other words, they help the elite translate its superior knowledge into practice in the face of any possible opposition from its politically less competent rivals.

These well-known political theoreticians have been echoed by a number of American political scientists who wrote in the 'forties and 'fifties (Robert and Helen Lynd, Floyd Hunter, etc.), as well as by present-day authors whose conceptions frequently reflect the now current philosophy of technocracy.² These authors try to draw a veil over the class nature of power relations in capitalist society. But the older theoreticians, despite their reservations and comments, nevertheless recognized the obvious fact that political power in society is closely linked with economic power and that the man who possesses property and wealth is by virtue of this a man of power. Many of these moreover recognized that a basic condition for membership of an elite is high economic status and income superiority. As for the technocrats, they claim that the technological revolution has brought about a cardinal change in the criteria adopted by society when forming its ruling elites. Contrary to the realities of the political life in the capitalist countries, they claim that the ownership of the means of production and wealth are no longer the factors ensuring the power and influence in the state. These now belong to those with specialized knowledge

¹ Walter Lippmann. *A Preface to Morals*, The Macmillan Co., New York, 1929, pp. 282-83.

² See Geraint Parry. *Political Elites*, George Allen and Unwin Ltd., London, 1969; Gabriel A. Almond, Sidney Verba. *The Civic Culture. Political Attitudes and Democracy in Five Nations*, Little, Brown and Co., Boston and Toronto, 1965; R. T. McKenzie. *British Political Parties. The Distribution of Power Within the Conservative and Labour Parties*, Frederick A. Praeger, Publisher., New York, London, 1964; Lester W. Milbrath. *Political Participation. How and Why Do People Get Involved in Politics?*, Rand McNally and Co., Chicago, 1965; Thomas R. Dye, L. Harmon Zeigler. *The Irony of Democracy. An Uncommon Introduction to American Politics*, Wadsworth Publishing Company, Inc., Belmont, California, 1971; James Q. Wilson, *The Amateur Democrat. Club Politics in Three Cities*. The University of Chicago Press, Chicago, 1962; V. O. Key, Jr., *Public Opinion and American Democracy*, Alfred A. Knopf, New York, 1961; and others.

and professional experience, who alone are able to competently govern society.

This process, according to the American economist John Galbraith, develops primarily in the sphere of capitalist economy and has allegedly resulted in the setting up of a modern technicalized enterprise with its own apparatus of management and decision-making. In the modern corporation, he claims, power is gradually being transferred from owners to managers, who owe their authority legally to the shareholders and are accountable to them.¹ Galbraith welcomes the increase in the role of managerial personnel at an enterprise, believing that contemporary capitalist economy must replace private authority by state authority and that large industrial enterprises must be gradually turned into instruments of the state. He holds that even now the industrial system and the state act in concert. "In notable respects the mature corporation is an arm of the state. And the state, in important matters, is an instrument of the industrial system."² This does not mean that Galbraith is advancing his concept of state-monopoly capitalism. He simply derives the system of power relations, under which managers rule both in the state and the enterprise, from the structure of a society where there will soon be no poor and no rich, no workers and no exploiters, but just those that are competent or incompetent from the point of view of management.

Such views are refuted by the history of capitalism and the presence of the tremendous power concentrated in the hands of the exploiters and by the difficulties which face the democratic and progressive forces trying to weaken this power or to place it under political control. The real situation in the capitalist economic world shows that it is not the managers who impose their will upon the owners of the basic means of production, but rather the reverse: the managers' real power is rooted in the power of monopoly capital. Membership of the most influential ruling elite is determined not by knowledge, ability or experience (although these, of course, are not without significance), but mainly by high economic and social status, business and financial connections and a big personal income. The big-business tycoons,

¹ See John Kenneth Galbraith. *The New Industrial State*, Hamish Hamilton, London, 1967, p. 49.

² *Ibid.*, p. 296.

the finance magnates and the members of the military-industrial complex are an operational elite acting behind the scenes, whose power is stable and needs no mandate from democratic election. Civil servants and members of representative organs are simply the obedient executors of their will.

Many books and articles have appeared in recent years in the capitalist countries, particularly the United States, West Germany and France, which draw on numerous data to show the tremendous growth in the overt and covert power of big capital—superpowerful corporations forming the military-industrial complex.¹ These publications openly discuss the situation in the capitalist countries and, naturally, leave the bourgeois theoreticians without a leg to stand on when these maintain that the technocratic methods of government have replaced the plutocratic methods in the capitalist state.

A common feature of bourgeois political theories advocating the elitist model of democracy is their sceptical attitude to the man-in-the-street's ability to take part in politics. Many political scientists, particularly those in America, claim they would welcome broad democracy and the inclusion of every citizen in the political system, but the point is, they say, that such a democracy is unfeasible, for the "objective laws" of society demonstrate that the masses are politically inert, apathetic, and often completely alienated from politics.

Conclusions such as these are as a rule accompanied by statistics and the results of sociological experiments which point to the low level of political involvement among those sections of the population that form the base of the bourgeois social pyramid and to an increasing involvement among groups with higher incomes and a better standard of education. It is well known that the greatest political activity among the population occurs at times of presidential or parliamentary elections. However, according to the American sociologist Thomas Dye, "about 65 per cent of the American people will vote in a hard-fought presidential campaign. Fully one-third of the population are politically apathetic and passive; they do not vote and they are largely unaware

¹ See, for instance, Robert Heilbroner and others. *In the Name of Profit. Profiles in Corporate Irresponsibility*, Doubleday and Co. Inc., New York, 1972; Morton Mintz and Jerry S. Cohen. *America, Inc. Who Owns and Operates the United States*, The Dial Press, New York, 1971.

of the political life of the nation. All of these proportions apply to presidential elections in the United States. In state elections the ranks of participants diminish and the ranks of the apathetic grow".¹

Those who favor elitist political models dispassionately state the lack of mass participation in politics in the capitalist countries. For them it is just one more proof that society is run by elites and that elitist theories are in full accord with facts. But the question arises to what degree such political practices are correct. In actual fact mass political apathy, just as mass electoral absenteeism is not an inherent feature of human society. It is rather the result of many centuries of domination by a social system based on the private ownership of the means of production and the exploitation of man by man. It is an outcome of the prolonged effect of the varied destructive forces of social, economic, political and cultural alienation, which have achieved their apogee in capitalist society. Under the capitalist system the working people possess immeasurably worse conditions for participation in politics than the members of the dominant class and the bourgeois intelligentsia. During its history capitalism has developed a system of social and political institutions which serve to restrict, impede and block the political activity of the ordinary citizens.

Bourgeois ideologists have had the time and money at their disposal to inculcate the belief that politics is something above and beyond the ordinary man, that it is the province of powerful people in parliament and that the most the ordinary man has to do is vote in elections. The bourgeois state has always taken special concern about a strict regulation of the procedure and forms of mass participation in politics and striven to reduce this participation to the minimum under given conditions. At the beginning of this century Walter Hellinek, a prominent German specialist in administrative law, wrote: "The state has always been greatly suspicious about certain forms of human activity. The only man it considers completely harmless is he who remains in peace and solitude within his own four walls."²

¹ Thomas R. Dye. *Politics, Economics and the Public. Policy Outcomes in the American States*, Rand McNally & Co., Chicago, Illinois, 1966.

² W. Hellinek. *Verwaltungsrecht*, Verlag von Julius Springer, Berlin, 1928, S. 459.

In general the ideal citizen for the exploitative state is the docile and obedient philistine, who accepts blindly what he is told by his rulers and who, on the rare occasions that he is allowed near a ballot box, votes for the candidate that has the support of the government press and the official propaganda. Such a citizen is not only submissive, but is proud of his submissiveness and holds himself up as an example to other citizens. It goes without saying that such an ideal is far from existing in the present-day capitalist world. But the main thing is that capitalism, its state and political institutions have discredited themselves to a much greater extent than before in the eyes of the broad sections of the public. The present-day capitalist with his vast income and political influence is now living on borrowed time, for many are beginning to question his right to colossal profits and publicly reveal the secret channels and hidden connections whereby he guarantees his privileged position.

The bourgeois world is now undergoing what American writers call a credibility crisis even though, as a rule, they tend to keep silent about the objects of distrust. These include primarily the capitalist system as a whole, the mode of production and distribution of the social wealth, the oppressive nature of the majority of the social and political institutions, and particularly the false and hypocritical nature of bourgeois moral values. More and more people are beginning to realize that capitalism is the sworn and implacable enemy of society. This is the basis for the aggravating conflict between capital and society and increasing confrontation between them, as soon as people realize their genuine interests and consider the prospects for progress. For many of them it becomes clear that the bourgeois state is on the side of the monopolies in this conflict, and this is directly related to the problem of mass participation in the politics of the bourgeois state.

In the world today the view is hardly justified that electoral absenteeism and political non-involvement demonstrate indifference and apathy or the lack of social activity and absence of serious political interests. More often the reason lies in lack of belief in state policy, a kind of protest against the ruling elite. The modern imperialist state is increasingly exposing itself as the instrument of suppression acting in the interest of monopoly capital. Of course, far from all the social strata that have realized this truth (which

was long ago revealed by Marxism-Leninism), are able to take the correct political course of action.

The monopolies have perfectly adapted themselves to the economy in which the state plays a prominent role. They have learned how to evade the formal restrictions and bans set up by the anti-trust and tax legislation. Taking advantage of their close union with the state, they minimize economic risk, make profits, and compensate their losses from the state budget, i.e. at the tax-payer's expense.

The fact is that the development of economic functions under state-monopoly capitalism has resulted in the state having become a very expensive organization. It always did have enormous financial and material resources, but these have now reached unprecedented levels. The state today costs the workers far more than any time before.

Statistics for many of the developed capitalist countries show that over the past 50-60 years taxation has risen at a faster rate than middle incomes and the growth of social wealth as a whole. This means that the state has become a powerful organization that is continually enriching itself at the expense of rank-and-file tax-payers. Taxes on monopoly profits, on the other hand, occupy a very modest place in the revenue structure. The burden of taxation lies mainly on the workers, for in the final analysis "the poor pay for everything". On top of all this the state budget becomes a virtual bonanza for the private corporations, who are given considerable tax concessions as well as direct subsidies and state grants. A considerable part of the revenues collected by the state in the form of taxes, instead of being used for the common good, trickle away down various channels and finally end up in the pockets of the small group of people that represent the big monopolies, the army and the bureaucracy.

As the bourgeois state becomes more and more exploitative, it more and more conflicts with the public interest. This undoubtedly complicates the relationship between the individual and the state in bourgeois society and is at the root of the crisis facing many of the bourgeois political institutions. Only an understanding of the deep antagonism between society and the state in the modern capitalist world can explain why large sections of the population have ceased to believe in the traditional forms of political activity and why the political energy of certain sections of the youth,

for example, is often expressed in terms of violent action.

Thus the idea of an "inert and apathetic mass" is nothing but a fiction created by bourgeois political theoreticians with the aim of justifying the anti-democratic elitist methods of ruling society. The facts of non-involvement in politics cannot serve as empirical proof of the correctness of elitist political themes because such behavior is not necessarily prompted by passivity and indifference. It is precisely these facts which show that the longing for social change and the social activity of the working people which it gives rise to have gone beyond the framework of official politics and reflect the people's deep alienation from the bourgeois state. The further capitalist society develops, the more pressure the state has to exert to stop the flood of massive political activity. At the same time the political organizations of the bourgeoisie—its parties and in particular the state bodies—not only try to and do organize the political activity of their own class, but try to turn the political activity of the other classes to their own advantage, using to this end demagoguery, deceit, bribery and various social concessions.

There exists one further factor in the capitalist world, which has historically conditioned the involvement or non-involvement of the masses in politics. The age-old alienation of the workers from politics, which is characteristic of capitalism at all stages of its development, and the tendency to keep politics within a narrow circle without and against the people, have had a peculiar effect on the public. Many people have come to hold the view that politics is in some way inimical to, or, at any rate, way above their heads, so they had better abstain from it.

The distrust felt by the people for the politics of the bourgeois states is quite natural, but the pessimism caused by the policies of the capitalist parties and governments is rooted deep down in the consciousness of certain sections of the population, and as a result of this their distrust is spread to politics in general.

The Soviet state which arose as a state of workers and peasants has decisively and irreversibly eliminated alienation between the individual and the state policy, which was formed as a result of prejudice, mistrust and scepticism. In socialist society, said Lenin, there is no other power over the working people than the power of their own association. Being precisely such an association the Soviet socialist state

relies on the activity and political initiative of the masses and in the final analysis on the social activeness of the individual. Under socialism for the first time in human history politics becomes a matter of concern for the broad mass of people.

The socialist revolution gave priority to the question of the political creativity of the masses. "Creative activity at the grass roots is the basic factor of the new public life," declared Lenin. "...Living creative socialism is the product of the masses themselves."¹

Politics and government, i.e. the spheres which previously were the exclusive prerogative of the ruling class, have become a field for the practical activity of all the working people. The development of the social and political system of socialism and of the principles of genuine Soviet democracy has resulted in a new understanding of the freedom of the individual, which is unthinkable without his active involvement in the exercise of political power and in running the state.

The theory of scientific communism and the experience of socialist construction have freed the concept of democracy from its bourgeois-liberal and utopian overtones and from its distortions by the apologists for the ruling classes. Marxism-Leninism rejects as absolutely unfounded the views that the bulk of the population is a "silent majority" which has no serious political interests and is unable to take part in the running of society and the state. Lenin was particularly adamant in his opposition to such ideas. "At all costs," he wrote, "we must break the old, *absurd*, savage, despicable and disgusting prejudice that only the so-called 'upper classes', only the rich, and those who have gone through the school of the rich, are capable of administering the state and directing the organisational development of socialist society."² He frequently stressed that after the proletariat and its class allies took power the main function of the socialist political system and of all socialist organizations, from the state down to the cooperatives, was to provide each working man with the opportunity of actively taking part in politics. The achievement of such an aim cannot be postponed on any pretext, in particular because of the inexperience of the masses or their lack of education or political knowledge.

¹ V. I. Lenin. *Collected Works*, Vol. 26, p. 288.

² *Ibid.*, p. 409.

The country was in a sorry state when the Soviet government and Lenin's party inherited it. The population was predominantly peasant and it was among the most culturally backward in the world. Ignorance and illiteracy reigned in the villages, and the church tried to suppress and control all aspects of cultural life. As far as the national regions were concerned the position was even worse, with the population at the early feudal or even tribal stage of development.

Only someone with the political wisdom and foresight of Lenin could have considered that involving the working people in the running of the country was a practical task of the first magnitude for the party and the state. Lenin believed it a fully realizable ideal that socialist democracy would follow a course when all citizens without exception would take part in administering the country, be fully trained in the exercise of the power that belongs to the working class, and actively participate in economic and cultural construction. He pointed to the necessity for "systematically drawing an ever greater number of citizens, and subsequently *each and every* citizen, into direct and *daily* performance of their share of the burdens of administering the state".¹ This is the ideal democracy where there is no longer any problem of majority and minority, for it is democracy for all and each. "Our aim is to ensure that *every* toiler, having finished his eight hours' 'task' in productive labour, shall perform state duties *without pay*."² Lenin not only set this ideal as a realizable political objective, but mapped out the paths by which it could be achieved.

The Marxist-Leninist idea of democracy has one further characteristic. It can be clearly seen when compared to those bourgeois theories which as distinct from the elitist models already examined claim to recognize the right of each man to take part in the political life of society. What we mean is the theories of pluralist democracy, which reflect certain trends in contemporary bourgeois liberalism and neo-liberalism.

According to the basic tenet of pluralism, power in contemporary capitalist society does not belong to an elite or to any other political organization like the state, but is distributed among innumerable social groups, each of which is competent and independent in its own field. The

¹ V. I. Lenin. *Collected Works*, Vol. 27, p. 156.

² *Ibid.*, p. 273.

American political scientist Robert Dahl, who adheres to this trend, writes: "The fundamental axiom in the theory and practice of pluralism is, I believe, this: Instead of a single center of sovereign power there must be multiple centers of power, none of which is or can be wholly sovereign. Although the only legitimate sovereign is the people, in the perspective of American pluralism even the people ought never to be an absolute sovereign; consequently no part of the people, such as a majority, ought to be absolutely sovereign."¹ The state is only considered as one group among many without the right to the final word on individual and social preferences or to control the existing apparatus of political decision-making.² However, this control is further impossible, claim the pluralists, because politics has no fixed or firm structure, power relations in society being highly unstable. Groups appear and disappear depending on the needs and interests of people brought together for the purpose of decision-making. After this a given system of power relations disappears and is replaced by another which is necessary for the next decision.

Dahl calls the systems of such groups polyarchies. They have complex internal relationships (between leaders and members) and external connections (getting agreement between groups), and include such varied organizations as governments, states and provinces, innumerable towns and villages, trade unions, associations, religious groups, "primitive" societies, etc. The number of polyarchies is great.³ Politics, according to Dahl, is nothing more than continuous negotiations between different centers of power with the aim of taking decisions, while the leaders and citizens should be ready to settle their disputes peacefully with regard not only for their own needs but for those of all interested parties.

¹ Robert A. Dahl. *Pluralist Democracy in the United States: Conflict and Consent*, Rand McNally and Co., Chicago, 1967, p. 24.

² See Dan Nimmo, Thomas D. Unga. *American Political Patterns. Conflict and Concensus*, Little, Brown and Co., Boston, 1967, pp. 21-22.

³ See Robert A. Dahl. *A Preface to Democratic Theory*, The University of Chicago Press, Chicago, 1956; Robert A. Dahl, Charles E. Lindblom. *Politics, Economics and Welfare. Planning and Politico-Economic Systems Resolved into Basic Social Processes*, Harper & Brothers, New York, 1953; Robert A. Dahl. *Polyarchy. Participation and Opposition*, New Haven and London, Yale University Press, 1971.

The theoreticians of pluralist democracy believe they have found the solution to the problem of political participation, by showing each man the individuality of his political role and interests. Polyarchy, according to Dahl, is a function of the political activity of members of society.¹ The pluralists maintain that power is an attribute of individuals in their relations with other individuals in the process of decision-making; there is no stable difference between the elite and the masses, and the individual is free to move from one political group to another according to his own interests. Everyone may express his opinion and be an active member of several groups at once. Political activity is that which is practised by the individual within the group, which makes decisions at its own level and according to the common interest of its members. The American congressman voting on the question of financing important government projects, and the housewife at the school council deciding whether or not to buy theatrical costumes for the children are both taking part in politics, but each is acting within the framework of a different group, which has its own particular function.

In Soviet sociological literature the bourgeois theories of pluralism have often been subjected to critical analysis and it has been noted in particular that these theories tend to obscure the serious political class conflicts that exist in present-day capitalist society with a mass of petty superficial contradictions. Criticism has also been levelled on the theory that all sections of the population and all classes have now been integrated into the political system. We would now like to draw attention to two circumstances which show just how far the bourgeois models of political pluralism are from the genuinely democratic objectives of society.

The first of these is connected with the attempts to give theoretical justification to the dispersion of political power, which has been evident in contemporary capitalist society. The bourgeoisie as the ruling class, sheltering behind various kinds of technocratic theories and demands to raise the professional level of decision-making, is in fact redistributing the centers of power to its own advantage, and arbitrarily reallocating the competence between them. As a result

¹ Robert A. Dahl. *A Preface to Democratic Theory*, p. 81.

of tactics like this, decision of the most important questions is often transferred to areas far removed from or completely inaccessible to the public and so out of their control. The political gains here are not, naturally enough, felt by philatelic societies or dumb-friends leagues, but by powerful, well-organized economic amalgamations—the corporations.

One of the characteristic contradictions of contemporary bourgeois society is that the desire of some powerful social groups to achieve the greatest possible political independence and considerably extend their rights is not matched by their readiness to accept a similar share of responsibility to society. Various arms concerns, big corporations and bourgeois parties, while virtually exercising power over society and deciding its fate, decline at the same time to accept responsibility to it. The fact that the voter can take no part in decisions on vitally important issues owing to their being placed outside the jurisdiction of the state and into the competence of other political structures, severely infringes the political rights of the working people.

Characteristic in this respect is the following statement in a West-German periodical by a citizen of Switzerland—generally thought to be a model of bourgeois democracy, where the citizens are frequently called to vote on the issues of state policy. “What we actually decide are just purely local trivialities. The significant issues facing our country are decided in places that are completely beyond the bounds of democratic control—the industrial concerns, the major banks, the military high command, special committees of political factions, and the faculties and senates of our universities. It is hardly surprising that we have little more than a thirty per cent turn out at elections.”¹

It is self-evident that the tendency to an actual limitation of state power, disguised as it is under slogans of pluralist democracy, represents a threat to the democratic gains of the workers. The constitutionally established and legally regulated connections between the state and the citizen are more or less under control, but in the overall mass of political connections, many of which are of an accidental and impersonal nature, this control is lost, and the opportunities for the individual citizen to exert influence over the adminis-

¹ *Neue Sammlung*, Marz/April, 1969, Heft 2, S. 114.

trative processes and the development of society are being increasingly limited.

As distinct from the Marxist-Leninist notions of the importance of democracy, bourgeois pluralism emasculates the essence of democratic involvement in politics if only because it presents government activity as an ordinary and not the decisive factor of political life. A constructive theory of democracy is impossible without recognition of the leading role of the state in politics, for, as Lenin pointed out, the most significant thing in politics is the organization of state power.¹ "Politics is participation in *state* affairs, directing the state, and determination of the forms, tasks, and content of state activities. . . ."² The pluralist theories which deny this fact are a clear reflection of current bourgeois attempts to distract the working people from major political issues of our time, limit their social activity with insignificant petty problems and channel their initiative into solving all "local trivialities".

The second fact that brings out the futility of pluralist claims to express the prospects of mass democracy (which is allegedly possible in capitalist society) concerns the type of man put forward by the pluralists as the "democratic citizen". What sort of an individual can he be, who "freely" moves from one political group to another, takes decisions here, there and everywhere, and who is continually changing sides and switching allegiances, likes and dislikes, etc? The short answer from the pluralists is that he is a man of action who is trying to gain the maximum advantage from each situation.

It is worth remembering in this connection that the general philosophical base of contemporary pluralism is chiefly pragmatism with its specific interpretation of experience and no less specific method of overcoming contradictions between knowledge and action. What is important for a man facing the need to take a political decision? Bourgeois political scientists, echoing the pragmatic philosophers, would answer that he must think of what he stands most to gain. Furthermore, each situation can only be understood in terms of itself, and not on the basis of any pre-set rules. Political decision-making in the United States is free from any pre-set

¹ See V. I. Lenin. *Collected Works*, Vol. 19, p. 122.

² V. I. Lenin. *Complete Works*, Fifth Russ. ed., Vol. 33, p. 340.

notions or preconceived ideas, claim American political scientists. It is independent both of any political lines or general programs and of position on any other questions, even similar to those that are being decided. "Policies and decisions," declare Zbigniew Brzezinski and Samuel Huntington, "can seldom be rationalized in terms of any systematic doctrine. They are hodgepodes compounded of varying viewpoints."¹ Here politics are presented as a totality of empirically determined solutions to a large number of individual situations.

The theoretical maxims of the pragmatists in their pluralistic refraction have led to the postulation of an idealized "democratic man" who fulfils himself in politics and has no need for other stimuli. Politics, according to the pluralists, is the personal concern of each man, connected above all with the realization of his own interests. The difference between those who participate in political decision-making and those who do not arises primarily from their interests in general and the degree of particular interest in any given issue. Those who do not wish to take part, are simply not involved in that particular issue, and there is no point in artificially involving them and so forcing them into uncharacteristic behavior and unnecessary action.

Pluralists also dismiss the question of the creative political education of the masses. Since an optimal decision can only be reached on the basis of the specific peculiarities of the situation, then there exist no common standards, rules, traditions, precedents, ideology or political programs for pluralist democratic man, i.e. all that which has gradually been developed by social experience and assimilated by the individual in the course of his education. It is not accidental that the pluralists stress the art rather than the science of decision-making. Talent they consider to be the main qualification for political activity and in this their position is akin to that of the elitists. Despite their pseudo-democratic phraseology, the pluralist ideologists are essentially indifferent to the political fate of the man-in-the-street. In a situation where there are many centers of power he is left to himself. The structures and institutions of pluralist society are not even theoretically orientated to help the ordinary man fulfil his political function.

¹ Zbigniew Brzezinski and Samuel P. Huntington. *Political Power: USA/USSR*, The Viking Press, New York, 1966, p. 43.

We can see how far contemporary pluralist doctrines with their claims to solve the problems of democracy in bourgeois society remain behind the theory and practice of socialist democracy as inspired by the ideas of Lenin.

He pointed out that political activity is not a purely personal matter for each man and that it acquires particular significance when incorporated in the political activity of the people. The theory of socialist democracy, as distinct from bourgeois elitist views, states that the right of every citizen to take part in politics cannot be made dependent on property status, cultural level or political experience, etc. But, on the other hand, it does not pass over the fact that the real possibilities for political involvement are directly conditioned by economic, cultural and educational standards. The improvement of these is the task of socialist society as a whole. As distinct from bourgeois pluralism the theory of socialist democracy is based on the idea of developing the personality, which is capable of achieving ever greater levels of general and political culture. Lenin realized that there would be tremendous difficulties facing Soviet society on this path. "We are not utopians. We know that an unskilled labourer or a cook cannot immediately get on with the job of state administration."¹ Long, planned and conscious work by the party, the state and the whole of society is necessary before the people in general and every citizen in particular can become active makers of politics.

At all stages of its development the Soviet socialist state has solved innumerable complex problems arising from the need to increase the political culture and experience of the masses. After the Great October Socialist Revolution political institutions were created of an essentially higher social level than those left by tsarist Russia. Consequently the state, the state organs and all the political institutions of society had the special responsibility of raising the cultural level of all social relations, political included.

In answer to the Social-Democratic pedants who rebuked the Bolsheviks for having carried out a socialist revolution in a country which in terms of culture was not ready to accept socialism, Lenin wrote: "If a definite level of culture is required for the building of socialism, why cannot we begin by first achieving the prerequisites for that definite

¹ V. I. Lenin. *Collected Works*, Vol. 26, p. 113.

level of culture in a revolutionary way, and *then*, with the aid of the workers' and peasants' government and the Soviet system, proceed to overtake the other nations?"¹

The political institutions which embodied the idea of victorious socialism became the main instruments for developing the new culture in a situation when political revolution preceded cultural revolution.

Of course, this confronted the political institutions of socialism with complex problems. Attempts to explain slogans, indicate political tasks and objectives, and inculcate faith in the political ideals of socialism came up against the general lack of political culture and experience among the people and even among many of the leaders who had been thrown up by the revolution. Lenin emphasized that a cultured approach was necessary to the work of the state. Particularly crucial, he said, were the cultural problems that related to the work of the state apparatus. Workers involved in the struggle for socialism, "would like to build a better apparatus for us, but they do not know how. They cannot build one. They have not yet developed the culture required for this; and it is culture that is required. Nothing will be achieved in this by doing things in a rush, by assault, by whim or vigour, or in general, by any of the best human qualities".²

In order to improve the work of the state apparatus, Lenin said, it is necessary among other things to thoroughly study the art of state administration, organize smooth and efficient work in the Soviet institutions, and set up a sound supervisory body which would be the means of improving the whole apparatus.

But perhaps the most important change in the establishment of cultured attitudes towards the socialist state and its apparatus was considered by Lenin to be the successful involvement of the working people in state administration. The Soviet government, proclaiming the principles of broad democracy abolished all the political and legal obstacles erected by the bourgeoisie to prevent the working people from taking part in the exercise of state power, although for some time to come a significant section of the working people was unable to enjoy the fruits of socialist democ-

¹ *Ibid.*, Vol. 33, pp. 478-79.

² *Ibid.*, p. 488.

racy. On this matter Lenin declared in 1919: "The Soviet apparatus is accessible to all the working people in word, but actually it is far from being accessible to all of them, as we all know. And not because the laws prevent it from being so, as was the case under the bourgeoisie; on the contrary, our laws assist in this respect. But in this matter laws alone are not enough. A vast amount of educational, organizational and cultural work is required; this cannot be done rapidly by legislation but demands a vast amount of work over a long period."¹

The main objective of cultural progress under socialism is not simply achieved when people learn how to read and write or when an effective educational system is introduced. It is a matter of developing conscious, or as Lenin put it, "cultured" attitudes of each man towards the state, society and other people. In relation to political attitudes, Lenin emphasized that culture is not only knowledge (about the socialist state, its principles, functioning, or the sources of its power, etc.), but the ability to apply this knowledge for the benefit of society.

A remarkable result of the efforts made by the Communist Party and the Soviet state, a result of the development of socialist society in the way indicated by Lenin, has been the creation of the political culture of socialism.

The actual term "political culture" is widely used in modern bourgeois political science but it would be wrong to think that it originated there, for Lenin himself used it when he said in reference to the problems of socialism: "The purpose of political culture, of political instruction, is to train genuine Communists capable of stamping out falsehood and prejudices and helping the working masses to vanquish the old system and build up a state without capitalists, without exploiters, and without landowners."² This statement fittingly defines the essence of political culture in socialist society, emphasizing the significance of its major elements, such as political consciousness, education and propaganda, and the social creativity of the masses. The political culture of socialism is a social factor and the leading role in its development belongs to the Communist Party as the organizer and educator of the masses. Under socialism the party is called upon to lead all forces of social progress,

¹ V. I. Lenin. *Collected Works*, Vol. 29, p. 179.

² *Ibid.*, Vol. 31, pp. 368-69.

and direct them towards a higher level of freedom, the conscious development of new social forms and creation of better living conditions.

The concept of political culture, like culture in general, expresses the scale of subjective historical creativity achieved by a given society, and the degree of people's freedom from objective (i.e. natural and social) necessity. In other words, a high level of political culture means that society adopts a conscious, scientifically based approach to politics and rational control over the social processes and that there exist tried and tested guarantees against destructive forces, chance happenings, and chaos and anonymity in political relations.

A specific feature of the political culture of socialism consists in its genuinely mass character. "The broadening of the working people's participation in the activities of the Soviets, in economic management, the growth of the activity of trade unions, the Komsomol and other public organizations make it imperative to raise the political level of the working people."¹ Political culture in socialist society implies agreement of views and ideals not just of a few individuals, but of millions of people. It implies collective political experience, combined with the people's foresight, realistic judgements, common sense, ability to take joint social action, and so on.

Thus the problem of political culture, seen in the light of the tasks posed by socialist democracy, characterizes not only the quantitative but also the qualitative aspects of mass participation in the political life of society. It is not simply a matter of a high level of the citizens' cultural and political consciousness determining their correct orientation on vital political issues and deep appreciation of the policy of the Communist Party and the socialist state, but that only by improving political culture can we assimilate a policy to the extent of giving it a definite direction, bringing about the required results, noting new trends in good time and anticipating events, etc. Moreover, the elements of political culture—political enlightenment, knowledge, experience, tact, etc.—guarantee realism in politics and the avoidance of extremes, and ensure that a practical approach does not develop into unprincipled practicism. Among the cultural qualities required of the man responsible for making politic-

¹ L. I. Brezhnev. *Following Lenin's Course*, p. 447.

al decisions are also the ability to estimate the effect of political action and to renounce local or departmental advantages in the interests of the state as a whole and think in terms of major advances tomorrow rather than minor successes today.

"Politics," said Lenin, "is a science and an art that does not fall from the skies or come gratis. . . ." ¹ Consequently, developing a political culture is a highly difficult and responsible task, demanding the greatest measure of purposeful activity. Success to a large degree is determined by the character of the socialist social system, which has created a firm basis for the consolidation of all social forces. Thanks to the socialist transformations in the economy, members of society are no longer alienated or subjected to conflicts and contradictions, and no longer waste their energies on fruitless and pointless tasks. This idea was aptly expressed by A. V. Lunacharsky ² in a speech to the 15th Congress of the CPSU(B) in 1927. He related his conversation with a French journalist who, struck by the thirst for knowledge and culture among Soviet people, had suggested that if the Soviet people ever reached anywhere near as high a level of education as the French people, there would be no one to oppose them. To this Lunacharsky had replied that if the Soviet people had approached the French level of education in technical and formal terms that would mean they would leave the French far behind, because educated French citizens were dispersed throughout the chaotic social system whereas in the USSR they were put together in one harmonious whole. ³ Today the achievements of the Soviet state in education and culture are recognized throughout the world. It has made comprehensive use of the advantages of socialism to develop the active social creativity of the Soviet people.

Measures designed to increase the political culture of socialist society have taken on added significance today, when worker participation in running the state and society has become particularly intensive. Being politically conscious for the Soviet citizens means the active acquisition

¹ V. I. Lenin. *Collected Works*, Vol. 31, p. 80.

² A. V. Lunacharsky (1875-1933) was a Soviet party leader, statesman, and publicist, literary critic and scholar.

³ See *Fifteenth Congress of the CPSU(B)*, December 1927. Verbatim Report. Vol. II, Moscow, 1962, p. 1120 (in Russian).

of the Marxist-Leninist theory, particularly the ideas of communism, an understanding and acceptance of the aims of Soviet society in the period of transition from socialism to communism, the awareness of the unity of personal interests with the interests of society and state in politics, economics, culture, etc., and finally the ability to apply political theory to the concrete problems of social practice. The degree of the citizens' active participation in political and public affairs is a real and important indication of the advantages of socialism and the achievements made by Soviet socialist society.

Chapter V

SCIENTIFIC MANAGEMENT OF SOCIETY AND DEMOCRATIC CENTRALISM

Essence of Scientific Management of Society

Management is the indispensable property or attribute of society at all stages of its development. It is a universal property which results from the systematic nature of society, from social and collective labor, from the necessity to communicate and exchange the products of material and cultural labor.

Labor was, is and will always remain social labor. For man to stand up to the powerful forces of nature and win from them the necessities of life, he has had, from the very first stages of his existence, to unite together with other men and work collectively. But the work collective is impossible without order and organization, which gives each man his place, his function and his rights and duties. A division of labor, that is the establishment of certain proportions between branches of production and the fields of material and cultural labor, is necessary in any society, although its character depends on historical circumstances and comprises varying components. Without social management, the establishment and maintenance of certain order and organization, without communication between people, labor is just as impossible as social activity. Without social management not only can there be no material and cultural production, there can be no distribution or consumption either.

Production and economic management is the first basic form of social management. Then there is socio-political management—the management of relations between different communities (classes, social groups, nations, nationalities and collectives), as well as relations within these commun-

ities. And finally there is cultural management, which similarly needs to be organized, controlled and continually kept under the influence of society.

From the very dawn of civilization right up to the present day there have been two mechanisms of social management—the conscious and the spontaneous. In the case of the spontaneous mechanism the regulating and controlling action on a system is the mean result of the conflict, intertwining and overlapping of different, often opposing forces, of a mass of individual acts. The resulting impact appears as a general trend in the blind play of chance. It is spontaneous in its nature and does not require human intervention. Such, for example, is the market—the basic regulator of the capitalist economy. It is precisely the spontaneous play of market forces, of numerous acts of buying and selling (which conceals the law of value manifesting itself as a tendency), that constitutes the main regulator of production, and of the social division of labor, and that establishes definite proportions in the economy which are again broken down and renewed through the blind play of chance. The gist of the matter is not altered by the fact that state-monopoly programming and regulating the economy has been widely introduced in the capitalist countries owing to the character of modern production and the scientific and technical revolution. Programming and regulating can weaken and slow down the effect of the spontaneous market-forces, but they cannot annul it.

Alongside the spontaneous, non-programmed factors affecting society at each stage of its development, there exist the conscious factors of social management, connected with the people's purposeful activity. Here specific social institutions have gradually developed—the agents of management, i.e. a system of organs and organizations exerting conscious influence on the social structure in order to preserve it and achieve certain aims.

The bounds of conscious social management and its content, aims and principles depend on the dominant economic relations and the character of the socio-political system. In a class society, conscious social management has a class, political character, for the dominant class (or group of classes) creates its own system of social institutions, organs and organizations for controlling society in accordance with its own interests.

In capitalist society social management is based on private capitalist ownership of the means of production. The main aim of such management is the increase of surplus value. The bourgeoisie governs society through the state and other organs in its own interests, using methods that are far from democratic.

In socialist society management is based on social ownership of the means of production. The aim of management here is the development and improvement of production and of all social relations for the greater satisfaction of the material and cultural needs of the working people. The latter govern society directly or through representative organs in their own interests and by democratic methods.

Socialist management has the following basic characteristics:

—socialism has for the first time in history enabled man to adopt conscious, scientific approach to the management of social processes on the scale of the whole of society, instead of being governed by the spontaneous play of social forces;

—socialism makes the centralized management of society as an integral economic, social and cultural system, both possible and necessary;

—socialist management is scientific management based on the knowledge and utilization of the objective laws of social development;

—under socialism the management of the social processes becomes the creative activity of the people themselves.

The scientific management of socialist society is the systematically exercised, conscious and purposeful influence by man on the social system as a whole or on its separate aspects (production, social and cultural life, industries, etc.), on the basis of the knowledge and use of the objective laws of socialism and its progressive trends, in order to ensure its effective functioning and development. Socialist management is the organization and mobilization of human, material and financial resources for the purpose of building communism.

The functioning and development of socialism is a natural historical process based on the objective laws. The nature of these laws is such that they can be cognized and used by people in their common interests. Moreover, the very cognition and use of the laws under socialism constitutes a historical necessity. The social, political and ideological

unity of society allows people to determine their common aim and make use of joint efforts to achieve it. Therefore the laws of socialism appear not in the acts of alienated individuals or in the struggle between antagonistic classes, as is the case in capitalist society, but through the joint action of all members of society working in cooperation and mutual assistance with one another. Hence the hitherto unknown increase in the role of the subjective factor, the expanded framework of its operation and the growth of the role of science and scientific knowledge which guides man in his organization of social life.

It is obviously impossible to fully cognize and use the totality of objective conditions and to meet the demands of all the laws without exception. This is because objective conditions are continually changing, knowledge is historically limited and the necessary scientific and technical means are not always available. The task of the agent of management, primarily the Communist Party and the socialist state, is therefore to know and utilize the largest possible number of objective circumstances and laws in their totality, in a system, and to make a thorough study and use of each of them in particular. At the same time, it is unavoidable that certain objective conditions or laws with their demands will remain outside the pale of the knowledge and use of the agent, and function as spontaneous regulators in society.

But the more the spontaneous processes are known and controlled, the more their effect is limited and, correspondingly, the greater is the extent of the scientific, purposeful management of social processes.

Scientific Management and Party Guidance

Management in socialist society is exercised by a specific agent—the totality (subsystem) of state (government and economic) and public (trade union, Komsomol, etc.) organs and organizations under the guidance of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union. “To govern,” said Lenin, “you need an army of steeled revolutionary Communists. We have it and it is called the Party.”¹

¹ V. I. Lenin. *Collected Works*, Vol. 32, p. 62.

The relationship between scientific management and scientific guidance is now the subject of lively discussion.

In our view the two concepts lie on the same plane and are, generally speaking, identical, insofar as both the one and the other represent the conscious influence on society or its separate elements on the basis of its objective laws. Their overall purpose is also similar—ensuring the effective functioning and development of socialist society. Both management and guidance are aimed at revealing and making use of the advantages and possibilities of socialism and guaranteeing the successful building of communism. However, they differ as regards their agents, content and, most importantly, the ways and means of bringing influence to bear on their subject.

The agent of scientific guidance is primarily the Communist Party. Its function is political guidance, political influence on the subject. This is expressed in party policy, which constitutes the foundation of the socialist system. Party guidance is the highest, most general and essential form of social management (or government), its nucleus and pivot.

The methods of political influence used by the party are also specific. It does not possess legislative power or means of coercion. Persuasion, organizational and ideological work and the efforts to arouse activity and creative initiative among the masses are the means by which it exerts its influence.

However, guidance is not the only aspect of scientific management of society. Party policy is implemented by the state (government and economic) organs, the public organizations, which directly govern society in its various aspects. The state and other organs manage the economy, culture and technology, including various enterprises and other objects, and deal with organizational matters, etc. Having the requisite powers, the state exercises influence by force of law and uses various means of persuasion and compulsion. The management agents have at their disposal the appropriate managerial, executive and administrative bodies.

There are other differences between management and guidance. Management can be spontaneous or conscious, unscientific or scientific. Guidance is always the conscious scientific influence over the social subject. Management exists in every society, but party guidance only in social-

ist society, which is a class society. In a classless society political guidance withers away and management loses its class political nature, becoming social self-government.

Political guidance, as the conscious scientific influence over the social system, belongs only to the Communist Party, which is armed with knowledge of the laws of social development. Under capitalism the Communist Party leads the working class and all the working people in their struggle against capital, for the accomplishment of the socialist revolution and the establishment of the dictatorship of the proletariat. In socialist society the Communist Party leads the working class and all the working people in the building of socialism and communism. Political guidance of the masses is only possible given an identity of interests between the party and the people and only when party policy expresses the interests of the working class and all the working people.

The bourgeois parties rule the state but they give it no guidance. Insofar as their intentions and aims contradict the interests of the working people, they impose their policies by force, using the methods of violence and coercion, as well as manipulation, demagoguery and mass deception, to that end.

Only a scientifically grounded policy can serve as a basis for scientific management. The policy of the Communist Party is the foundation and pivot of such management.

The party determines a united political line covering all aspects of the country's life and conducts the organizational and ideological work necessary for its implementation. It exercises its guiding role through the state and public organizations. It unites the efforts of these organizations, coordinates their work and directs it to the achievement of definite goals. It is through the state and numerous public organizations that the party is linked with millions of workers. It teaches and educates the masses, while at the same time learning from them and assimilating the wealth of their experience. Together with the people and the state the party decides the most important questions of social management and the building of communism.

The tremendous growth in the scale and complexity of the tasks involved in the building of communism, the hitherto unknown rise in the creative activity of the masses and the involvement of millions of working people in production

management and state administration, the further development of socialist democracy, the increasing role of the Marxist-Leninist theory in society and the complex tasks of communist education have combined to make the party's function in the management of society and the building of communism more important than ever.

The political guidance by the party is an objective necessity for the development of socialist society.

Socialist society is, of course, a class society, and political organizations are inherent in it. Social management under socialism is carried out in the interests of the working class, the peasantry, and the intelligentsia. The policy of the Communist Party and the Soviet state expresses the most vital interests of the working people.

The politics and political interests of the working class and all the working people permeate the essence, principles, methods and objectives of socialist management. Party policy gives the whole process of management a firm unity and consistency, welding together all links in the administrative system and directing them to the solution of definite (general and specific) tasks. Scientific management of society, of any one sphere of people's activity would be quite impossible under socialism without a political approach to it, without determination of the political meaning and implications of a particular measure.

There is no other socio-political organization in socialist society, except the Communist Party, capable of integrating modern science, technology, management and education, ensuring the purposeful and coordinated functioning and development of all elements of the social organism, and weighing up and considering the interests and specifics of all the different classes, social groups and collectives, all the nations and nationalities and all the generations. The party has no local, professional, national or departmental interests. It expresses the general interests of the whole people and therefore each collective and each individual. Only the party can channel all the tiny streams of popular initiative into a single torrent, sum up the rich experience of the people and direct their efforts to a common goal.

Party policy enters into all spheres of the life and development of socialist society. It permeates the management of the economy insofar as it is itself a concentrated expression of economics, its generalization and consummation.

The party seeks to base all its work on Lenin's principle of the unity of political guidance and economic management. Economic successes depend directly on politics, on the scale of party-political work and on the degree to which party policy is tied in with the solution of practical problems, particularly those relating to economic development.

In improving economic management, it is necessary to adopt a genuinely party approach to all aspects of economic activity. Socialist economic management is a party, political matter. It is incompatible with a narrowly departmental, or even more, a technocratic approach.

Party policy is the basis not only of economic management but of the running of society. Social relations always manifest themselves through human action. Therefore, the management of social processes above all takes the form of the management of the affairs of millions of people. Governing and guiding the masses, whose activity is the foundation of social relations in the Soviet country, is in effect managing these social relations, that is scientifically controlling them.

Party policy is also the point of departure and foundation for the cultural management of Soviet society, including cultural development and communist education. The party is the custodian and defender of the achievements of the Marxist-Leninist theory; it develops this theory and inculcates it into the consciousness of the masses so as to raise their political awareness.

The Communist Party is a ruling party and it is called upon to exercise guidance over all aspects of social life, including culture. Its Marxist-Leninist ideology, which has amassed great experience of the working people's struggle, has been voluntarily and consciously accepted by the whole people. Thus party policy on ideology is a popular policy expressing the innermost thoughts, ideas and aspirations of the people. Hence the necessity, right and duty of the party to exercise leadership and direction of ideological work.

The party guards the consciousness of the masses from alien bourgeois ideology and leads an uncompromising struggle for the purity of Marxist-Leninist theory and against reformism and "left" and right revisionism.

Sovietologists have churned out innumerable volumes trying to show that socialist management of social processes is incompatible with democracy, that these two concepts oppose and contradict each other and that only capital-

ism and capitalist management, which allow free enterprise, are compatible with democracy. Meanwhile, bourgeois democracy is democracy for the minority and only serves to strengthen and defend private ownership and exploitation together with economic, political and cultural inequality. Democracy in capitalist society is a convenient form of class domination by the bourgeoisie.

The bourgeoisie has created its democratic institutions—parliament, elective state bodies and frequently universal suffrage. Bourgeois society fairly bristles with all kinds of referendums, debates, inter-party and intra-party squabbles, mutual denunciations in the press, on radio and on television. But none of this affects the real interests of the ruling circles. The bourgeoisie governs in its own interests.

Only socialist society can guarantee genuine democratic management. Socialism eradicates the antagonism present in capitalist society between the governors and the governed, insofar as the working people themselves either directly or through their elected representatives exercise management over production and society.

Democratic Centralism

The clearest reflection of the scientific, planned and democratic character of social management is the principle of democratic centralism—the basic principle of organization and government in socialist society.

The essence of democratic centralism is the indissoluble unity between democracy (i.e. the sovereignty of the working people, their mass initiative, the electivity of all government bodies and their leaders and the accountability of all these bodies to the people) and centralization, or government from a single center, the submission of the minority to the majority, one-man management and strict discipline.

The principle of democratic centralism was first established by Marx and Engels in their Communist League and later in the First International. It lay at the foundations of the organization and work of the Russian Social-Democratic Labor Party, which was founded by Lenin as a militant, centralized, disciplined organization with broad democracy in the solution of intra-party problems and strict subordination of the minority to the majority and the lower organs to

the higher. Lenin stressed that the party must be organized on a centralist basis, but insisted upon broad intra-party democracy, the electivity and replacement of party leaders, collective leadership and the necessity to develop criticism and self-criticism, strengthen ties with the working people and encourage the initiative and independent activity of the local organizations. Democratic centralism is the basic principle of the organization and work of the Communist Party.

After the victory of the Great October Socialist Revolution, as the country achieved successes in building socialism, democratic centralism was consistently established in administering the state and managing its economy and culture, as well as in public organizations. Lenin attached particular importance to the introduction of democratic centralism in the management of the economy. "Our task now is to carry out democratic centralism in the economic sphere."¹

Democratic centralism allows a combination of scientific management of society as a whole with the scientific management of the separate sections of the social system—social life, regions, the enterprises and the collectives. It stems from the very nature of socialism and has firm objective foundations.

Socialist ownership of the means of production makes it possible to eliminate crises and anarchy in production, unemployment, and unmanageability of society as a whole, so characteristic of capitalism, and the professional and local dispersion of the work force, which is one of the sources of the strength of capital and the weakness of labor. It is the social base which unites all branches of the economy into one, turns all the workers, wherever they are engaged, into associated producers, and puts into practice the law of planned proportional development. This had made it possible and necessary to effect centralized management of society. But at the same time, since it is public, socialist property, it guarantees collective ownership and utilization of the wealth of society, and, correspondingly, collective, democratic participation by the members of society in running its affairs.

The material and technical basis for democratic centralism is modern large-scale socialist production. "Large-scale machine industry—which is precisely the material source, the

¹ V. I. Lenin. *Collected Works*, Vol. 27, p. 268.

productive source, the foundation of socialism—calls for absolute and strict *unity of will*, which directs the joint labours of hundreds, thousands and tens of thousands of people.”¹

Modern production is characterized by increasing specialization and the appearance of new industries and spheres of social life, which leads to their integration and increases the significance of their interaction, cooperation and the concentration of huge material, financial and labor resources. At the same time collective scientific and technical endeavor, organized on democratic principles, comes to play a more conspicuous role. The new discoveries of science and technology, and particularly their practical application in production, are the result of the efforts of large teams of scientists, technologists and workers, together with extensive discussion and improvement of plans, projects, designs, etc. by those involved in them.

The socio-political basis of democratic centralism is the absence of antagonistic classes, and the social and political unity of society. The identity of interests of society, its classes, collectives and individuals guarantees the unity of purpose and objectives, on the one hand, and, on the other, provides the conditions for the development of the creative initiative, independence and activity of collectives and individuals in the solution of common problems and the achievement of common goals.

Being in accordance with the nature of socialism, democratic centralism, according to Lenin, guarantees the “absolute harmony and unity” in the functioning of the different aspects of social life and of the various localities and regions of the country, but at the same time “centralism, understood in a truly democratic sense, presupposes the possibility, created for the first time in history, of a full and unhampered development not only of specific local features, but also of local inventiveness, local initiative, of diverse ways, methods and means of progress to the common goal”.²

The unity of centralism and democracy has been embodied in the socialist state, which expresses the will of the whole of society and guarantees the most democratic system of mass participation in state administration.

¹ V. I. Lenin. *Collected Works*, Vol. 27, p. 268.

² *Ibid.*, p. 208.

The ideological basis of democratic centralism is the Marxist-Leninist ideology which holds undivided sway in socialist society, and the ideological unity of socialist society. Marxism-Leninism is the ideology of the whole people, inasmuch as it sums up and elucidates the experience of popular struggle and labor.

The principle of democratic centralism expresses the deepest essence of the socialist system, its centralized and democratic character. It ensures centralization and planning, on the one hand, and broad initiative and democracy in the functioning and development of the social system, on the other, giving scope to the unfolding of creative initiative of millions of working people.

This principle has nothing in common with regimentation imposed from above or with anarchy, i.e. disregard for centralism. Unity over basics, Lenin said, ought to ensure variety in details, that is in local peculiarities, methods and approaches and in specific paths to the solution of common problems. At the same time, though, the relative independence of the various local methods ought not to go beyond the framework of the common objectives and interests of communist construction. If this were to happen, the necessary relationships in society will be broken, imbalances will appear and there will inevitably occur a general slide into the anarchist positions of separatism and localism.

The most important and difficult aspect of the implementation of the principle of democratic centralism is achieving the optimum combination of the two elements—democracy and centralism. This in the final analysis depends on the level of production, the state of social relations and the specific historical situation.

The optimum combination of centralism and democracy can only be achieved if centralism is not absolutized, but exists on a democratic basis. Otherwise democracy becomes formal and the opportunity arises for an excessive concentration of power in the hands of one man or group of men and a corresponding abuse of power, with the leaders standing outside the control of the masses. "It would, however, be inexcusable to forget," wrote Lenin, "that in advocating centralism we advocate exclusively *democratic* centralism."¹

Lenin was intolerant of any contempt for the "periphery", of ignorance of local experience and the creative ini-

¹ *Ibid.*, Vol. 20, p. 46.

tiative of the masses. Speaking out against prolific abstract arguments and political demagoguery, he called for greater particularization in the study and dissemination of local experience, for plunging into life as it is on the district and village level. The more we enter into everyday life and get away from bureaucratic injunctions from above, the more successful will be the work of socialist construction. We must "teach the people the art of administration, not from books, not from lectures or meetings, but from practical experience. . .".¹

The second important condition for an optimum combination of democracy and centralism is that democracy must exist on a centralized, plan basis within the framework of socialist organization and discipline, as well as being in harmony with the interests of society and able to promote the common goal. Otherwise democracy will hypertrophy and become a screen for anti-social acts.

Lenin fought persistently against all forms of anarchism and anarcho-syndicalism, which considered socialist society as a conglomeration of autonomous productive communes. Under the false flag of defending independence and freedom, they opposed centralized government and planned economy and called for the complete autonomy of local state and economic organs and their total independence from the center. In this way they were trying to put back the clock and return to the feudal period of the guilds, feudal disunity and isolation. Lenin also fought against the "left communists" stressing that the working class and all the working people were called upon to govern and control society at every level and not remain within the narrow confines of their own profession or trade, their own industry or factory.

Socialist democracy implies discipline, organization and the strict observance of the laws and ethical principles of society. These laws and principles express the will of the people and therefore their observance is in accordance with the vital interests of society and of each of its members. Democracy without discipline or responsibility would become anarchy and disorder, while discipline and compulsion without democracy would be tyranny.

Socialist discipline is conscious discipline. It expresses the relations of cooperation and mutual aid between people

¹ V. I. Lenin. *Collected Works*, Vol. 28, p. 426.

who are free from exploitation and responsible for their own actions.

Discipline is obligatory for all leaders and their subordinates. This does not mean the mechanical, automatic execution of laws, orders or norms; it implies initiative on the part of the executors and a conscious, creative attitude to work. Discipline and initiative are important elements in managerial relations.

A necessary condition for the optimum combination of centralization and democracy in management is the strict division and conscientious fulfilment of the functions of both the central organs and the local organizations and collectives. The central organs are required to determine the general objectives of managing society or its separate spheres, without interfering with the details of current managerial activity. Otherwise there would be excessive regimentation and administration in the work of the collectives with the result that the creative initiative of the masses would be stifled by the mechanical fulfilment of commands from above. At the same time "boundless" democracy that goes beyond the framework of general aims leads to irresponsible attitudes which are not far from anarchy and disorder.

Lenin, who developed and introduced democratic centralism, attached great importance to combining the principles of collective and one-man management in the building of communism.

Administrative or managerial decisions, particularly those affecting the life of society as a whole or its most important spheres have, as a rule, a comprehensive character, which at times affects the various aspects of the development and functioning of the object. Therefore even the most experienced leader is not in a position to evaluate the source information, determine the whole complex of problems that need solution or envisage effective ways to achieve this. The task of the leader is to formulate objectives in very general terms on the basis of an evaluation of source information, determine the ways to their attainment, organize the work of the collective on the detailed elaboration and careful and serious discussion of the decision and, what is most important, to take the decision in the knowledge that the full responsibility devolves upon him. This is the essence of the combination of collective and one-man leadership in management. "There must," said Lenin, "be individual responsi-

bility—this and individual management are as necessary as collectivism is essential in discussing basic questions if there is to be no red tape and no opportunity to evade responsibility.”¹

While advocating collectivity, Lenin cautioned against the dangers involved in exaggerating it and turning collective institutions into a talking-shop, and against irresponsibility disguised under references to the collective, which he described as a “supreme evil”. Lenin demanded the “absolutely indispensable minimum” of “collegiate methods” and stressed in particular that “the *practical management* of institutions, enterprises, undertakings or tasks should be entrusted to *one comrade*, known for his firmness, resolution, boldness and ability to conduct practical affairs and who enjoys the greatest confidence”.² Collectivity at all times must be combined with a precisely established degree of personal responsibility on the part of the leader. At the same time Lenin was intolerant of even small abuses of power and disregard for the opinion of the collective and demanded that the leaders be responsible to the collective in whose name decisions are taken, and to the workers who are called upon to carry out such decisions.

Such, in outline, is the principle of democratic centralism in management. The specific manifestations of the principle may vary and this is expressed in the degree to which centralism and democracy are combined.

The specifics of democratic centralism depends primarily on the particular sphere of administration or management. Democratic centralism has differing characteristics according to whether it operates in economics, in social life, in the party, in the public organizations, in the army or in culture. In the army, for example, centralism is very much predominant, because there every facet of life is controlled from the center by various regulations and orders. In the economy those in charge are largely appointed, whereas in the party they are elected. The party does not apply the measures of compulsion in the form specific to the state, like legislation.

The specifics of democratic centralism is also manifest in exercising various functions of management. For instance,

¹ V. I. Lenin. *Collected Works*, Vol. 30, p. 245.

² *Ibid.*, Vol. 29, p. 437.

the drafting of a decision is one thing, decision-making is quite another. The drafting stage requires broad democracy, discussion and a thorough analysis of administrative decisions. Decision-making, on the other hand, demands centralism and the personal responsibility of the man in charge. Another example: account is largely centralized in character while control is exercised by both the broad masses of the people and the central organs.

The features of democratic centralism also depend on the conditions in which a particular object is developing. War-time, for example, is quite different from peacetime. War requires the tightest centralization to the detriment of some democratic principles, whereas peace gives democracy much wider scope.

Finally, the features of democratic centralism are conditioned by the character of problems being solved by a particular institution and by the time limit for the solution of a problem.

The Further Development of Democracy and the Strengthening of Centralism

Centralized government or management is socialism's greatest achievement and advantage. It is democratic centralism that is furiously attacked by the opponents of Marxism—the anti-communists and revisionists who would like to shake the monolithic unity of the socialist system of government and to show that centralist government is repressive and leads to totalitarianism. Of course, they say nothing about the fact that the socialist type of government implies the essential unity of centralism and democracy, that these are not just two juxtaposed principles but are two sides of the same principle of government. There can be no socialism without centralist government, just as there can be no socialism without genuine democracy.

Centralism in socialist society fulfils its role precisely because it is democratic centralism. Socialism can only develop successfully when centralization exists on the broadest democratic basis. "There can be no victorious socialism that does not practise full democracy."¹

¹ *Ibid.*, Vol. 22, p. 144.

Socialist democracy means the absolute power of the people to create the most favorable conditions for mass participation in state administration, in making decisions and in control over their execution. The most important proposals and drafts are drawn up with the active participation of millions. The workers themselves supervise the work of the government, economic and public organizations. More than nine million people take part in the people's control bodies.

The development and expansion of socialist democracy is a multi-faceted process. It implies an increase in the role of the Soviets, in their membership and activity. It implies a growth in the function of the public organizations, particularly the trade unions, and a greater part played by work collectives in society. Finally, it implies the improvement of Soviet legislation and the strengthening of socialist law and order.

The Communist Party of the Soviet Union is continually concerned about the strengthening of the centralized, plan basis of social management. This was particularly reflected in the decisions of the plenums of the CPSU Central Committee and the 25th Congress of the CPSU.

The increased role of centralized planning and management is indissolubly linked with the further development and expansion of socialist democracy, the involvement of more and more working people in production management and the development of local creative initiative. This has resulted in a certain redistribution of functions from top to bottom and from the center to the localities, over an increasingly wide circle of organizations and people—a process which is reflected in the systematic expansion of competence and authority among the organs of government and administration and the working people's collectives.

The party relies on two factors in economic construction: (1) improving economic management and giving it a scientific, party foundation, and (2) mobilizing the masses, encouraging creative initiative and creative attitudes.

The further development and expansion of socialist democracy alongside the constant strengthening and improvement of the centralized plan principles in management and administration, as well as the involvement of new sections of the working people in these are a necessary condition for success in the building of communism. In outlining the con-

tours of the system of agricultural management L. I. Brezhnev said that "it should be geared to achieve an organic combination of centralized planning guidance with independence and initiative on the part of state and collective farms in deciding the day-to-day questions of production and sale of produce".¹

As has already been mentioned, the principle of democratic centralism has been subjected to bitter attacks both from anti-communists and revisionists, particularly the right revisionists. These have found their expression in a variety of revisionist models of socialism.

The authors of these models try to substantiate them with references to the scientific and technical revolution and the necessity for intensive economic development.

To back up their position they refer to Marx, Engels and Lenin, who are supposed to have understood socialism somewhat differently from the way the "traditional" adherents of scientific socialism understand it today. But wasn't it Lenin who said that "neither railways nor transport, nor large-scale machinery and enterprises in general can function correctly without a single will linking the entire working personnel into an economic organ operating with the precision of clockwork".²

In fact, industry today has been widely differentiated and numerous branches exist specializing in the manufacture of different types of commodities. But as this differentiation has grown and more and more branches have sprung up, the role of inter-branch links and coordination between the various sectors, which can only be effectively guaranteed by means of centralized, planned economic management, has correspondingly increased. The scientific and technical revolution has produced branches of science and technology (such as atomic energy, electronics, rocketry, etc.) which it would be unthinkable to develop without unification and concentration on a national, if not international scale, of tremendous resources of manpower, i.e. without centralized, planned management. And this is to say nothing of a united and effective policy on technology, and of managing science and education, which is also unthinkable without "interference" from the socialist state.

¹ L. I. Brezhnev. *Following Lenin's Course. Speeches and Articles (1972-1975)*. p. 412.

² V. I. Lenin. *Collected Works*, Vol. 27, p. 212.

The scientific and technical revolution arms management with the latest means of information processing, without which it would be impossible to make competent decisions. Computers and cybernetics make it possible to improve centralized planning under socialism, take fuller account of the working people's opinion in managerial and administrative decision-making, free man from monotonous and tiring operations and give time for creative work, various forms of labor and socio-political activity, and participation in management. Consequently the new technology of management and administration widens the basis for the democratization of the whole of social life.

The authors of the revisionist models of socialism pin all their hopes in the market as the only automatic regulator of the economy. But they must know that even in the capitalist world the market and commodity-money relations are generally recognised as unfit to be the main regulators of economic development. It is precisely because of the demands of production and the scientific and technical revolution that state-monopoly programming and regulation of the economy, which is a surrogate of socialist planning, has been so widely developed in the contemporary capitalist world. There can be no genuinely scientific planning under capitalism, since its economic basis is private capitalist ownership which generates market fluctuations.

And so now, when centralized planned management—an inherent attribute of socialism and its greatest achievement—has become the imperative of the times, the originators of "models of socialism" spring up and try to drag mankind back to the free play of market forces or, worse still, to the medieval guild system and economic disunity.

All this, of course, does not mean any belittlement of the importance of commodity-money relations or the market in the economic life of socialist society. But it is one thing to utilize the market and commodity-money relations within the framework of socialist planning, and quite another to abolish socialist planning and rely fully on market regulation. This is a clear departure from the principles of scientific socialism and opens the way for a return to capitalist economy.

The Leninist principle of democratic centralism remains the organizational basis of the socialist system of management and thanks to it newer and greater successes are being achieved in the building of communism.

Chapter VI

PROFESSIONALISM AND DEMOCRACY IN MANAGEMENT

Democracy and Technocracy

Bourgeois and social-democratic sociologists as a rule link socialism with technocracy. Many of them refer to the founders of Marxism-Leninism, who said that the state and political power under communism would wither away and that the management of things would replace the management of people.

The technocratization of socialism is not, of course, used by bourgeois propaganda to demonstrate the important role played by specialists in running socialist society, but to show that under socialism a "new dominant class" is being formed.

What are the facts of the matter?

Marx and Engels saw the most important characteristic of the new socialist society in that it would be organized on a scientific basis and open wide prospects for the application of science to all spheres of human activity.

The tremendous role of science in the building of socialism and communism was frequently mentioned by Lenin. He advanced the idea of making wide use of the bourgeois specialists and appealed to them to come and work for the Bolsheviks, for the Bolsheviks alone had taken on the tremendous task of transforming the country and educating the people.

Under the care of the Soviet government a vast new scientific and technical intelligentsia has grown up devoted to the ideas of communism and indissolubly linked with the working class and the collective-farm peasantry. Millions of highly qualified specialists direct industrial and agricultural enterprises, organize services for the population

and work in the education and health systems and in all departments of state administration.

But neither in theory nor in practice has scientific communism have anything in common with a state system under which power belongs to the specialists as an independent political force. All official documents of the CPSU and the Marxist-Leninist parties of the other socialist countries invariably state that until a full communist society has been built, society must be led by the working class and its revolutionary party.

Clearly there is no place here for a "dictatorship of specialists" or a technocratic regime.

But it is not just a matter of theory. Bourgeois ideologists maintain that the practice of socialism is far from corresponding to the theory, and that the latter is only a shroud of words covering the reality, which is allegedly nothing like that which the founders of scientific communism envisaged. They harp on the story that there is a "social elite" and a "new class" in the USSR and the other socialist countries.

The Marxist-Leninist parties decidedly reject slander of this sort. To realize just how groundless it is, it is enough to put the question this way: the formation of a new dominant class would entail a change, or at least a qualitative alteration in the forms of ownership and the production and other relations. Nothing of this kind has taken place in the Soviet Union or in any of the other socialist countries. Relations of production have developed in them from the foundations set down by the socialist revolution.

Then again, such a radical change in the character of political power as the formation of a new dominant class was to have entailed a rejection of the aims of the revolution. But the communist and workers' parties have consistently and steadfastly sought to achieve the objectives based on the Marxist-Leninist theory and written into their program documents.

Finally, one of the basic features of a ruling elite is its more or less permanent membership. However, it is fairly well known that the leadership in the socialist countries is continually being renewed. A natural process is taking place whereby the competence of management personnel is increasing in conformity with the demands of each new stage of social development. As administrative ideas improve, staff requirements change.

It is important to emphasize that management is far from being a sort of constant privilege for one or another section of society. The social composition of the specialists who form the administrative apparatus is continually being replenished from all classes and social groups.

Probably the most curious piece of evidence against the theory of a new ruling class is the admission of Brzezinski and Huntington that as distinct from the leadership in the United States, the overwhelming majority of the political leadership in the Soviet Union come from worker or peasant backgrounds.

More than 80 per cent of the secretaries of the Central Committees of the communist parties of the Union republics, and of territorial and regional party committees, chairmen of the Councils of Ministers and of territorial and regional executive committees of Soviets of People's Deputies, and some 70 per cent of the ministers and chairmen of the state committees of the USSR started their work as workers or peasants. Among the directors of the country's largest industrial enterprises more than a half were originally workers. The situation is almost the same in the other socialist countries. Thus in Hungary more than 300,000 former workers have become executives in various spheres of social life.¹

When speaking on the subject of elitism, bourgeois sociologists frequently refer to bureaucratism and the violation of the norms and principles of socialist state administration. But it is well known that from the earliest days of the Soviet government Lenin and the Bolsheviks conducted a vigorous campaign against this most dangerous and tenacious inheritance of capitalism—bureaucratism.

The CPSU has led a constant struggle against bureaucratic trends, from which the administrative apparatus is not free even under socialism. It was said in the report of the CPSU Central Committee to the 24th Party Congress that "most of the employees of the state apparatus are highly-trained, conscientious and considerate people. Their work merits the highest appreciation and respect. But it must be admitted that there still are callous officials, bureaucrats and boors. Their conduct invokes the just indignation of Soviet citizens. Relying on public support, the Party is and will go on mak-

¹ See *World Marxist Review*, No. 3, March 1974, Prague, p. 12.

ing resolute efforts to achieve more efficiency in the work of the administrative apparatus".¹

Overcoming bureaucratism is particularly helped by an active propaganda of the democratic methods of administration and management. Inculcating respect for competent and highly qualified administrative labor makes it possible to create the necessary social atmosphere for a successful struggle against all forms of bureaucratism.

Administrative functions get continually more complex, demanding wider and more varied training, high qualification and talent. Socialist society is vitally concerned that practical administrative and managerial problems are solved with the aid of scientists and highly qualified specialists. This entails no danger of a dictatorship of the intellectual elite, "the government by the scientists", for management in socialist society loses the function of command and is exercised under general control. The problem of the fate of management and the managers has been solved by Marxism-Leninism on the basis of two fundamental ideas. The first is that everyone must participate in management; the second that under communist society the state will wither away and the need for management of the people will disappear together with it. "Capitalist culture," wrote Lenin in his work *The State and Revolution*, "has created large-scale production, factories, railways, the postal service, telephones, etc., and on this basis the great majority of the functions of the old 'state power' have become so simplified and can be reduced to such exceedingly simple operations of registration, filing and checking that they can be easily performed by every literate person, can quite easily be performed for ordinary 'workmen's wages' and that these functions can (and must) be stripped of every shadow of privilege, of every semblance of 'official grandeur'."²

And later on: "We, the workers, shall organize large-scale production on the basis of what capitalism has already created, relying on our own experience as workers, establishing strict, iron discipline backed up by the state power of the armed workers. We shall reduce the role of state

¹ Report of the CPSU Central Committee to the 24th Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, Moscow, 1971, p. 92.

² V. I. Lenin. *Collected Works*, Vol. 25, pp. 420-21.

officials to that of simply carrying out our instructions as responsible, revocable, modestly paid 'foremen and accountants' (of course, with the aid of technicians of all sorts, types and degrees). This is *our* proletarian task, this is what we can and must *start* with in accomplishing the proletarian revolution. Such a beginning, on the basis of large-scale production, will of itself lead to the gradual 'withering away' of all bureaucracy, to the gradual creation of an order—an order without inverted commas, an order bearing no similarity to wage slavery—an order under which the functions of control and accounting, becoming more and more simple, will be performed by each in turn, will then become a habit and will finally die out as the *special* functions of a special section of the population."¹

What Lenin is saying is, first, that administrative functions in communist society will not entail any special privileges and consequently there will be no necessity for the existence of any "executive class" and, second, that all will take part in supervision and control in turn. In another part of the same work Lenin expressed the idea like this: "Immediate introduction of control and supervision by *all*, so that *all* may become 'bureaucrats' for a time and that, therefore, *nobody* may be able to become a 'bureaucrat'."² Thus for Lenin it was continually a matter of supervision, account and control. This was quite natural, because in a work devoted to the future of the state and designed to develop and substantiate the thesis of Marx and Engels on the withering away of the state under communism, Lenin was focussing attention on that which would maintain the discipline of social labor when there existed no capitalists, no executives and no police. The answer he came up with was conscious self-discipline.

This of course is not referring to the functions of organizing industry, education, etc., which are getting increasingly more complex and need trained specialists.

In our view, it is quite permissible to retain professional administrative personnel under communism, since we are not talking about political expertise, which will certainly wither away, but about scientific knowledge.

¹ *Ibid.*, p. 426.

² *Ibid.*, p. 481.

Obviously, under communism management will be no more and no less highly regarded than any other profession or trade. It will be just one more branch of applied science.

The following idea of the organization of management in the future is fully logical: the principle of mass participation in management under communism does not mean anarchic changing of occupation and activity or unsystematic enlistment into social management, for this would run counter to the principles of highly organized production. Two conclusions follow from this: first, participation in the social organs of government will be in accordance with ability, interest and knowledge; secondly, involving the people in the work of management does not prevent there being certain persons, who together with other work are engaged in exercising the functions of technical management, such as planning and accounting, manpower distribution, etc. These are the experienced specialists who can regularly fulfil the functions of organizing social production.

It must be stressed that a highly organized society like communism cannot tolerate any anarchic changing of occupation, particularly in such an exceptionally important sphere as management.¹

However, the future communist society itself will best deal with this question. It is not in the traditions of Marxist thought to guess at the details of society's future organization. If we try to foresee certain of its fundamental characteristics, this is only in order that we can look back to the present and once again verify some of the current trends. These trends consist in the fact that optimum economic organization in socialist and, most probably, communist society demands more and more qualified specialists from various fields of knowledge, particularly those who have experience in management, i.e. dual specialists.

This gives rise to two problems at least. First—the forms of mass participation in management, when it is growing increasingly more complex. Second—the conditions guaranteeing a high level of competence among managers.

¹ In this connection it would be wrong to believe that the thesis of the "withering away of the management of people" is tantamount to the abolition of all means of organized influence by society on its members (apart from moral standards). After all the very process of organizing labor is at the same time a means of organizing the work force.

Democratic Control--a Form of Mass Participation in Management

On the subject of the need to develop and expand socialist democracy, Lenin wrote: "We demand that *training* in the work of state administration be conducted by class-conscious workers and soldiers, and that this training be begun at once."¹ Carrying out Lenin's directive is the precondition of mass participation in management (given the requisite material conditions). It is impossible to take part in running the state without a clear idea of the structure and function of the state apparatus, a knowledge of the constitution and the basic branches of the law and an understanding of the fundamentals of modern science of management.

During the early years of the socialist revolution, objective conditions prevented conscious mass participation in governing the state. "So far," said Lenin, "we have not reached the stage at which the working people could participate in government. Apart from the law, there is still the level of culture, which you cannot subject to any law. The result of this low cultural level is that the Soviets, which by virtue of their programme are organs of government *by the working people*, are in fact organs of government *for the working people* by the advanced section of the proletariat."²

This problem was largely solved by the cultural revolution and the introduction of mass education. Universal literacy and a comprehensive program of political education run by the party and the Komsomol together with the teaching of social science in the secondary schools, sociology and political economy in the specialized secondary schools and political economy, Marxist-Leninist philosophy and the theory of scientific communism in the institutions of higher learning have all gone to ensure a high level of political knowledge among the people.

But administration and management is getting continually more complex and demanding an increasingly higher degree of professionalism. The question consequently arises of how to ensure the most effective methods for expanding mass participation in management. The key to the problem, we believe, can be found in the following ideas of Lenin's:

¹ V. I. Lenin. *Collected Works*, Vol. 26, p. 113.

² *Ibid.*, Vol. 29, p. 183.

"The more resolutely we now have to stand for a ruthlessly firm government, for the dictatorship of individuals *in definite processes of work*, in definite aspects of *purely executive* functions, the more varied must be the forms and methods of control from below in order to counteract every shadow of a possibility of distorting the principles of Soviet government, in order repeatedly and tirelessly to weed out bureaucracy." ¹

In the first place, Lenin refers to the variety of forms and methods of control needed. Obviously the various administrative and managerial functions require correspondingly varied forms of mass participation. When we talk about all the citizens of a socialist state taking part in management, this does not mean that all ought to participate at once or all the time. It is only important that each link in the managerial chain should be under the control of the working people and that each citizen should take part in one of the various forms of control.

Secondly, this quotation from Lenin contains an exceptionally important observation on the inadmissibility of interference in those administrative processes which require one-man management or one-man responsibility.

In this connection let us consider the management process from the point of view of the stages at which it is necessary and permissible to exercise mass control and what are the most satisfactory forms of such control.

1. *Gathering information.* Accurate information and a clear knowledge of the real situation have always been the primary condition, the prerequisite, as it were, for successful management and for the implementation of its democratic principles.

This requirement has become exceptionally complex as a result of the gigantic increase in the flow of information. But thanks to the development of the techniques of information processing the mass monitoring of such information has become possible and selected and graded information can now be brought to the reader or listener.

2. *Evaluating information.* The evaluation of information in all its complexity with regard for all related factors is an exceptionally complex task requiring specialized and thorough knowledge of the subject and the use of ancillary

¹ V. I. Lenin. *Collected Works*, Vol. 27, p. 275.

technical aids, e.g. for comparing one or another aspect of a new information unit with previously gathered data.

3. *Positing the problem.* This is one of the most important stages in the managerial process which largely determines the success of the whole undertaking.

Positing a problem in the clearest and most precise fashion is the prerequisite of its rational solution. It is obvious that the managerial or administrative bodies are interested in the help from the public to find whether the requisite importance is attached to a given problem. It is precisely problem-positing, accompanied by references to source material and containing its evaluation, that allows indirect control over the previous stage of the managerial cycle, i.e. evaluating the information and introducing the necessary correctives.

Hence it is easy to see that it is both possible and desirable to utilize at this stage a great variety of methods, such as discussion at the Soviets of People's Deputies, in the standing and *ad hoc* commissions, and in the press.

4. *Preparing the draft decision.* This stage must be entirely entrusted to the specialist managers with the only proviso that they must take account of the remarks and suggestions that were made when the problem was posed (in the press or at meetings, etc.).

5. *Decision-making.* From the point of view of management science decision-making is the most important stage in the managerial cycle. It has, therefore, been most thoroughly elaborated. Together with the constitution there exist a number of laws, resolutions, rules, directives and other normative measures which accurately determine (for various organs and categories of officials) who has the right to take a decision, what are the correct formalities involved, what are its terms of reference and who should be given preference in the event of collision and conflict of decisions. The strict observance of these laws and other normative rules governing decision-making is the primary condition for exercising control over this stage in the management process.

In the USSR and the other socialist countries there exist a variety of forms of mass participation in management at the factories. On the basis of sociological research into their effectiveness suggestions are made for bringing them up to date and creating an orderly structured system of democratic

institutions in industry. These institutions have considerable reserves for direct worker participation in management at one of the most responsible stages—the decision-making stage on which depends the position of the work collective and therefore, to a greater or lesser extent, the position of all its members.

6. *Organization*. At this stage many of the problems facing the management cycle are solved, which means that people's control here has a positive role to play. But account must be taken of certain negative factors. In the first place, discussion may hold up organizational work, making managers diffident from the start. In the second place, the efforts of members of the public to get their recommendations carried may take away the responsibility from those in charge, and deprive themselves of the moral right to demand accounts and exact penalties for shortcomings.¹

7. *Current control or supervision*. As distinct from control in the general sense of the word, this refers to control as a definite stage in the management cycle. In the language of cybernetics this can be referred to as the feedback stage: here the management body can check how accurately the parameters and criteria that have been set for the achievement of given objectives are being observed.

Current control is the concern both of the management body itself and the specialist local and central organizations, whose work embodies one of the most important functions of the socialist state—account and control—which is exercised by the people's control bodies.

8. *Regulation*. Like organization, this stage of the management process above all needs an order relying on one-man management and personal responsibility (obviously, after the reports of the control bodies have been received and the appropriate conclusions drawn).

But although interference in this work is, in our view, undesirable, it is absolutely necessary to inform the public about the very fact of such regulation. If the appropriate management organs do not make information public on what has been done in regard to remarks and suggestions, and in

¹ There is a definite tendency to overload the management with control, which is of course just as harmful as the lack of control. Such a tendency is found in the management system itself, where excessively narrow specialization often leads to the formation of too many specialized control bodies.

general in regard to regulation, correction and improvement, this may give legal grounds for repeat control and, if necessary, for making the guilty responsible.

9-10. *Verification and evaluation of results.* Although the two concluding stages of the management process are substantially different, they may be united under democratic control.

The collective that has taken part in carrying out a particular management task is also directly interested in participating in the summing up and evaluation of the results, because this is what primarily determines the degree of material and moral incentive (or the kind of penalty to be exacted as the case may be). Moreover, not only the collective, but the whole of society needs to know how a particular component of a long-term plan has been fulfilled or whether planned growth-rates will be met and what typical shortcomings have been revealed from the angle of organization and quality of the work done.

Thus the degree and type of worker participation in management cannot be identical at all stages of the management cycle. The greatest opportunities for participation in management and in the exercise of effective control and the greatest demand for such control arise at the following stages: positing the problem, decision-making, current supervision and evaluation of results.

The fundamental methodological basis for solving the problem of combining specialist managerial skills with worker participation in management was stated by Lenin in the following way: "The democratic principle of organization—in its highest form, in which the Soviets put into effect proposals and demands for the active participation of the masses not only in discussing general rules, decisions and laws, and in controlling their fulfilment, but also directly in their implementation—implies that every representative of the masses, every citizen, must be put in such conditions that he can participate in the discussion of state laws, in the choice of his representatives and in the implementation of state laws. But it does not at all follow from this that we shall permit the slightest chaos or disorder as regards who is responsible in each individual case for definite executive functions, for carrying out definite orders, for controlling a definite joint labor process during a certain period of time. The masses must have the right to choose responsible

leaders for themselves. They must have the right to replace them, the right to know and check each smallest step of their activity. They must have the right to put forward any worker without exception for administrative functions. But this does not at all mean that the process of collective labour can remain without definite leadership, without precisely establishing the responsibility of the person in charge, without the strictest order created by the single will of that person.”¹

In this way, the growing complexity of management will not impede the steady increase in the mass participation in it. The scientific and technical revolution is not the enemy of democracy, it is, on the contrary, its ally, for it permits the fuller satisfaction of material and cultural needs and guarantees the conditions for the all-round development of the individual.

The complexity of the management process and the growth and development of a specialized management science make it necessary to call into play the huge reserves of democracy that are contained in the communist mode of production. This means not only widely utilizing and perfecting the existing forms of mass participation in management and administration, but in finding new ones.

This can also provide the solution to another important problem mentioned earlier: how to guarantee continued growth in the competence of the administrative apparatus and conduct the most effective and democratic selection of executive personnel.

Democratic Methods for the Selection and Placement of Executive Personnel

As was mentioned earlier, at the dawn of the revolution Lenin insisted on an immediate training of the working people in state administration. This was a relevant requirement of the time and on it hung the fate of the socialist revolution.

Bourgeois propaganda bitterly mocked the idea of allowing “any cook from the kitchen” to govern the state. It crudely distorted Lenin’s slogan, taking it to mean that literally any cook taken from the kitchen stove could stand

¹ V. I. Lenin. *Collected Works*, Vol. 27, p. 212.

at the helm of state. Meanwhile, the socialist revolution had begun the genuinely grandiose task of teaching the fundamentals of management and administration to large sections of the people, drawing them into active participation in political life, and selecting from amongst them the most talented and capable, who after appropriate training would be able to provide the country with a highly efficient management.

The great attention paid by Lenin and the Communist Party to working out consistent scientific principles for building the socialist state apparatus and developing various methods and techniques for managing the varied social processes, the insistence with which the leader of the revolution demanded the study of Taylor's system and all the other new developments introduced by bourgeois scientists in the field of the scientific organization of labor, and the concern which he showed for the establishment of managerial research institutes and the production of text-books on management, have today all borne fruit.

It is important to point out that the Soviet science of management was developed not so much in response to the requirements of traditional managerial practices. The Soviet system was a completely new type of economic and political system and Soviet management science was therefore from the start a militant, party-oriented science based on Marxist methodological principles.

At the center of the management science is the problem of the training, selection and placement of cadres, primarily the leading executives who plan the development of the economy, organize the work of the various branches of state administration and run enterprises, institutions and their branches in industry, agriculture, culture and the various services. "Today," said Lenin, "the workers' and peasants' state is the 'proprietor', and it must select the best men for economic development; it must select the best administrators and organizers on the special and general, local and national scale, doing this *publicly*, in a methodical and systematic manner and on a broad scale."¹

This problem was particularly acute because the revolution had to raise Russia from the depths of backwardness to the heights of progress, while the number of trained specialists on which it could rely was negligible. Further-

¹ *Ibid.*, Vol. 32, p. 388.

more, what was required were not simply qualified specialists ready to do what was asked of them for a high remuneration, but men devoted to the ideas of communism, enthusiastic, capable organizers and innovators ready to give their utmost. Hundreds of thousands of such specialists had to be added to the party vanguard, which together with Lenin built the new state, and members of the scientific and technical intelligentsia who served the great cause of the socialist transformation of the country. The party spared neither means nor effort to achieve this goal and succeeded as a result of the cultural revolution.

Today the problem of cadres or personnel is quite different from what it was during the first years of the Soviet government. Our country now has a multi-million-strong army of qualified specialists in all spheres. These are representatives of generations that have grown up under the Soviet government and been educated in the spirit of Marxism-Leninism, and who are devoted to the cause of communism. In other words there are tremendous possibilities for the selection of people who are most suited for exercising managerial functions.

What techniques need to be applied to most fully implement party policy on the selection of cadres?

There are in the USSR today hundreds of thousands of industrial enterprises, building projects, state farms, collective farms and various institutions ranging from administrative central boards to theaters and hospitals. Within these enterprises and institutions there are shop-floors, departments, sections and other independent components. The interests of the nation require that these are run by experts in their own fields, who are at the same time cultured, energetic and enterprising. In other words, the main task of personnel work is to ensure that managerial posts are held by the most capable and competent people.

In recent years the question has been mooted in the press with increasing insistency on the necessity for purposeful and effective managerial and executive training. It has been suggested to set up special managerial institutes and introduce the management science into the curricula of higher educational establishments, so that graduate students coming to the work collectives as specialist organizers would be able to get through to the people on the job there, build up friendly relations and win themselves prestige. The correct

placing of cadres begins from their training which should be carried out during their specialist studies and particularly at the beginning of their practical work.

Such an approach is also expedient because owing to it young, energetic and healthy men and women can be boldly and confidently promoted to managerial posts.

The demands currently made on the manager can only be of practical value provided the society has objective criteria to authentically determine the presence or absence of appropriate qualities. The best and most reliable criterion is of course the results of preceding activities. Account must also be taken of the person's assessment, on behalf of his collective, by its party, Komsomol and trade-union organizations. Finally, psychological tests may also be useful in determining such qualities as observation, memory, selective thinking and the ability to summarize facts, analyse, collate, etc. These may be accompanied with various logical problems, which help determine capabilities in a particular field.

Thus we can draw the following conclusions: To give a scientific basis to the training and promotion of cadres, specialist knowledge is required. Equally important is the training of personnel specialists who are in a position to give qualified help to party and state organs in education, selection and placement.

In socialist society there exist well-tested methods of selection and placement of managerial workers. At the same time experimental work is going on with a view to verifying various improvements according to the specific requirements of each managerial category. Thus during the last few years the number of posts that have been put on a competitive basis has been increased.

Experience shows that appointment of officials by responsible government bodies is the most expedient form of placing managerial personnel in the administrative and economic apparatus. This accords with the requirements of the management process and the principles of one-man management and one-man responsibility, on the strict observance of which success largely depends. At the same time it does not curtail democratic initiative, for the party organizations which reflect the interests of work collectives are able to actively influence all personnel appointments and control the work of the administration at the enterprises and institutions.

The fundamental basis for promotion to managerial posts has been clearly outlined in Lenin's demand to approach the workers "a) from the standpoint of honesty, b) from the political standpoint, c) business qualifications, d) executive capacity".¹

Correct training and placement of cadres is considered by the party as one of the most important aspects of its activity. A special section of the Report of the CPSU Central Committee to the 25th Party Congress was devoted to this problem. "We must continue improving all this work. We should apparently give thought to ways of raising to a new and higher level the training of leading Party cadres, especially those on the ideological front, to ways of steadily raising the ideological, theoretical and business standards of the comrades who are already engaged in leading Party work. The activity of the central Party educational institutions should be further improved. Here, we should both recall the experience of the past and also give thought to new and modern forms of training high-skilled cadres. The important thing is to provide the Party with an even more extensive reserve of experienced and theoretically mature comrades."²

Democracy, Management and the Ideological Struggle

The problems of management and democracy are the subject of acute ideological conflict. The question of the objective conditions of democracy in management is of special relevance today. Bourgeois ideologists argue that insofar as socialist ownership of the means of production, which is the basis of socialism, implies a concentration of economic might in the hands of the state, a similar concentration of absolute political power in the hands of one man or group of men is inevitable. This dictatorship may be hard or soft, enlightened or otherwise, but it is unavoidable because the economic system of such a society supposedly lacks democratic conditions. Such conditions, they claim, can only exist under competitive capitalism which, according to the bourgeois theoretician Milton Friedman, is "a system of economic

¹ V. I. Lenin. *Collected Works*, Vol. 45, p. 243.

² *Documents and Resolutions. XXVth Congress of the CPSU*, p. 86.

freedom and a necessary condition of political freedom". He supplements this statement with the conclusion that "a society which is socialist cannot also be democratic, in the sense of guaranteeing individual freedom".¹

Arguments of this kind appear to conform to the requirements of the scientific methodological analysis of social phenomena, but in fact the character of political institutions is here deduced not from themselves and even not from a particular ideology, but from the economic system and the material conditions of the life of society. The point is that this has only the appearance of a scientific approach, an attempt to use Marxist methodology to refute Marxist theory.

As was noted by the Canadian Marxist S. Ryerson, bourgeois theory, "in an attempt to equate capitalism and freedom, bases its demonstration of the latter on an increasingly unreal model of the former."² Capitalism, as is well known, has long left the stage of free enterprise and passed into the last stage of its existence, the monopoly stage. Although this does not exclude competition, it is the concentration of the means of production and the centralization of capital together with the domination of the powerful financial and industrial concerns which determine the character of the economic structure of contemporary bourgeois society. And even if competition alone could serve as the basis for democratic order, bourgeois theoreticians should have had to admit at least that state-monopoly capitalism is far from favoring such a development.

Irrespective of the extent to which bourgeois theoreticians are consistent or inconsistent, their point of departure in analysing democracy is its identity with competitive capitalism. To what extent does this accord with reality?

It is unquestionable that the establishment of the capitalist mode of production gave rise to both the need and the possibility for democratizing the whole political life of society. The fundamental economic condition for the existence of capitalism is the presence of a free labor market, where labor is offered for sale like a commodity. For such trade to take place freely, it is essential first of all that each man be free to dispose of himself as he thinks fit and secondly

¹ Quoted from *World Marxist Review*, June 1963, No. 6, p. 60.

² *Ibid.*

that all be formally equal before the law. The proclamation of these two principles was the most important result of the bourgeois revolution. It marked the end of the serf exploitation of the peasantry and the social estate hierarchy of the feudal system based on it.

But if the capitalist system cannot exist without formal equality and the free buying and selling of manpower, it does not require much more. Given these two conditions the capitalist economy can function successfully. It is quite unimportant what type of government exists or whether there is universal suffrage, freedom of the press, a jury system, or whether the government is accountable to parliament, etc. These democratic institutions may exert reverse influence on the economy, boosting it at times, hampering it at others.¹ But they are not essential for its existence.

The absolute value of competitive capitalism as a foundation of democracy is limited to the formal equality it establishes and the free buying and selling of manpower. These principles are directly derivable from the economic system of capitalist society and stand, as it were, at the junction between economics and politics. All the other democratic principles and institutions, which in their totality are known as bourgeois democracy, are not inherent in capitalism and come from the working people's class struggle for their rights, and to a certain extent from the struggle for power between various sections of the ruling class.

The formation of the monopolies and their complete sway over the economy to all intents and purposes destroys the chances of the other sections of the bourgeoisie in their struggle for power. The state continues to protect the fundamental conditions for the existence of the whole bourgeois class—private property and the exploitation of labor, but at the same time it becomes the instrument for the political

¹ These essentially opposite influences are chiefly determined by the overall political situation. For example, when a country is preparing for war and militarism is running high, the democratic institutions can be used by progressive forces to spread anti-war propaganda and exercise a restraining influence on government policy. Militarism is therefore invariably accompanied by the desire to suppress democratic freedoms as was done by the Nazis in Germany. Similar tendencies have been noted in the United States, where the arms race has been accompanied by McCarthyism, the persecution of Communists and democrats in general and the blatant violation of the democratic principles proclaimed by the Constitution.

domination and defence of the interests, not of the whole capitalist class, but of its monopoly upper stratum alone. Ruining the petty proprietors and infringing upon the interests of the middle bourgeoisie, the monopolies pursue a militarist policy, urging the nation continually into war for the sake of their own profit. The monopoly bourgeoisie thus stand opposed to all other sections of the population and the opportunity presents itself for the creation of a united anti-monopoly front headed by the working class.

This continual threat hanging over the monopolies becomes more real as the organizational unity of the working class strengthens, and it drives the monopolies into reaction. Of course, it would be an oversimplification to say that the monopolies are always and everywhere striving to set up reactionary political regimes. On the contrary, they would prefer to operate under bourgeois democracy, for they are only too well aware that reaction limits their own possibilities. After all totalitarian terrorist dictatorship is nothing but an extreme form of the power of a class or its section, the power which has its own logic and demands utmost discipline and readiness to make definite sacrifices on behalf of the ruling class itself. Hitler was the servant of the Thyssens and the Kirdorfs and at one time had stood in their waiting rooms hoping for a cheque. But once he had become Reichschancellor, they were the ones who now stood at his beck and call, and woe betide anyone who didn't do what they were told. Hitler was quite prepared to take the most extreme measures as his treatment of the rebellious generals clearly demonstrates. Fascism guarantees the position and growth of the monopolies and their ruling directorates as a whole, but is far from guaranteeing the personal safety, let alone the independence of individual members of the group.

Insofar as the monopolies are able to maintain their dominant position with the help of the bourgeois political parties, bribery, flirting with the intermediate social strata and other well-tried methods of bourgeois democracy, they are prepared to give their full support to the democratic institutions. But when a political crisis is brewing and violence is in the air, they are ready to take extreme measures. The outcome of these depends on the correlation of forces, but however it may be, in such situations the monopolies tend to turn to reaction.

Account must also be taken of the political struggle which is continually being waged within the ruling elite. On the one hand, this is the kind of struggle that exists in any class and any social group around opinions as to what are the best means to promote common interests. But, on the other hand, it is a struggle for dominance in the state. It stems once again from economic causes—the various spheres of interest of the different monopoly groups. Naturally the more reactionary tendencies are more consistently and zealously pursued by those monopolies involved in the manufacture of arms or colonial plunder.

What organizational structure does the political regime generally have as soon as the most aggressive and reactionary imperialist circles succeed in overcoming the democratic resistance of the working people? It doesn't take much to answer this question, which has already been answered by history. Wherever reaction triumphs, even only temporarily, it assumes the form of one-man dictatorship. This was the case in fascist Germany and Italy and is still the case in a number of Latin-American countries, such as Chile.

The reason for this is contained first of all in the character of the reactionary political regime. Every extreme form of power requires strict organization and discipline on the part of the ruling class, which is taken to the extremes of one-man rule and centralism. The natural summit of the power pyramid and the prerequisite of its effectiveness is the national leader, who holds all the reins of state power and stands above the law, insofar as he himself decides the objectives of the regime and the means to their achievement.

However, it is not simply a matter of the internal logic of the reactionary political regime. Monopoly strivings towards reaction cannot be achieved by the simple annulment of the democratic institutions—this would do absolutely nothing for its instigators. On the contrary, it would be the signal for the cohesion of all democratic forces and their decisive action in defence of their rights. The chief task of the reactionary political regimes is therefore to artificially widen the social base of monopoly domination.

This can only be achieved by appealing to the nationalist feelings of the petty-bourgeois mass under the flag of national and social renaissance. But to control the pet-

ty-bourgeois element and turn it into the bulwark of the regime, a leader is needed. Best suited to this role is an ecstatic person who has come from the same background as the people he is trying to mobilize—a grocer, or a butcher, or just simply a lumpen. In this way the Hitlers, Rockwells and Poujades appear on the political scene.¹ They promise prosperity to the petty proprietors in dire straits, take them away from their natural ally, the proletariat, and reconcile them with their natural enemy, the monopolies, while setting them against Communists, socialists, democrats, foreigners, and the like.

Thus the tendency to one-man leadership is deeply rooted in the nature of capitalist society and state-monopoly capitalism. It is the natural result of the socio-economic conditions under which the exploiting minority (grown even smaller under imperialism) holds sway over the majority of society and every time this domination is threatened tries to establish extreme forms of totalitarian dictatorship. During the period of free enterprise Bonapartism represented such a form of government; in the era of monopoly capitalism it is known as fascism.²

A second conclusion of no less importance follows from this: after capitalism reaches maturity and its economic and political forms crystallize, a contraction of the social

¹ The formation of the leader has been brilliantly described in H. G. Wells' novel *The Autocracy of Mr. Parham* and Sinclair Lewis' *It Can't Happen Here*. Engels once said that reading the novels of Balzac was the best way to study French society. The above-mentioned novels also give a masterly depiction of the process of duping the petty-bourgeois mass and turning an insignificant little man into the ruler of a nation's destiny.

² It is characteristic that Bonapartism relied essentially on the same social strata as fascism (of course with regard for the changes that took place among the petty bourgeoisie during the century). "As the executive authority which has made itself an independent power," Marx wrote, "Bonaparte feels it to be his mission to safeguard 'bourgeois order'. But the strength of this bourgeois order lies in the middle class. He looks on himself, therefore, as the representative of the middle class and issues decrees in this sense. Nevertheless, he is somebody solely due to the fact that he has broken the political power of this middle class and daily breaks it anew. Consequently, he looks on himself as the adversary of the political and literary power of the middle class. But by protecting its material power, he generates its political power anew." (K. Marx and F. Engels. *Selected Works*, Vol. I, pp. 484-85.)

base of the bourgeois state is inevitable and this means the gradual degeneration of bourgeois democracy. Under the economic and political domination of the monopolies, the institutions of democracy cease by themselves to serve as guarantees against totalitarianism. Their ability to play this role wholly depends on the degree of organization among the working people and their readiness to resist reaction.

Furthermore, these institutions are used with increasing frequency and readiness by reactionary circles both as a guise for their own domination and as a transition to more extreme forms of totalitarian dictatorship. Thus it was universal suffrage that gave legality to Hitler's dictatorship. The majority of the nation, duped by the Nazis, ensured their predominance in the Reichstag and gave them the mandate to form a government.

Communists have never refused to work through the democratic institutions just for the reason that they were also used by the bourgeoisie. Universal suffrage, the representative system, the executive bodies being accountable to the electoral organs of power, the judges being subject only to the law and the principle of the inviolability of person together with many other democratic institutions have been widely used in the political system of socialism and will be more effectively employed in accomplishing the task of building a communist society.

But socialism is also creating completely new forms of democracy, democratic institutions that have been hitherto unknown. It enlarges the very concept of democracy, which under socialism is not limited to politics alone, but embraces all spheres of social life, including the economy, culture and the whole system of government.

One of the most important differences of the socialist state from an exploitative state is that in the former the only adequate form of democracy is socialist democracy. Democracy is rooted in the very nature of the socialist social system and the sphere of its manifestation broadens enormously, from the very inception of socialism. Only the socialist revolution can bring the mass of the working and exploited people, and not just separate strata or classes, into the work of conscious history-making. Socialism not only opens up a wide field of work for the politically active part of the people, it also encourages the bulk of

the people to participate in politics by involving them in the discussion and management of social affairs.

Any revolution gives society a powerful democratic boost, but only the socialist revolution can guarantee the further development and expansion of democracy. This is primarily because it is not yet complete, having only begun with the winning of political power after which should follow the period of radical transformation of capitalist society into socialist and communist society. A great aim generates great energy. Every step towards the heights of social justice and overcoming obstacles on this way stimulates fresh political activity and the creative efforts of the masses. Such a part was played by the struggle for socialist industrialization and the collectivization of agriculture, the cultural revolution, the defence of socialist gains in the Great Patriotic War (1941-1945) and the building of developed socialist society.

The urgent need to develop democracy is engendered by the new material conditions of life, the system of production relations and the class structure of socialism. Social ownership of the means of production is the economic foundation of socialism, which excludes all possibility of the exploitation of man by man. In whatever branch of production men are engaged, whatever their work, they know that they are not working for capitalists, but for themselves, for the whole of society. The emancipation of labor from exploitation based on private ownership is the fundamental condition for the freedom of the individual.

But it does not end here. Social property also means social management of that property. The state, which manages socialist production according to plan and exercises account and control over the measure of labor and the measure of consumption acts in the name, on the authority and in the interests of the collective owner of the means of production, that is, the people. The public organization and management of the economy does not serve to limit democracy, as bourgeois ideologists maintain, but, on the contrary, is its prime prerequisite.

And there is still one more side to the question. Democracy is not only one of the most important ends of the new society, it is also the universal effective means to the achievement of all its ends, which is used to structure the whole system of management. The socialist socio-economic

system not only creates the conditions for the democratization of the whole of society, it persistently demands such democratization.

Socialism cannot delay the creation of its own democratic system, which is in accordance with the new conditions and accelerates the development of social relations. But this cannot be done overnight. Socialist democracy does not appear in a ready-made form, but goes through various stages of improvement. The formation and development of socialist democracy is an objective process.

The radical difference between the political system of socialism and the political system of capitalism consists in the fact that the former is in the ascent. As the socio-economic relations of the new system gain in maturity, its democratic institutions are made more real and more meaningful.

But before achieving such maturity, socialism, like any other phenomenon must pass through the ripening stage. The founders of Marxism-Leninism frequently warned against utopian dreams of the socialist revolution solving all the social problems in one go. Lenin said that "*only* socialism will be the beginning of a rapid, genuine, truly mass forward movement, embracing first the *majority* and then the whole of the population, in all spheres of public and private life".¹

Socialist democracy has already shown to the full its immeasurable advantages over all other political systems. "Today, we know not only from theory, but also from long years of practice that genuine democracy is impossible without socialism, and that socialism is impossible without a steady development of democracy."²

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

² *Documents and Resolutions. XXVth Congress of the CPSU*, p. 103.

Chapter VII

DEMOCRACY AND THE INDIVIDUAL

Individual Freedom and Socialist Democracy

The concept of freedom in general and individual freedom in particular has always been regarded as something sublime and noble. Yet this concept has often been given highly contradictory interpretations according to the nature and features of the historically conditioned ideas, ideals and aspirations that have given rise to it. In a society divided into opposing classes and contending social groups, the various concepts of freedom clash. Therefore, theoretical attempts to understand the nature of freedom have, as a rule, been made in conditions of ideological conflict.

According to Hegel, "the history of the world is none other than the progress of the consciousness of Freedom; a progress whose development according to the necessity of its nature, it is our business to investigate."¹ But Hegel reduced the whole point of this progress to the self-realization of the Absolute Spirit—the mythical demiurge of all that exists.

It took the genius of Marx to give the concept of freedom a genuinely scientific foundation. Rejecting all forms of alienation of history from man and human activity, and all spiritualization of the historical process, Marxism considers freedom as the cognition and revolutionary transformation of natural and social reality in the interests of working men. Marx criticized Hegel's extreme idealization and absolutization of reason, spirit and idea as a distortion of historical reality, saying: "the history of mankind becomes the history of the *Abstract Spirit* of

¹ Georg Wilhelm Friedrich Hegel. *The Philosophy of History*, The Colonial Press, New York, London, 1900, p. 19.

mankind, hence a *spirit far removed* from the real man." ¹ Engels wrote that "'history' is not, as it were, a person apart, using man as a means to achieve *its own* aims; history is *nothing but* the activity of man pursuing his aims." ²

In this way the Marxist philosophy of freedom offers to the world the prospect of liberating the individual and mankind as a whole from all that suppresses, humiliates and demoralizes them and gives man hopes and real possibilities for becoming the master of his own fate. It also provides a concrete program for building a society based on the principles of equality, democracy and progress. It is this which constitutes the deep historical optimism of Marxist philosophy and its belief in the tremendous potential of individuals, nations and peoples.

The optimism of the Marxist philosophy of freedom results from its scientific grounding, the fundamental tenets of which amount to the following:

Man is dependent on the objective laws of existence, which cannot be ignored. These laws follow from the very essence and inherent interconnection of the phenomena, events and processes that take place in the material world. The objective necessity of these laws is expressed in the fact that any phenomena, events and processes in nature and society develop in principle in this and no other way under certain definite conditions.

Though it underlines the objective character of the development of the material world, Marxism-Leninism nevertheless admits of no fetishization of the laws of nature and society. Man, who has cognized these laws and learned how to utilize them can do so in his own interests and in this way gain control of them. Engels wrote: "Active social forces work exactly like natural forces: blindly, forcibly, destructively, so long as we do not understand, and reckon with them. But when once we understand them, when once we grasp their action, their direction, their effects, it depends only upon ourselves to subject them more and more to our own will, and by means of them to reach our own ends." ³

¹ K. Marx, F. Engels. *Collected Works*, Vol. 4, Moscow, 1975, p. 75.

² *Ibid.*, p. 93.

³ F. Engels. *Anti-Dühring*, Moscow, 1975, p. 320.

If there were no laws in nature and society objectively regulating the course of events, people would be unable to make even the simplest decisions or execute them, for they would not know how to go about achieving the desired results. Purposeful thinking and activity are only possible because of the existence and functioning of these objective laws which are one way or another reflected in the human mind.

Man comes to understand the laws of the natural and social environment in the course of his daily activity and in accordance with them he is able to determine the objectives of his volitional actions. How successful he is in achieving his aims depends on the degree to which he understands these laws and the precision with which his actions conform to them. The more people understand the laws of natural and social development, the more they can envisage the future lines of this development and the more successful will be their influence on the external world. So long as in their activity people are guided by sensuous appearance, which as a rule differs from the rational essence, they will remain slaves to blind necessity and powerless before it. Their volitional actions may occasionally correspond with objective necessity and achieve the desired aim. But in most cases it is impossible to guarantee such achievement. On the other hand, when people's volitional aspirations are based on objective laws, they can achieve the desired results, and their activity, though based on necessity, becomes at the same time free. The more clearly, deeply and comprehensively people understand necessity, the more their actions become meaningful, the higher their level of freedom and the more liberated their will. Consequently, "freedom does not consist in any dreamt-of independence from natural laws, but in the knowledge of these laws, and in the possibility this gives of systematically making them work towards definite ends. This holds good in relation both to the laws of external nature and to those which govern the bodily and mental existence of men themselves."¹

The point is that practical activity designed to master the forces of nature and society implies conscious control of one's own forces. For this reason freedom is understood by Marxism-Leninism not only in the sense of man's

¹ *Ibid.*, p. 132.

domination over his natural environment, over the interrelations and circumstances of his existence, but also as control "of ourselves" and our inclinations, our actions and our behavior.

Consequently to master the spontaneous forces of nature and society men must not only cognize the laws that govern the objective development of the material world, but subject the movement of their own forces to the purposeful utilization of these laws in their own interest, i. e. subject their own natural forces to reason. It is chiefly thanks to man exercising control over himself that his actions become reasoned and practically expedient, though it is important to stress that the utility of the result of his action must be considered primarily not from the angle of personal advantage but rather from the point of view of its social utility and value, insofar as the freedom of society is a condition of the freedom of its members. Man's control over himself consists in the submission of his natural forces to the achievement of socially meaningful objectives, thanks to which he can gain his own individual freedom. Therefore only socially expedient action directed to the progressive development of man's being is free action. For this reason not every action is free, though it may be performed with the "knowledge of the matter" and rely on accidental opportunities born of reality; only such an action is free which accords with the necessary movement of reality and is performed in the interests of the whole of society.

All this allows for a certain specification of the traditional definition of freedom as the cognition of necessity and action in conformity with cognized necessity. The point is that such cognition and action, at any rate in respect of the natural environment, are in evidence not only under socialism, but also to a certain extent under the exploitative socio-economic formations, whose essence precludes freedom.

In our view a definition of freedom ought to include three elements: (1) cognition of necessity; (2) action in conformity with cognized necessity; (3) action in the interests of society.

Many bourgeois theoreticians however prefer a less active conception of freedom, seeing it either as some sort of anarchy, independent of the objective conditions of existence, or as a kind of enclosure, where a man locks himself away

in order to discover his innermost being, hide and protect himself from the outside world. Thus, according to Sartre, freedom is just as indefinable as existence itself and boils down to a choice of self.¹ Proclaiming a similar existential isolation, Heidegger arrived at the conclusion that man has no other freedom than his own death, whereas for Burnham the utility of the concept of freedom only consists in the fact that it may be used instead of the word "war".

However, neither the negation of objective reality and the laws of its development, nor calls to retire from reality to one's own private world, nor propaganda for the freedom of death and the freedom of war can alter the obvious fact that freedom can only be achieved by those who have cognized the law-governed necessity and on this basis transformed their environment.

If the individual depends on society where alone he can exist and act, then consequently the freedom of society is a prerequisite of the freedom of its members. Man's freedom depends on the conditions in which he lives, works and creates. The individual can only fulfil himself in and through society. Being a member of society the individual unavoidably enters into a variety of contacts with other members of society. Man cannot be isolated or completely independent of the historical circumstances in which he lives and whose nature forms and conditions his social essence. But at the same time man possesses his own specific individuality, thanks to which he is not only a product of social relations, but their creator.

Dependence on society and active participation in its transformation are the objective criteria for an understanding of the real freedom of man. The level of freedom is not determined by any good wishes or promises, such as are frequently lavished by the leaders of the bourgeois parties and bourgeois statesmen and ideologists. It is rather a matter of the extent to which man is offered real possibilities for enjoying the benefits, achievements and values of the society of which he is a member and the degree to which social life itself guarantees the translation of these possibilities into reality. For this reason the necessary prerequisite of the individual's free self-fulfilment and social active-

¹ See J.-P. Sartre. *L'être et le néant*, Editions Gallimard, Paris, 1943, pp. 513, 516.

ness can only be such social conditions as are genuinely democratic, favorable and benevolent, in one word, humane.

In fact, the free cognition of necessity and the successful translation of its possibilities into reality depend on the existence of favorable, democratic conditions in society and the state, a genuinely democratic system of social relations and extensive citizens' rights, all of which can promote understanding of the objective laws of nature and society and their utilization in the interests of society and the individual. Today, when the social processes are becoming ever more complex, there is no point in talking about the freedom of the individual if he does not possess the necessary material means for the transformations of natural and social being, is denied the education necessary for the cognition of these processes, or has no access to those cultural values which are indispensable for the progressive development of mankind. The individual only acquires freedom when he has been freed from exploitation and oppression, when all the benefits and achievement of society are at his disposal and when he himself actively participates in the creative transformation of the world.

Hence it follows that freedom can develop and expand only in the bosom of democracy, that the condition of freedom is democracy and that the level of democracy reached by society determines its degree of freedom and that of its members. But freedom is far from being the passive consequence of democracy. Freedom actively stimulates the development of democracy and constantly and systematically accommodates it to the needs of the individual. Being the reflection and embodiment of necessity, freedom determines the necessity of democracy, and its movement, development and perfection.

And so free individual self-fulfilment and social involvement can only be given their full scope in a genuinely humane environment, where the interests of society and the individual are harmoniously combined and where consistent democracy ensures real freedom. The means to the creation of such a society have been scientifically laid down by the Marxist theory and tested in practice by the building of communism in the USSR and some other socialist countries.

Under socialism there is no private ownership of the means of production. Society exists as a whole unit and is not fragmented into alienated sections with each acting

according to its own will. There are no contradictory clashing forces and no conflict of hostile social groups, strata or classes. Social relations do not dominate people, commodities do not control producers and there are no anarchy of production, crises, unemployment or other social ills engendered by capitalism. With the establishment, stabilization and development of the socialist social ownership of the means of production the economic and political unity of the people is formed, the people's social activity being directed to the achievement of common goals.

The following are the most important consequences of the social ownership of the means of production:

First, the exploitation of man by man is completely done away with and the fundamental interests of all working people are unified in developing and multiplying social wealth and material and cultural values.

Second, the purpose of social production is changed. It now consists in the full satisfaction—according to existing conditions—of the material and cultural requirements of the individual.

Third, the functioning and growth of the economy and other aspects of the life of society now becomes planned.

Fourth, sound, rational and optimal production management based on the principles of democratic centralism can now be achieved.

The conscious participation of the Soviet people in the building of communism is one of the ways in which the individual freedom of each is manifested. Comradely mutual assistance and creative cooperation in all spheres of their activity contributes to developing, enriching and improving their personal experience, talents and gifts. Accumulating theoretical knowledge and applying it to the practical transformation of objective reality, the Soviet people satisfy their social and personal interests and requirements.

Those who live in socialist society have become the creators of their own destinies. They alone govern their state and control relations among themselves. In this way they increasingly establish their domination over the objective conditions of existence and achieve a greater degree of freedom in all spheres of their activity. This process is given maximum encouragement not only by economic, but also by political conditions. All power in the Soviet Union belongs to the working people in town and country through

the Soviets of People's Deputies which involve millions of people in the political, economic, social and cultural life of society and in running the state.

Soviet democracy relies on the socialist system of economic management and the socialist ownership of the means of production, the power of the working people and the consistent fulfilment of the requirements of socialist legality by all state and public organs and all officials. Therefore Soviet democracy is a real and effective guarantee of the rights and freedoms of the individual.

The dialectical interrelationship between freedom, democracy and the law, which has been achieved in socialist society, ensures the social activity of millions of people, which is based on scientific knowledge of the objective laws and the organized and planned control of social and natural forces, gives the latter the direction which is most expedient for society and utilizes them for the benefit of the people and for satisfaction of their continually growing material and cultural requirements and interests.

But external conditions of freedom alone, even if they are given the force of law, are insufficient for each individual to be internally free. If it is true that genuinely humane conditions of existence are created by the people themselves during their struggle for freedom, then it is obvious that the people must be sufficiently prepared for the struggle for these conditions and for their freedom. If it is further true that genuinely humane conditions are necessary to ensure individual freedom, then it follows that the individual will only be completely free when he learns how to utilize these conditions in his social activity. If, finally, it is true that there is no ultimate freedom, insofar as it is eternally developing with the development of society and mankind, then it follows that the individual can only acquire freedom by continually increasing the level of his knowledge and his ability to apply it and by systematically improving his social activity. This is why, given the external conditions of freedom, the individual will become internally free if he possesses an advanced world outlook, modern scientific knowledge and the values of culture and civilization, and if he fulfils himself in social activity and takes creative part in the production of material and cultural benefits, the running of the state and society and in the revolutionary transformation of the world. It is precisely due to this that an

association of people has been created that is the highest embodiment of humanitarian values. It is this that in its deepest sense is the meaning of the unity of men and women under socialism, which alone guarantees full scope for the freedom of society and of each of its members.

As a result of the development of the socialist sociopolitical system, a situation has arisen in which the management of social processes would be unthinkable without the active participation of the individual, the working people and the whole nation. Every Soviet citizen possesses full democratic rights and duties, which allow him to freely implement the socialist principle of "from each according to his ability, to each according to his work" and promote the establishment of the communist principle of "from each according to his ability, to each according to his needs".

In connection with this it is important to note two important problems. First, the new Constitution of the USSR, which was drawn up on the basis of the experience of both Soviet legislation and the constitutional development of the fraternal socialist countries, establishes a clear correlation between the rights and duties of Soviet citizens. Soviet constitutional legislation reflects the fact that the state of the whole people is concerned about extending the rights of citizens, but does not lose sight of the necessity to strengthen public order, discipline and responsibility of all citizens and the fulfilment of their duties to society, for as L. I. Brezhnev said at the 25th Party Congress, "democracy is inconceivable without discipline and a sound public order. It is a responsible approach by every citizen to his duties and to the people's interests that constitutes the only reliable basis for the fullest embodiment of the principles of socialist democracy and true freedom for the individual."¹

It is therefore relevant to study the most rational correlation of the various elements of the legal status of citizens.

This is an excessively complex problem, whose solution implies a comprehensive study of man as individual and citizen.

Secondly, with the aim of optimizing the implementation of the socialist principle of "from each according to his ability, to each according to his work", and the communist

¹ *Documents and Resolutions. XXVth Congress of the CPSU*, p. 103.

principle of "from each according to his ability, to each according to his needs", it is necessary to conduct an extensive study of those criteria which would make it possible to determine not only the abilities of each, but how to provide reasonable satisfaction of their needs as an expression of the socialist way of life.

There is, perhaps, no need to specifically demonstrate the importance of theoretical work on this problem now that the advantages of the socialist economic system are combined with the scientific and technical revolution. Under socialism the scientific and technical revolution provides hitherto unknown benefits. Socialism utterly rejects the petty-bourgeois ideal of a "consumer society". It is rather concerned to ensure that the material and cultural wealth amassed by society serve the all-round development of Soviet man and the full flowering of his freedom, abilities and talents.

Thanks to their democratic rights and freedoms Soviet citizens are able to actively participate in the building of communism and in social, political, economic and cultural life. Citizens' rights and freedoms under socialism serve primarily to satisfy their personal requirements. But at the same time they serve the interests of the collective, society and the state as a whole, in that they express the unity of vital personal and social interests in socialist society. The state, whose whole organization is based on the principle of the active participation of the working people in public affairs, is concerned to ensure broad democratic rights and freedoms, for their exercise promotes the primary objectives of society.

In its turn the exercise of the rights and freedoms of the individual increases his participation in the social, political and cultural life of society and in this way helps to develop and improve him. "Nothing adds so much to the stature of the individual," said L. I. Brezhnev, "as a constructive attitude to life, and a conscious approach to one's duty to society, when matching words and deeds becomes a rule of daily behaviour."¹

Earlier on, we gave a detailed outline of the system of socialist democracy and indicated its most important components and its basic lines of development. To this it may

¹ *Documents and Resolutions. XXVth Congress of the CPSU*, p. 94.

be added that this system is, as it were, an environment which favors the all-round, harmonious development of the individual and in which man can develop as a conscious, free, creative worker and builder of communism. Man relates to this environment in an innumerable variety of ways, of which we shall only mention the most important, to be analyzed further on. These are: the relationship between (1) the individual and the state, (2) the individual and the public organizations and (3) the individual and the work collective. As for the relationships between the individual and the party these run through the whole system of Soviet society and therefore exist in all the above-mentioned relationships. Politics and the work of the party enter into all spheres of social activity and are important in characterizing any social association designed to represent or further the interests of the working people.

The State and the Individual in Socialist Society

The relationship between the state and the individual in socialist society is based on the general humanitarian principles of socialism, the ideas of Marxism-Leninism and the genuine humane ideals of communism. The freedom of the individual is one of the central ideas of the Soviet state and socialist democracy.

Throughout the course of history the individual, as a member of a social community—the state—has always been given a special role and specific capacity, which are summed up in the concept “citizen”. This concept obviously includes the political and juridical aspect. “A citizen” . . . is an *individual in relation to the state and the law, the authority and the legal rule*¹. But through the ages this relationship has been subject to continued change and was radically altered as a result of the transition from exploitative socio-economic system to socialism, from a class-oppressive state to a socialist state. In the socialist world man has first become the subject of the social policy and activity of the

¹ *The Marxist-Leninist General Theory of the State and the Law. Fundamental Institutions and Concepts*, Moscow, 1970, p. 472 (in Russian).

state and the independent and active agent of political relations and the system of socialist democracy.

One of the fundamental tasks of the socialist state is the education of the individual in a spirit of social activeness, his inducement to social creativity and his mobilization for the task of building communism. The citizen as he is and as member of numerous socio-political associations, is the holder of power in society and the state. This function he exercises in close interrelationship with other people and associations. In a word, he acts within the system of socialist democracy, which implies his active participation in state administration, in managing the economy and culture and in controlling the state apparatus. The socialist political system offers the citizens the opportunity of taking part in both representative democracy and direct democracy.

Political practices, as shown by the action of the forms and institutions of socialist democracy, whose purpose is to strengthen the political role of citizens in the running of society and the state, demonstrate that under socialism man no longer stands opposed to the state as a simple object. Between the socialist state and the individual there exists a relationship, which is continually improving, of cooperation and interaction over the solution of the most important social problems. On this basis a marked process is taking place, whereby the individual and society, the citizen and the state are drawing closer together and this reflects the tendency for the evolution of the Soviet society towards attaining social homogeneity. The historical alienation of man, society and the state, which resulted from the domination of exploitative socio-economic systems, gives place to their solid unity in the course of communist construction.

In determining the sphere of relations between the state and the individual, it is important to avoid a one-sided view of it by keeping in mind its complex, manifold nature. The fact that these relations are marked by convergence and cooperation, which clearly underlines their socialist nature, does not exclude the existence of the "vertical" ties, traditional for any state, between the state organs exercising power and the citizens who are subject to it, i.e. between the governors and the governed. The socialist society will therefore continue to attach importance to those methods of exercising power which involve the strengthening of state discipline, enhancement of citizens' responsibility for their

actions and work, and, where necessary, the use of compulsion. It would be incorrect to disregard the fact that in relation to its citizens the Soviet state and its organs act as the holders of authority and the agents of management, who have the right to make demands, give orders, offer incentives, inflict punishments and make prohibitions, etc. Furthermore, the citizen is obliged to fulfil the state demands and injunctions, obey the law, in a word, submit to the state, whose will expresses the common interests of the working people. Such submission is the elementary condition for the organization of social management. "We do not expect," wrote Lenin, "the advent of a system of society in which the principle of subordination of the minority to the majority will not be observed."¹

There are two fundamental aspects from which it is possible to consider the structure of relations between the state and the individual. One of these relates to the growing contacts, cooperation and convergence of the two social entities, the other to their specific status within the framework of power relations, in which the state is always able to govern its citizens.

The first comes from the humanitarian nature of socialism, is its practical realization in the sphere of politics and represents everything new that the socialist social organization has brought to democracy. As for the second, it seems to have certain analogous elements to the relationship between the state and the individual as exists in exploitative society: above there is the state, the state organs and the civil servants; below, the citizen, the subject. But this is purely the appearance.

In actual fact socialism consistently and fundamentally democratizes the "vertical" ties, developing the system of power relations within the state on the principles of genuine democracy. As distinct from capitalist society, the governors and the governed under socialism are not hostile groups with antagonistic interests. The social progress of the individual within the framework of the socialist economic and political system was and is one of the major tasks confronting the socialist state and the motive for all its actions, particularly those that directly affect the citizens. The individual is not a means to the achievement of special, self-

¹ V. I. Lenin. *Collected Works*, Vol. 25, p. 461.

inclusive social and state ends. On the contrary, he is the end of all efforts made by the state on a nation-wide scale.

But this gives rise to a fairly relevant ideological question: how far are the powers of the state in keeping with the programmatic aims of communist construction, and is the state compatible with the broad perspectives for socialist democracy and individual freedom. Listening to the bourgeois liberals one gets the impression that any state can only strengthen at the expense of personal freedom, whereas the development of this freedom requires the weakening and erosion of the state, and minimizing its right to interfere in human relations.¹ These ideas are well known in the West, although the social and political practices of capitalism have frequently demonstrated their futility.

An increase in the social role of the state can now be observed in the capitalist world too, but it is of a complex and contradictory nature and reflects deep social rifts. That which bourgeois liberals once saw as the sole function of the state—guarding the rights and interests of the individual (which meant the property owner) now occupies but a small part of the functions assumed by the state in relation to society and the individual.

The modern capitalist world has begun to strengthen the role of the state as organizer and participant in economic activity, which has faced the state apparatus with the necessity to assume a measure of control over private capital supposedly in order to guarantee employment, wages and a general minimum standard of living and ensure the optimum correlation between supply and demand on the market. However scientific and technical progress in the 20th century has led to a deep contradiction between the activity of the state, which traditionally supports the class interests of the big bourgeoisie, and the demands of the public for the state's social policy.

Under these conditions an unstable political leadership with limited class views, the ineffectual activity of the state, reflecting social and economic difficulties, and the inability to withstand anarchic and destructive tendencies in society

¹ The idea of weakening state power in the name of democracy had long been a leading political doctrine in the United States. See *Contemporary Bourgeois Doctrines on the Capitalist State. Critical Essays*, Moscow, 1967, p. 151 et seq. (in Russian).

all serve to seriously infringe on the freedom of the individual and bourgeois democracy.

The Marxist-Leninist position on this question starts from the need to strengthen both the socialist state and the freedom of the individual throughout the whole period of transition from socialism to communism. Under socialism the state is the reliable guarantor of individual freedom, whose flowering ultimately depends on how the state organizes the economy, ensures the stability of social relations, guarantees the rights and interests of the citizens, protects the individual and involves the working people in the running of the state. In this sense the socialist state is and must remain powerful. Strengthening state power under socialism is identical with its further democratization and humanization.

The essence of the matter is that under socialism a suitable social and economic base has been created by the state for the extension of democracy and individual freedom. Of considerable importance for the relationship between the socialist state and the individual is the fact that according to the Constitution of the USSR the state owns all public property and organizes economic construction, distributes incomes, etc. All the material and cultural wealth which is to be distributed among members of society according to the principle of "from each according to his ability, to each according to his work" reaches the citizen via the state.

By virtue of this the manifold activity of the socialist state becomes a decisive factor in the establishment and extension of individual freedom. This factor is decisive not because man receives his freedom from the state in a ready-made form. Such a view would be an inadmissible simplification of the problem, alien to the ideas of socialism. Lowering man to the level of the object of a beneficent activity by the state contradicts the revolutionary-liberatory spirit of Marxism-Leninism. It is not only the state that provides opportunities for individual freedom. Other sections of the political structure of society also play their part. Finally, of course, there is the individual himself, whose own abilities, energy and desires contribute greatly. But the modern socialist state is chief among the factors that make for the development of the individual freedom. It virtually exists to provide for the cultural and material needs of individual and guarantee his life and freedom.

The socialist state must take on itself the colossal task of providing for the well-being and freedom of the individual and the demands made upon it are consequently high. The socialist state may not renounce its responsibilities to man, neglect its tasks of ensuring the all-round development of his freedom and guaranteeing his needs and interests. This duty follows objectively from the economic and political structure of the Soviet society and from the aims of the socialist revolution which began the transition from capitalism to communism.

The specific position of the state as the focal point of the political organization of society is given concrete expression in a number of factors that are of considerable relevance to the political status of the individual. The continually growing contacts between the individual and the state under socialism are a demonstration of the increased interest among citizens in the effective workings of the state bodies and in improving the quality of state decisions. Only given such genuine interest can the age-old principle of true democracy be implemented according to which the affairs of the state are the affairs of each of its citizens.

Of all the components of the political structure of socialist society the state is the best adapted to develop the political activity and initiative of the individual. But to say that the state is a specially favorable environment for the political development of the individual does not of course mean that the state stands opposed to the public organizations. It is simply a matter of comparing the range of possibilities available to the various sections of the political organization, and from this point of view the state, of course, takes first place. Therefore, there is no other public organization or any other political unit within society that can substitute for the state in its relations with the individual.

Many jurists hold the idea of the legal character of the relation between the state and the individual. This relation can be described as jural, as a kind of general legal relation. It of course has its social, political, economic and legal aspects, but its legal aspect is the most essential.

The strengthening of legal principles in the relations between the state and the citizens is an integral part of the further development of socialist democracy. It should be noted that the notions on the importance of these principles and on the boundaries to the legal regulation of state

activity evolved gradually during the history of Soviet society and had to contend with opposing views. The first years of Soviet power witnessed what might be called a certain "legal nihilism", when it was believed that the state, which in the political and moral respects represented the interests of the working class and the peasantry, could function successfully without any legal formalities or juridical norms. Those who held such views (and they existed both among lawyers and state functionaries) considered it superfluous to set definite juridical obligations on the state and its organs in respect of citizens.

But those who favored the nihilistic approach to legal norms in society were defeated. After considering the practical conditions and requirements for the building of socialism in the country, Lenin and the party adopted a plan for expanding legal regulation, and for the publication and implementation of effective laws which clearly defined the rights and duties of all participants in the task of economic, cultural and political construction. Lenin insisted that when citizens came into contact with the organs of the state they should be well informed juridically and know all their rights and opportunities, and demanded that "they should be taught (and helped) to fight for their rights according to all the rules".¹

It is impossible to contrast the political, moral and juridical methods of governing society, but at the same time it is clear that the moral, political and social unity of the state and the citizen cannot be interpreted to mean that all problems arising between the state and the citizen may be solved "freely", i.e. without norms, without formal rules and without firmly established limitations on the conduct of all participants in social relations.

Juridical methods of governing people ensure the reliability and stability of the social order as well as the citizens' confidence in the assurance and inviolability of their rights. For this purpose there exist juridical formalities which must be respected and observed. Any violation of legality, no matter what the reason, undermines the state prestige and the system of public order, leading to the distortion of the proper relations between the individual and the state. The law, which is binding on both sides, is the unshakeable

¹ V. I. Lenin. *Collected Works*, Vol. 45, p. 274.

foundation of these relations. The state bodies, enterprises and institutions must be extremely exacting on themselves in relation to their observance and fulfilment of the laws, for their work is carried out under the eyes of, and directly affects, all the citizens. In a socialist society there can be no different legalities for the citizens and for the state.

On the subject of the legal relations between the state and the individual under socialism one more highly important factor must be mentioned. In its relationship to the citizens the state has specific and unique prerogatives which cannot in principle be alienated in favor of any other political association; these are its powers to publish laws which establish their subjective rights, and determine their legal duties. These prerogatives are rooted in state sovereignty, and it is this sovereign character of the implementation of state power within the country that gives rise to the principle, according to which its legislative function cannot be transferred in whole or in part to any other organization which represents only the interests of a part of society. In exercising this function the socialist state can rely on the mass organizations and the organs of public initiative, which act under the guidance of the Communist Party, but the whole process has the effect of linking various types of intra-social political structures to the legislative work of the state. The latter possesses all rights and at the same time bears full responsibility to the people for legislation. All this is particularly important where it is a matter of the interests and rights of the individual citizen.

The rights of Soviet man reflect the nature of Soviet democracy and are its concrete manifestation. Each right that the Soviet government guarantees the citizen allows him to perform definite actions in accordance with his own will, at his own discretion and in his own interests. The successful exercise of his rights and the receipt of the material and cultural benefits that society has to offer, require the citizen to fulfil the duties that are incumbent upon him, give his labor for the use of society and concern himself with the running of the state and public affairs. Each duty which the state imposes upon the citizen requires the performance of a given action in the interests of the state, society and his fellow men.

The totality of rights granted to the citizen by the Soviet government and the duties imposed upon him constitute

the legal status of a citizen of the USSR, which characterizes the political and legal standing of the individual. The fundamental characteristics of the legal status of the Soviet citizen are the following: a) all rights (freedoms) and duties that constitute this status form a single system, based on the principles of socialism and answering the needs of the building of communist society in the USSR; b) all the rights (freedoms) and duties of citizens are guaranteed and ensured by the Soviet social and state system and are the common property of all the Soviet people; c) all rights (freedoms) and duties are protected by the Soviet state; no one may hinder the exercise of the rights, freedoms and legal interests of citizens just as no one is entitled to impose other duties or alter the existing ones outside the law; d) the rights and duties which constitute the legal status of the citizen are equal in the sense that all citizens have equal legal opportunity to enjoy their rights and fulfil their duties.

The legal status of the Soviet citizen reflects the social and economic nature of the Soviet state, which has created the necessary conditions for the harmonious development of the individual and the exercise of his freedom. Although it possesses relative continuity and stability, the legal status of the citizen is nevertheless not something that is determined once and for all. It becomes enriched as socialist democracy expands the opportunities for the active participation of Soviet citizens in the running of society and the state and in economic and cultural construction, promotes the fuller satisfaction of the needs and interests of the citizens and furthers the all-round development of the talents and abilities of the individual.

The new Constitution of the USSR established the political rights and freedoms of Soviet citizens, which give them the opportunity to actively participate in the running of state and public affairs and exercise control over the state apparatus. Citizens of the USSR may both vote and be elected to the Soviets of People's Deputies, take part in the discussion and drafting of laws and measures of All-Union and local significance. They may participate in the work of the state bodies and the cooperative and other public organizations, in control over their activity, in the management of production and affairs of work collectives and in meetings at their place of residence. Every citizen has the right to submit proposals to state bodies and public organizations

for improving their activity, and to criticize shortcomings in their work. Persecution for criticism is prohibited.

Naturally the state, more than any other political organization, has the opportunity to institutionalize the principle of mass participation and control in government. By saying that a decision of the sovereign state ought to express the will of the people, we imply the necessity of those juridical institutions which take account of that will, transform it into the will of the state and at the same time establish the means of mass control that are directed not only at individual acts and measures of the state, but at its whole policy.

Hence arises the question—closely connected with the state sovereignty—of the responsibility of the socialist state to the people. Responsibility and the whole complex of problems related to it are of considerable theoretical significance, which comes from the Marxist-Leninist theory of the socialist state as a state of the whole people.

The Constitution of the USSR deals with the most important and fundamental elements in the system of juridical institutions, which ensure the contacts between the individual and the state. Insofar as it establishes the right of citizens to vote and to be elected, to hear the reports of deputies, to recall them at any time and to participate in national polls and referendums, the Soviet Constitution provides the opportunity for citizens to influence state policy as a whole and to evaluate the political measures of the state. Together with these constitutional institutions there exists the whole juridical system which allows individual citizens to influence the work of the state bodies by means of declarations, suggestions and complaints, etc. Thus the state is responsible to the whole people for its decisions and actions and, what is of particular significance, this responsibility is juridically institutionalized in the form of the right and opportunities of each citizen to take part in the state policy and control and evaluate it.

The Communist Party upholds and strengthens the prestige of the state and its tremendous capabilities, but in no way seeks to replace it in its relations with the individual. It rather directs these relations with regard for the aims of communist construction. The ideological and organizational influence of the party is to a significant degree exercised via the state thanks to the utilization of the appropriate state channels.

The Socialist Constitution, the Individual and Human Rights

An important stage in the legal regulation of the status of the individual in Soviet society was the adoption in 1977 of the new Constitution of the USSR. It is the fullest declaration of the rights and duties of the citizen in socialist society throughout the whole history of the Soviet state and has increased the opportunities for the working people to take an active part in the building of communism, contribute to this common cause, satisfy their own material and cultural requirements and comprehensively develop as free individuals. Preserving continuity with former constitutions of the Soviet state and drawing on the whole constitutional experience of Soviet history, the new Fundamental Law has enriched this experience, adding to it new propositions that are relevant for the task of further improving the social, political and economic system of the USSR. Thus it has been shown once again that in a mature socialist society the development of the individual is inseparable from the process of strengthening the foundations of society and the state and the achievement of the chief aims of the state such as the creation of the material and technical basis of communism, the improvement of socialist social relations and their transformation into communist social relations, the education of communist man and the raising of the material and cultural standards of the people.

It would be difficult to find a section or aspect of the democratic development of Soviet society which did not concern itself or would be indifferent to the growth of man and the extension of his creative powers, abilities and talents. Solving the problems of the individual as they apply to the various spheres of social life is one of the fundamental tasks facing the constitutional regulation of socialist social relations.

In this connection let us consider the function of the Constitution and the limits and possibilities for constitutional regulation of the status of the individual under socialism. If we understand the Constitution as primarily a legal enactment, then its objectives may be summed up as establishing the basic rights, freedoms and duties of the citizen and defining the manner of their exercise in its most essential features. But the concept of a socialist constitution which

has been arrived at over the years of socialist and communist construction views the Fundamental Law not merely as a legal enactment, but the most important political document of its time. Together with giving the force of law to what has already been achieved, it proclaims the main objectives and aims of socialism and the principles of state organization. This to a significant degree expands the possibilities of constitutional regulation and allows the constitution to embrace the principles and fundamentals of the mutual relationship between society, the state and the individual. To establish the constitutional principles of man's status in society is a far greater task than simply stating the rights and duties of the citizen. Insofar as the functions of a constitution understood in this sense are very wide, the constitution itself gives an integral idea of the character and type of the relationship that exists between the individual and the state under socialism. This aspect of the socialist constitution determines its tremendous significance for society as a whole and for each individual citizen.

The constitution, like any state law, contains fundamental statutes which may be directly referred to by anyone in support of his demands or claims on the state bodies, the public organizations, or citizens. By the traditions of socialist democracy the fundamental rights and duties of the citizen are an important part of the constitutional act and an indication of its democracy and humanity. But regulating relations between the state and the individual is a function of the socialist constitution as a whole, not of its separate sections, chapters or articles. Generally speaking, each constitutional provision, whether it treats the granting of a particular right to a citizen or the terms of reference of the higher organs of state power and administration, relates directly to this question, adding to the general picture and specifying various aspects of the relationship between the individual and the state.

At the same time we should take note of the current tendency to develop socialist constitutions by widening the field of constitutional regulation, which stems from the deeper socialist nature of society, the achievement of the stage of mature developed socialism, the comprehensive character of the social processes, the increased role of party guidance over the building of communism and the development of socialist democracy and the creative activity of the masses.

This tendency was clearly expressed in the 1977 Constitution of the USSR, which included a number of clauses that were either entirely new, or had previously been part of current legislation and now, by virtue of their greater social significance, became constitutional norms. For instance, the right to housing previously belonged to the working people and was exercised according to Soviet laws and statutory instruments. But now this right has become constitutional and consequently can be more firmly guaranteed as a result of the extensive housing program. The Constitution of the USSR is one of the first in the world to proclaim this important human right. As a result of extending the subject-matter of the constitutional regulation, new possibilities have appeared in the sense of a fuller and more accurate reflection of the relationship between the state and the individual.

What are the determinative characteristics of this relationship and how are they reflected in the socialist constitution? The social status of the individual is formed as a result of continuous social change which characterizes the epoch of transition from capitalism to communism. It is the result of the purposeful activity of the revolutionary forces in society, or to be more exact, the victorious working class and its allies. It is the result of the work of the Communist Party which is leading socialist and communist construction. It comes from the objective development of society from socialism to communism and the gradual maturation of new social relations in economics, politics and culture. The preamble to the new Soviet Constitution states that in the USSR a developed socialist society has been built, that the stage has been reached when socialism is developing on its own foundations and that the creative forces of the new system and the advantages of the socialist way of life are becoming increasingly evident and the working people are more and more widely enjoying the fruits of their great revolutionary gains. Being a natural, logical stage on the road to communism, developed socialist society means important changes in the social status of the individual.

In fact, mature socialism is a society in which powerful productive forces and progressive science and culture have been created, in which the well-being of the people is constantly rising and more and more favorable conditions are being provided for the all-round development of the individual.

It is a society of mature socialist social relations, in which, on the basis of the drawing together of all classes and social strata and of the juridical and factual equality of all its nations and nationalities and their fraternal cooperation, a new historical community of people has been formed—the Soviet people.

It is a society of high organizational capacity, ideological commitment and consciousness of the working people, who are patriots and internationalists.

It is a society in which the law of life is concern of all for the good of each and concern of each for the good of all.

It is a society of true democracy, the political system of which ensures effective management of all public affairs, ever more active participation of the working people in running the state, and the combining of citizens' real rights and freedoms with their obligations and responsibilities to society.

Having noted the major gains of developed socialism, the Soviet Constitution determines its prospects. While speaking of the need for the constitutional establishment of the status of the individual in society, it is necessary to remember that in addition to its function as the legal and political regulator of social relations, the socialist constitution fulfils important ideological and programmatic functions in linking the subjective desires of the people (under the dictatorship of the proletariat this meant primarily the working class) with the objective social conditions which arise after the victory of the socialist revolution at all stages of the building of socialism and communism.

In elucidating the ideological role of the socialist constitution considerable interest attaches to the pronouncements of Lenin relating to the time of the adoption of the first Soviet Constitution (1918). He considered it important that "the Soviet Constitution—the fundamental law of the Russian Socialist Federative Republic—reflected the ideals of the proletariat of the whole world".¹ The Constitution of 1918 was the first political and juridical document of such a kind in history. But at the same time it was also an act of a deeply practical nature, in which the desires and aspirations of the working class and its ideas of what should be were expressed via the experience of struggle. Characterizing the 1918 Constitution Lenin stressed that "it embodies what

¹ V. I. Lenin. *Collected Works*, Vol. 27, p. 551.

experience has already given, and will be corrected and supplemented as it is being put into effect".¹ The Constitution expresses the class ideal and translates it into real social practice. The combination of the ideal and practice, conscious determination and objective statement of the facts define the volume and character of the active constitutional influence on social relations in socialist society.

The above quotations from Lenin direct our attention to the fact that a socialist constitution, in expressing what has been learned from the past and affirming what exists in the present is at the same time concerned with what will be in the future. Of such a character is the new Constitution of the USSR, which reflects sixty years' experience in the building of socialism and communism. Born of the Great October Revolution the Constitution of the USSR asserts its fundamental gains and continues its transformative efforts, being the program for the further improvement of the social, political and economic system. The Fundamental Law of the Soviet state answers the needs of the present, but it is also the visible embodiment of the link between the glorious past of the Soviet people and their great future.

The preamble to the Constitution of the USSR declares that the supreme goal of the Soviet state is the building of a classless communist society. Among the tasks of social development which are indicated in the Constitution particular significance for the development of the freedom of the individual is attached to raising the material and cultural standards of the people. The Constitution also declares that the supreme goal of social production is the fullest possible satisfaction of the people's growing material, cultural and intellectual requirements. Under socialism man creates new production in his own interests, but its further development in its turn requires new qualities from the individual, a new type of man. Engels foresaw this when he wrote: "the joint management of production by society as a whole and the resultant new development of production require quite different people and also mould them."²

The Soviet Union is in the process of realizing the inexhaustible economic and social potential of socialism in

¹ *Ibid.*, Vol. 28, p. 35.

² K. Marx and F. Engels. *Selected Works*, Vol. 1, p. 93.

the development of production and in the related increase of the nation's well-being. The economic development of the country, particularly during the eighth, ninth and current tenth five-year plan periods reflects the long-term orientation of the party's economic policy and its economic strategy which is based on the humane principle: "all in the name of man, all for the sake of man." At the 25th Party Congress L. I. Brezhnev stressed that "just as any other, strategy, the Party's economic strategy begins with the formulation of tasks, with the identification of fundamental, long-term aims. The most important of these has been and remains a steady rise of the people's living standard and cultural level." ¹ The policy, pursued by the party and affirmed by the new Constitution of the USSR, is founded on a firm material base, is scientifically grounded and realistic. At the 25th Party Congress long-term plan estimates were made according to which during the period 1976 to 1990 the USSR would have at its disposal almost twice the material and financial resources it possessed during the previous fifteen-year period (1961-1975).

The reality of these plans is guaranteed by the coordinated collective efforts of the citizens in all branches of the economy and by the tremendous possibilities for increasing the effectiveness of social production, accelerating scientific and technical progress, raising the productivity of labor, and improving the quality of work in all sectors of communist construction. The well-being of the people in mature socialist society is created not by any miraculous means, but comes from the growth of social wealth which is the result of the determined, selfless labor of the members of society. Great attention is therefore paid in the Constitution of the USSR to organizing labor and raising efficiency.

The new Constitution of the Soviet state affirms the trends and goals of the development of the political system of mature socialism. The principal trend here is the extension of socialist democracy, namely ever broader participation of citizens in managing the affairs of society and the state, continuous improvement of the machinery of state, heightening of the activity of public organizations, strengthening of the system of people's control, consolidation of the legal foundations of the functioning of the state and society, great-

¹ *Documents and Resolutions. XXVth Congress of the CPSU*, p. 48.

er openness and publicity, and constant responsiveness to public opinion. In the course of the socialist transformations of society a single developing democratic system has been formed, which organically unites the state and social bases, as well as the political and non-political and representative and non-representative forms. But the most important thing is that socialism creates the material basis for such democracy, by successfully furthering the socialist economic system based on social ownership of the means of production.

It must be realized that the constitution exerts an active influence on all aspects of the development of society both by establishing the principles of the relevant system of social relations and defining their aims, prospects and tendencies, and by determining the fundamental rights and duties of those who participate in these relations. The constitutional regulation of social problems, as has already been mentioned, does not only amount to the establishment of rights and duties, but the system of these rights and duties as set out in the Fundamental Law is its most important contribution to defining and developing the relationship between the individual and the state. The fundamental rights and duties express the most essential connections between society, the state and the citizen. The constitution includes such principles and institutions as go far beyond the framework of the relationship between individual citizens and individual state bodies, relating rather to the general links between the state and the individual. It is this that constitutes its most important characteristic as a juridical and socio-political enactment.

A fundamental right or duty is one that possesses a certain complex of social and legal features. It is important to stress that it is not the fact of the affirmation of this or that right or duty which makes it fundamental, for it is made such in the course of the objective development of social relations. The will of the state, as expressed in the constitution, formalizes and establishes a fundamental right or duty as being constitutional, i.e. gives it legal validity and the force of law. The fundamental rights and duties express and mediate the interests and the relevant needs of the people, without which normal day-to-day activity in society would be impossible. These needs and interests involve work, creativity, material benefits, cultural development, health and security, and they cannot be withheld from the sum-total of

man's vital aspirations without seriously impeding his development as a free individual. The legislator includes a particular right in the constitution if it has obvious social features characterizing it as "basic".

The constitutional form of establishing the rights and duties of the citizen most fully corresponds to the Marxist-Leninist, socialist understanding of human rights and the concept of the supreme social value of the individual whose interests and well-being are the aim of social development under mature socialism. As the highest normative enactment of the state the constitution possesses certain juridical features that set it apart from other enactments such as laws and various statutory instruments, etc. The Soviet Constitution has the highest juridical force. All other normative enactments must be constitutional, that is to say drawn up on the basis of and in conformity with the Constitution, and not in contradiction to its express provisions. Should such conflict arise, the constitutional solution is the one to be recognized as valid. Any change in the constitution must be carried out in conformity with a special fixed procedure. The rights and duties of citizens as set out in the Constitution can only be altered or amended by the Supreme Soviet of the USSR. More than any other normative enactments the Constitution is able to guarantee the stability and security of the legal position of the individual in society and the state.

Thus it is clear that the very fact of stating the rights and duties of the citizen in constitutional form is in itself a powerful social, political and legal guarantee of the freedom and dignity of man in socialist society. It would be wrong to think that the legal form of the affirmation of rights is of secondary importance, the main thing being the creation of reliable social guarantees of such rights. The experience of constitutional development under socialism has shown that such gradation is incorrect, for both elements are of equal importance for the further development of individual rights and freedoms.

The Marxist-Leninist ideas of humanism and human rights constitute an integral part of the theoretical foundation of the new Soviet Constitution. Socialism is a whole epoch in the development of human rights and individual freedom. The changes it has brought to the theory and practice of human rights constitute its clear advantage over

exploitative social and economic formations, particularly capitalism. Socialism, which embodies all the most progressive and valuable that was created by man over previous epochs and generations, resolutely discards any distortion of the essence of human rights, which has arisen from the conditions and requirements of the system of human exploitation. It asserts the new socialist understanding of human rights, which actively furthers social progress and the liberation of the working people from exploitation and all forms of class and national oppression. We will not try to give a comprehensive characterization of this concept, but it is worth while mentioning certain of the principal features, which underline the difference between the socialist concept of human rights and the doctrines of the bourgeois ideologists.

The fundamental consideration, which should be given particular emphasis in this context, is that in socialist society the value placed upon human rights derives from the value placed upon man as the active subject of social practice. In other words, the Constitution and laws of the USSR, which define the legal status of the individual, stem from the interests and needs of man as he really is, involved in social life and developing as a personality in the process of social creation. Only real life provides the key to understanding the essence of the problem of human rights.

The socialist concept of human rights has nothing in common with idealistic interpretations which see human rights as some absolute value, the embodiment of a supreme *a priori* normative principle, transcendental reason, etc. We relate the value of human rights in socialist society to the objective historical fact of the origination and consolidation of socialism, its essence, material and other laws of its development and, in the final analysis, the position and role of man in the process of building socialism and communism. In our view it is not the will of the state that gives rise to human rights and duties, for these are formed by objective social processes and the material conditions of life. The state will and the legislature, within the limits of their competence and together with other conscious forces in society, influence these processes and conditions, but only in conformity with the objective laws.

While on the subject of the humanist orientation and social-class content of the socialist concept of human rights,

mention should be made of a new approach to the problem of man, who is at the focus of attention of all the social structures, institutions and norms of socialism, including the legal order. The socialist system—and this is the essence of the matter—implies a new type of individual, who is called upon to build a new type of society and who is capable of carrying out complex revolutionary and transformative functions in an epoch of transition from capitalism to communism. Lenin saw the socialist organization of society as the embodiment of the creative powers of the masses. The sixty-year history of the Soviet state is a brilliant demonstration of Lenin's idea that socialism is inseparable from the creative energy of the masses, their initiative and labor enthusiasm. The socialist understanding of human rights and its embodiment in the constitution promote the idea of man as the creator of a new life, as an active participant in the social arena who is fully conscious of his freedoms and responsibilities and has the necessary opportunities to reveal his abilities and talents, and realize his creative potential in conditions of collectivism, comradely mutual assistance, socialist emulation and humane relations.

Under socialism the individual has extensive and varied rights, some of which are those arising from the needs of everyday life and concerning the satisfaction of purely personal requirements and interests. But if we look at the group of fundamental constitutional rights, or the socialist system of rights as a whole, then their connection with the concept of man as the carrier of active functions in society, that is the agent of social creativity, will be beyond any doubt. Under socialism each man is in possession of rights and freedoms, which allow him to take an active position in life and fulfil himself as an individual, who harmoniously combines the qualities of cultural attainment, moral worth and physical excellence.

One feature of the socialist concept of human rights distinguishing it from the bourgeois concept, consists in the fact that it implies the personal participation of each able-bodied citizen in the creation of social wealth as a condition of the possession of rights. "The source of the social wealth and of the well-being of the people and of each individual," declares the Constitution, "is the labour, free from exploitation, of Soviet people." Work is the foundation of life under socialism and at the same time it is also the

foundation of human rights. The latter's scope and limits are to a significant degree determined by the quantity and quality of work invested in the common cause. Human rights in socialist society are in essence the rights of the working man. The socialist theory and practice of human rights assert the value of work and the principle of its contribution to society as the true criterion of the activity of citizens and the freedom and worth of the personality. At the center of social life stands not an abstract individual, but a man of labor, a worker, who gives all his efforts to the benefit of society and who has closely bound up his own interests with the interests of the collective and society as a whole. The fact that man is not only the aim, but also the builder of the new life (for everything relies on his energy and initiative and on his creative powers), is the source of the harmonious development of society on the road of social progress, which is firmly connected with the achievements of socialist and communist construction. The feasibility of the aim "all in the name of man" is to a very large extent determined by the people's contribution to the common cause.

Forced labor for an exploiter is the greatest misfortune for man, whereas liberated labor which stimulates creativity and initiative is his greatest benefit. It is the value of liberated labor that lies at the root of the rights and duties of man in socialist society. The further socialism develops, the greater becomes the significance of labor, which is characterized as a means to the self-fulfilment of the individual, the consolidation of working people within the framework of society and the collective and the growth of the freedom of the individual. Thanks to this a mutual relationship between man and society becomes possible, in which each of the sides plays the part of both giver and receiver. This relationship is regulated by socialist law through the appropriate norms which establish the rights and duties of the citizen. It implies that all labor contributions by the citizens and their receipt from the fund of social wealth must be ordered, balanced and based on the fundamental principle of socialism, "from each according to his ability, to each according to his work". This contains one of the characteristic features of the essence of social justice in socialist society, which has done away with the exploitation of man by man, the gratuitous appropriation of the fruits of

another man's work and the parasitic existence of some classes at the expense of others.

The system of human rights and duties has important functions to perform in the organization of production relations and exchange and distribution ties in society. Human rights in such conditions become the instrument of organizing social relations and the means to the practical solution of the problem of the individual and society and to overcoming the dialectical contradictions that naturally arise therefrom.

In emphasizing the influence of human rights on the social processes under socialism, it is worth while considering this as it applies to the global trends in social development under mature socialism, such as the advance of society towards social equality and social homogeneity. "We have built a society of people," L. I. Brezhnev said, "who are equal in the broadest sense of the word, people who know neither class, property, race nor any other such privileges, a society which not only proclaims human rights, but guarantees the conditions under which they can be exercised."¹ The classics of Marxism-Leninism rejected the idea that the establishment of equality between people meant identity of physical and mental characteristics and that this was somehow the aim of communism. Lenin declared that socialists did not even think of equality in this sense.² In the words of Engels, "the real content of the proletarian demand for equality is the demand for the *abolition of classes*".³ Under socialism, particularly in a developed socialist society a policy of overcoming class distinctions is pursued, whose aim is the transition from a condition of class differentiation to the complete communist homogeneity of society and to the establishment of an organized, single national collective of workers in town and country.

Equality is an essential feature of the socialist concept of human rights, whose significance can only be fully understood in terms of the processes of the democratization of social life under socialism. As distinct from some Western ideologists who try to exclude from the theory of democracy the idea of equality (as being allegedly unrealistic and in

¹ *For Peace, Security and Cooperation and Social Progress*, Berlin, June 29-30, 1976, Moscow, 1976, pp. 19-20.

² See V. I. Lenin. *Collected Works*, Vol. 20, p. 145.

³ F. Engels. *Anti-Dühring*, p. 128.

contradiction to human nature and human freedom) and interpret equal rights as a purely formal principle, the socialist conception starts from the assumption that genuine democracy is impossible without the real equality of the citizens and that equal rights ought to have their roots in the social processes, which ensure equality and social homogeneity. Socialism attaches great significance in this context to the establishment of the citizens' equal relationship to the means of production and to citizen participation in social distribution on equal terms, which stems from the former.

In socialist society the principle of equality is given new meaning and is guaranteed in all aspects of economic, political, social and cultural life. Citizens of the USSR, it is stated in the Constitution, are equal before the law, without distinction of origin, social or property status, race or nationality, sex, education, language, attitude to religion, type and nature of occupation, domicile or other status. The bourgeoisie, as is well known, also proclaims equality, but in the capitalist world this principle is narrow, limited and bears a formal juridical character only. Bourgeois equality arose historically in opposition to the system of ancient feudal rights—the system of privileges and inequalities between the various social estates, classes and social groups that was given the force of law. But though it established formal equality the bourgeois system did not abolish the source and subject of privileges, namely private ownership of the land and merchant capital, and these gave tremendous advantage to their owners under free enterprise and competition.

The limitations and formalism of bourgeois equality are also determined by another highly relevant circumstance. The point is that the slogan "equal rights" as it is applied in capitalist legal practice and interpreted by bourgeois ideologists is far from being connected to the question of equal duties. This is not accidental. The system of capitalist production and the social relations corresponding to it have developed the mechanism for separating rights from duties and the limitless opportunity for manipulating rights without duties and duties without rights, which allows all the rights to the exploiters and all the duties to the working people. The actual inequality between duties makes the principle of equality illusory, invalid and futile, so that it

becomes nothing but a myth. Such a situation was opposed by Communists even in the last century. The Provisional Rules of the Working Men's International Association (International), written by Marx, declared that its members "consider it as the duty of every man to demand the rights of man and citizen not only for himself but for anybody who fulfils his duties".¹ The motto inscribed on the banner of the Basle Section of the First International was "No duties without rights. No rights without duties." Again in 1891 during the discussion on the Erfurt (Draft) Program of German Social-Democratic Party, Engels once more turned the attention of the representatives of the working-class movement to the importance of this question. "Instead of 'for the equal right of all'," he wrote, "I suggest 'for equal rights and equal duties of all', etc. The *equal rights* are for us an especially important addition to the bourgeois-democratic *equal rights*, which divests them of their specific bourgeois meaning."² Such an addition in fact nullifies the privileged position of capital in society, which has been carefully camouflaged by legal illusions.

In socialist society where private ownership of the means of production, capital and capitalist exploitation have been abolished, the unity and equality of rights and duties becomes the effective principle for the organization of legal relations. The equality of rights loses its formal character when the exercise of these rights by members of society is directly conditioned by the fulfilment of their duties and accompanied by a clear definition of the duties of those in positions of responsibility. The Constitution of the USSR, therefore, has affirmed the principle, according to which the citizens' exercise of their rights and freedoms is inseparable from the performance of their duties and obligations. "Socialist democracy," it is said in the Resolution of the CPSU Central Committee, On the 60th Anniversary of the Great October Socialist Revolution, "means oneness of rights and duties, of genuine freedom and civic responsibility, a harmonious combination of the interests of society, the work collective and the individual."³

¹ Marx/Engels. *Werke*, Bd. 16, Dietz Verlag, Berlin, S. 15.

² *Ibid.*, Bd. 22, S. 232.

³ *On the 60th Anniversary of the Great October Socialist Revolution*, Moscow, p. 12.

In this connection it is impossible to overlook certain comments in the Western press, which appeared during the discussion of the draft Constitution of the USSR. Admitting that the rights of Soviet citizens had been extended by the new Constitution, the "commentators" claimed that their duties had been extended even more and that all-round state pressure on the individual had increased. The fact that the Constitution of the USSR stresses the duty of Soviet citizens to guard the interests of the state and further its might and prestige is interpreted as a sign that duties come before rights in Soviet society. Bourgeois advocates of democracy tend to reason thus: the citizen feels uncomfortable in a "totalitarian" society, where duties account for more than rights, but if rights account for more than duties, that is how it should be, that is real democracy. In fact genuine democracy only exists where rights correspond to duties and it is only socialist society that provides the unity, equality and balance between them.

A balanced system of rights and duties is not something that is created at once, but a continual quest for the optimal correlation between rights and duties, power and responsibility. "Great powers with little responsibility create possibilities for arbitrary administrative acts, subjectivism and ill-considered decisions. But great responsibility with small powers is not much better."¹ The unity and balance between rights and duties is the fundamental condition for the development of the legal status of the individual in socialist society, where the full exercise of rights must be clearly guaranteed by the strict fulfilment of duties. The latter means in particular that each man must devote his work and his efforts to society and concern himself about the running of state and social affairs. If the citizen enjoys only rights and forgets about his duties to society, the collective and his fellow men, he is giving nothing for what he receives and thus becomes an anti-social element, a consumer living at the expense of others. But just as undesirable is the conduct of the individual who performs his duties, but doesn't know his rights and is therefore not able to realize the great potential he is given under the socialist constitution and other legislative acts for his free and all-round development. In both the one case and the other the

¹ L. I. Brezhnev. *Following Lenin's Course*, p. 400.

disequilibrium between rights and duties leads to distortion of the normal links between society, the state and the individual. This is why harmony in the system of rights and duties is so important from the point of view of the conscious and responsible exercise of citizens' rights and the raising of their effectiveness.

In characterizing the socialist theory and practice of human rights mention must be made of the most important factor—the decisive significance that socialism attaches to guaranteeing the rights of man. It is not just the formal affirmation of these rights, but making them a living reality for each man that is the aim of the socialist social system, and work towards this end was begun immediately after the victory of the Great October Socialist Revolution. The rights and duties of Soviet citizens appear real in at least two essential respects: first, in relation to the objective, law-governed process of extending and strengthening the whole complex of rights and duties; second, in relation to the steady rise in the economic, political, legal and other guarantees of these rights and duties. All these comprehensive and dynamic processes have been reflected in the new Constitution of the USSR.

As far as the system of constitutional rights is concerned, the following is of particular importance for their development. Prime significance under socialism—and this is one of the characteristics of the socialist understanding of human rights and freedoms—is placed on that group of rights which are generally known as socio-economic. There has been a significant extension in the juridical guarantees of these interests and requirements whose satisfaction is possible only on the basis of the successful functioning of the socialist economic system, the collective organization of labor and the socialist political system. In the USSR measures are being taken to extend the whole system of rights, and particularly the fundamental, constitutional political and personal rights, while the further development of the socio-economic rights and freedoms of citizens most fully expresses the purport of nation-wide efforts to improve the people's well-being. It is these rights that are the consistent and clear expression of the value of socialist labor which is free from exploitation. The 1977 Constitution has framed new social and economic rights (the right to health protection, the right to housing, the right to enjoy cultural benefits, the freedom

of scientific, technical and artistic work) and those rights which were previously enjoyed by citizens have been given new and deeper meaning. The right to work has been supplemented by the right to choose a trade or profession, type of job and work in accordance with one's inclinations, abilities, training and education, and with due account of the needs of society. The right to education has been particularized by the institution of universal, compulsory secondary education and the broad development of vocational, specialized secondary and higher education, etc.

The material guarantees of these rights have become broader and firmer in the new Constitution. Let us consider the most important of the socio-economic rights—the right to work—and see how it is implemented in practice. In the Soviet Union this right is guaranteed by the socialist economic system, the continued growth of the productive forces of society, free vocational and professional training, improvement of skills and training in new trades and professions. A planned economy allows forecasting the growth of production so that every able-bodied citizen can be guaranteed work. There is not one capitalist state that can firmly and consistently guarantee this right. Unemployment which is a serious social problem in many capitalist countries has been long abolished in the USSR. Economic demands on the workforce continue to grow. Soviet people have become accustomed to high demands being made upon their work and they value the opportunity to make full use of their talents and abilities. Scientific and technical progress in socialist society has led to full employment and is continually utilized for the purpose of easing labor and abolishing heavy manual labor and other unskilled work.

Labor in socialist society is free. Citizens can enter into employment relations and terminate them at their own free will. In the interests of the working people themselves a system of legal guarantees has been established which defines the terms of hiring and discharge. The Constitution and other laws prohibit any direct or indirect limitation of the rights of citizens or establishment of direct or indirect privileges in offering employment on grounds of sex, race, nationality or religious beliefs. Officials are held liable under the law for the groundless refusal to grant a job. Soviet citizens have the right to begin work from the age of sixteen years. In exceptional circumstances and with the

consent of the factory or office trade-union committee this limit may be reduced to fifteen years if the persons concerned are to be trained individually or in teams, courses, etc. Before employment all citizens under the age of eighteen must undergo a medical examination and then be regularly examined at least once a year until they reach the age of eighteen. In conformity with the law, persons under eighteen may not be employed on underground, heavy or dangerous work.

In the USSR there is an effective and democratic procedure for dismissal from work. As a general rule the managers may not cancel a labor contract on their own initiative without the prior consent of the factory or office trade-union committee. Labor legislation has a strictly defined enumeration of grounds for dismissing a worker on the initiative of the management. Any dismissal without the consent of the trade union is considered illegal and the worker must be reinstated in his former job with his average monthly wages being paid to him for the period of enforced absence.

Socialism provides the material and moral incentives for better standards of work and the continuous development of socialist production. Wage levels are rising and the forms of labor remuneration are being improved as higher productivity is achieved. During the previous (ninth) five-year plan period (1970-1975) over 75 million people had their wages and salaries raised. Under the law it is the responsibility of the management of the factories, institutions and organizations to ensure that the necessary conditions of health and safety are met. State supervisory services and inspectorates together with the trade unions have the right to stop work at industrial enterprises, shops or sections if the appropriate safety conditions are not complied with. Additional privileges and special preventative medical care are available to persons employed in health-hazardous jobs or in jobs performed at high or low temperatures.

We have looked at only one right—the right to work—but Soviet people possess no less important guarantees for the exercise of their other social and economic rights: the right to rest and leisure, the right to health protection, the right to maintenance in old age, in sickness and in the event of complete or partial disability or loss of the breadwinner, the right to housing and to education, etc. Socialism has created—and this is its greatest advantage over capitalism—a

stable system of social and legal guarantees of human rights on which the citizen can rely entirely. The citizen of socialist society is well aware—and this has tremendous significance for him—that the policy of the Communist Party and the Soviet state is firm and unchanging in its main objectives and is by itself a reliable guarantee of his freedom and all-round development.

The Individual and the Public Organizations

We will consider here some aspects of the relationship between the individual and the public organizations. In socialist society this relationship necessarily takes on a political character and develops on a truly democratic basis. The ties which are formed in the process of the Communist Party's guidance of the work of the public organizations, i.e. those ties that are free from state authoritarian elements, constitute a political relationship and the citizen's participation in them means his active involvement in politics.

Together with the state the public organizations are important components of the political organization of Soviet society and of the system of socialist democracy. The party exercises its guiding role through the state and public organizations and unites and directs their efforts towards the building of communism. Evaluating the results and scale of the work of the public organizations, the CPSU Central Committee noted: "The *Soviet trade-unions*, the school of communism and of drawing millions of working people into communist construction, come to play a growing role in the life of Soviet society.

"The Leninist Komsomol, an active helper of the Party, extends and invigorates its work with the youth. The Soviet system is a great school of courage and steeling for the young people.

"Co-operative, scientific and technical, sport and other public organizations have been developing apace."¹

As components of the system of socialist democracy the

¹ *Questions of the Ideological Work by the CPSU*, Moscow, p. 153 (in Russian).

mass organizations, as has already been stressed, are one of the most important organizational forms of drawing the working people into government. This is not just a matter of running social affairs or of social management nor is it just a question of democracy within the organizations (unions and associations).

The political activity of the public organizations under socialism is distinguished by the richness of its content and forms, and their functions by their breadth and variety. Primarily this activity is closely linked with the process of involving the masses in state administration and with the development of specific state forms of democracy as are shown, for example, in the work of the Soviets of People's Deputies, the executive and administrative organs of the state, and the economic, cultural, legislative and other institutions. Under socialism state democracy and social democracy are not isolated from one another, just as the tasks of the state and the public organizations are not divided in such a way that the former is concerned only with the development of state democracy and the latter are only working towards the improvement of social democratic forms. What we have rather is a united system, all the elements of which are organically linked, mutually conditioned, united by common aims and have a common party leadership.

As distinct from the political organization of capitalist society, the relation of the socialist public and political unions towards the state is characterized not by the struggle for power but by the broad participation in the exercise of state power on the basis of principles established by the Soviet constitution and other laws.

The public organizations, having their representatives in the higher and local organs of state power, use various means to influence the work of the state administrative bodies, actively participate in the solution of questions of home and foreign policy, and give their full support to the policies of the state and promote their implementation. The political activity of the mass public organizations in the exercise of state power and in the performance of the tasks and functions of the state is exceptionally valuable; it advances them to the forefront on the political scene and enables them to solve the vital political problems of social development.

The public organizations make an important contribution to the task of educating the citizens in the spirit of high political awareness. This is an important problem which society tackles continually, using all its resources for the purpose and increasingly involving the citizens in the progress of society and in the implementation of the ideals of communism. Creating the necessary conditions for political involvement, the socialist public organizations and the state do everything in their power so that the citizen is not only able to take part in political life (i.e. that he has enough time, that he has the necessary rights and that he is not impeded by his living conditions), but consciously strives to do so.

The socialist public organizations have long held an important position in the life of society both because they are necessary as forms of organizing the masses and the collective action of the workers and because they have a special role to play in relation to the individual. They guarantee the conditions and provide the means for the fulfilment of many social and political functions performed by the individual in socialist society. Of considerable significance for understanding this side of the work of the public organizations is the problem of interests, or to be more exact, the correct combination of public, collective and personal interests.

A certain interest is in general a fundamental aspect in the concept of the social organization, and no appropriate definition can therefore dispense with pointing to it as a most important link between the organization as a whole and its members.

It is essentially a matter of people's associations according to their interests. People enter into public organizations owing to their desire and inclination to unite their efforts to fulfil a program of action that will further their interests. The existence of a variety of public organizations results from the variety of interests in society. The character and form of the interests upheld by the socialist mass public organizations are highly complex. The Communist Party expresses the general interests of the working class, and since under socialism, especially at its present stage of development, these objectively correspond with the interests of social progress, the party becomes the vanguard of the whole of society. It embodies the aims and strivings of all classes, social groups, nations and nationalities that actively parti-

cipate in the building of communism. The trade unions, for example, are chiefly organizations of the working class and the cooperatives on the whole represent the interests of the collective-farm peasantry. However, in contemporary conditions, when the friendly classes—the working class and the peasantry—are drawing closer together, and forming a historically new community of people—the Soviet people—the development of the public organizations is characterized by a tendency for the organizations no longer to represent the interests of any one particular class. The trade unions are beginning to include in their membership certain categories of farmers. In recent years the role of the trade-union organizations on the collective farms has risen and their increased membership will have considerable importance for achieving the task of boosting farm output and improving working and living conditions for the collective farmers.

The public organizations are based on the principles of voluntary membership and self-government. For millions of working people they are a daily school providing the knowledge and habits for active social and political involvement. The public organizations make use of specific methods of mass education. The Communist Party has always highly valued this aspect of their work and strives to strengthen it ideologically and organizationally by drawing up a scientifically based program for their joint efforts. In this connection mention should be made of the fact that the party has always shown particular concern about the educational work of the trade unions and the Komsomol. Let us take, for example, socialist emulation, which under the scientific and technical revolution is called upon to play a qualitatively new role in the development of the economy and the education of the working people. The resolution of the CPSU Central Committee of August 31, 1971, On the Further Improvement of the Organization of Socialist Emulation, clearly defined the tasks of public organizations in this matter and pointed to the necessity of the correct placement of forces. Other resolutions of the CPSU Central Committee also stressed the trade union task of educating the masses in the process of socialist emulation and in the daily performance of work collectives.

The education of youth is a party and national task which is of tremendous significance for the present and future of

Soviet society. In its work of providing a communist education for the growing generation the party invariably relies on the Leninist Komsomol as its true and reliable assistant. The purport of the ideological and political work among youth is the formation of a Marxist-Leninist outlook and a class approach to all aspects of life and its education in the revolutionary, labor and military traditions of the Soviet people.

Thus in socialist society the public organizations fulfil a twofold function in relation to the individual: a) they are the effective means for drawing citizens into mass political work both within and outside the organization; b) they undertake to continually enhance the level of socio-political activity among the people, teaching them the appropriate skills and developing their best qualities as builders of communism.

The individual becomes practically involved in certain definite relations with every or almost every component of the political structure. The basic features of the connection arising between him and public organizations are as a rule subject to normative regulation and are reflected in those enactments which affirm the status of a given organization. The relationship between the individual and the CPSU, for example, is affirmed in the Party Rules, and his relationship with the Komsomol, the trade unions and the other organizations is set out in the corresponding rules and regulations.

The rules, regulations and other constituting acts of the public organizations reserve for their members, and for them alone, a definite circle of behavioral possibilities, which are also called rights, and require in return certain actions from them, which may be called duties. There is no need to prove here that the statutory rights and duties resulting from the regulatory work of a public organization must not be confused with the subjective rights and juridical duties arising from the legislative work by the state.

The difference between them is very real and may be seen in relation to many aspects: the range of possible action contained in a right, the circle of subjects, the availability of effective guarantees, character of protection, etc. This of course does not mean that the Party Rules, for example, contain no features which characterize the relationship between the individual and the state. On the contrary,

they contain such clauses as oblige Communists to do all in their power to promote the effective work of the state bodies and submit to state discipline. On the other hand, the Constitution of the USSR, by setting down the citizens' right to unite in public organizations holds the key to constructing the relationships between the individual and the party and other political organizations. There are many norms in state laws that regularize the relationship between the industrial and office workers and the trade unions, particularly in the field of labor law. In a word the thesis that some type of relationship with a political organization is set down in a special document is basically correct. The Party Rules chiefly define the relationship between the individual and the party, and the Constitution of the USSR between the individual and the socialist state, and through it society.

Thus in socialist society the individual participates in political life as a citizen of the state (and as such he possesses definite guaranteed rights and freedoms) and as a member of those public organizations which exercise political power. In this case his actions are based on those rights which come to him as a member of a public organization and within the framework of its opportunities recognized by the state as legal.

The citizen enters the public organization voluntarily, having definite aims which reflect the degree to which he has combined public and personal interest, a factor which varies according to the organization. Public interest is the prime factor determining the aims and character of the work of a higher type of political organization such as the Communist Party. In the trade unions, on the other hand, personal interest is more in evidence. But in all cases members of a public organization are required to show concern for the utilization of all the political and intra-organizational opportunities for achieving the objectives set. Mostly this becomes personal interest in seeing the satisfaction of vital public interests.

It is with regard to all this that we must approach the question of how membership of a public organization influences the scope and exercise of citizens' rights under socialism. Individual participation in the public organizations gives considerable opportunities not only for the satisfaction of a particular group of public interests, for whose sake the organ-

nization exists, but also for achieving the fuller satisfaction of individual interests and subjective rights. Of course, this is a unified process and should not be taken to mean that within the organization the individual exercises public interest on the one hand and personal interest on the other. As distinct from the larger social communities (societies, nations, peoples, etc.) and as distinct even to a certain extent from the state, the public organizations exist for the satisfaction of such personal interests as do not go beyond the framework of the collective and the public interest specific for it. They do not assume the task of representing the interests of the individual in all their fulness, breadth and variety. On the other hand, the individual may be simultaneously a member of various public organizations, which significantly widens his social opportunities.

Thus, there is not a single public organization whose work is orientated on all the interests of its members: it promotes, advances and protects only those interests that are incorporated in the general interest of the organization. In principle this relation also exists in regard to the subjective rights of its members. Entry into a public organization does not entail any special or new rights (i.e. legal rights and not those accruing from the organization's statute or rules), does not alter the legal status of a member as a citizen of the USSR and does not violate the constitutional principle of citizen equality in socialist society. This requires more detailed explanation.

In our view there are no grounds for seeing membership of a public organization as offering "additional rights" or "advantages", which non-members do not possess. Membership rights add nothing to the status of a citizen of the USSR and are only the specific expression of general provisions in the Constitution and the laws and consequently exist within the framework of a single social status that is equal for all. True, they may put a member in a more favorable situation in terms of specific rights. But in comparison with whom or with what? Different men in different organizations possess different advantages, so in the final analysis it is hard to say who is in a better or worse position. Comparing the actual results that individuals obtain from their exercise of rights which are equal to all takes us beyond the framework of a juridical understanding of the problem, i.e. discussion of the question of "legal advantage".

If this is the subject of discussion, then the membership rights appear "supplementary" not in relation to the rights of an individual who is not a member of an organization and has no connection with it, but in relation to the member's own position which he held prior to joining the organization. This brings us back to the idea that membership of an organization gives additional means and offers new possibilities for the exercise of rights and the satisfaction of lawful interests, but does not in principle change the legal status of a citizen of the USSR.

The further improvement of the work of the public organizations is an important and necessary part of the party work in strengthening the system of socialist democracy. The public organizations cannot stand aside from the fulfilment of the ideological and educational tasks of the present day. The Central Committee of the CPSU urges to use all means of educational work to involve the people in the conscious activity of raising the effectiveness of production and running public affairs, mould noble goals, cultural requirements, and high moral conduct as the standard for each person, and promote the rational utilization of free time.

The structure of socialist democracy is thus formed from a variety of components that are closely interconnected in everyday life and make up a unified whole. Each of these components is a necessary and individual link in the chain, as it were, but together they have one purpose—guaranteeing the all-round development of the individual, the active participation of all citizens in the running of society and the state and the broad expansion of democracy and political initiative of the working people in the period of communist construction.

Chapter VIII

THE WORK COLLECTIVE AND DEMOCRACY

The Increasing Role of the Work Collective in the Development of Socialist Democracy

At the contemporary stage of communist construction priority is given to the task of the comprehensive management of all aspects of social development: the creation of the material and technical basis of communism, the formation of social relations and the education of the new man, member of the future, communist society. The 25th Party Congress adopted a policy for the further intensification of social development as well as economic. It pointed to the necessity of raising the level of the management and organization of all aspects of the system of mature socialism.

The democratic principles of the organization of society and their improvement and further development are connected with the increasing participation of the masses in managing the socialist economy, the most important sphere of social life. The nature of democracy under socialism is largely determined by the level of material production.

Mass participation in the management of production and in improving planning and control, etc. is both the condition and the means for the future development of socialist democracy.

At the 24th Party Congress it was stressed that "in the development of socialist democracy an important task is to enhance the role of our *labour collectives*, which are the basic units of socialist society. This is a major field to struggle for stepping up the labour and social activity of Soviet people. The new, socialist qualities of the working people and the relations of friendship and comradesly mutual assistance take shape in these collectives."¹

¹ 24th Congress of the CPSU, p. 97.

The new Constitution of the USSR has given legislative force to the position of the work collectives and public organizations which take part in the management of the enterprises and institutions, discuss and decide matters relating to the organization of working and living conditions and use the funds allocated both for developing production and for social and cultural purposes and financial incentives.

The character of a production collective in the sphere of material production just like the character of any socialist work collective is determined by the presence of socialist social relations, primarily socialist relations of production. Therefore, only a production association, based on social ownership of the means of production, can be considered a socialist collective. This determines the community of interest among the members of the collective and the essential unity of social aims between the collective and society. The production collective is characterized not only by joint labor, but by common concern for its organization and results. Insofar as productive labor is the chief activity of the production collective, then its whole activity is largely and directly determined by the character and form of the labor performed and the state of the technology prevailing at a given factory or plant. In this sense the social aspects of the production collective (the degree of sophistication in intra-collective relations, the level of social maturity and social organization, etc.) cannot be considered apart from the content of labor, its structure and the level of qualification among the workers. But it would also be incorrect to determine the level of social maturity in a production collective by technical parameters and economic indicators alone.

The production collective is a primary component in the economy, whose function is to contribute to the creation of the material and technical basis of communism.¹ The chief, determining function of the production collectives is economic. But this should not be isolated and seen in opposition to its other functions. An enterprise can be equip-

¹ Collectives are usually divided into those of the productive and non-productive spheres. The first include collectives at industrial enterprises, building sites, collective and state farms. These are called production collectives. Among the work collectives in the field of material production, chief role goes to the collectives at industrial enterprises and it is these that constitute the main subject of discussion in this chapter.

ped with the latest machinery in the most rational manner, but this will not give the desired result if the people working there do not have a communist outlook and sufficient expertise, if they are not conscientious about their work or if they build their relations with one another in a way that is alien to the norms of socialist democracy. In this sense the degree of maturity in the production collective is characterized by the ideological, political, social and psychological community of interests among its members and the degree of their involvement in the management of its affairs. Consequently the functioning and development of each production collective requires not only material and economic, but favorable social factors as well.

In a developed socialist society the organization of production increasingly requires that each organizational measure or technical facility should be evaluated not only in economic terms, but according to social criteria which will determine the extent to which technical and economic changes will contribute to making work easier, enriching its functions and increasing the solidarity and raising the organizational level of all aspects of social life.

At the 25th Party Congress social policy was given further development. The task now set was to solve the problems of the economic, social, political and cultural development of our society in a more comprehensive way than before. Ensuring the organic unity of all aspects of social life is an even more relevant problem during the current, tenth five-year plan period. Evaluating the significance of raising efficiency and quality Chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers A. N. Kosygin said in his report to the Congress: "This is not a purely technical and economic problem. It is also a social and ideological problem, which we will continue to deal with in the process of Soviet society's further development. For its part, it will contribute to the consolidation and improvement of socialist social relations and the rules of communist community life."¹

One of the most important questions of social policy is how to manage people and optimally organize human activity and the whole process of forming the politically conscious individual. The most important subsystem of society

¹ *Documents and Resolutions. XXVth Congress of the CPSU*, p. 164.

in which human activity is directly organized with a definite social aim in view, is the production collective.

If we start from the assumption that under socialism man is not only the subject of social management, but its creative agent, then it is clear what importance attaches to elucidating the question of the mechanism through which society regulates individual behavior in conformity with the principles of the organization of socialism, and converts the social aims of society into the individual aims of each of its members. This mechanism of transmission from society to the individual is the collective (the system of work collectives).

The party implements its social policy both in society as a whole and within the framework of the work collective. As they become larger as a result of the establishment of industrial associations and agriculture-cum-industry complexes, the production collectives are taking a more active part in the decision of important social problems, such as combining achievements of the scientific and technical revolution with the advantages of socialism, the further easing of labor conditions, overcoming the lack of social homogeneity, the development of communist attitudes to work and the improvement of democratic principles of production management. The production collectives today are the chief laboratory, so to say, where society learns to improve methods of social management.

All this permits us to regard the work collective not only as the subject of the party's social policy, but as its creative agent. It is the active force which accelerates the social processes and improves social relations that have been established since the victory of socialism.

The party and other public organizations of production collectives directly organize the implementation of the social policy of the CPSU. Increasing the role of the collectives, improving the style, forms and methods of their work and of all the public organizations and actively involving the workers and the whole collective in managing the affairs of the collective, and consequently the social processes of society as a whole are the most important condition for the development of socialist democracy.

It should be noted that the whole tenor of the life of society is largely perceived and interpreted by the individual through the prism of the social environment in which his

own socially useful work is directly practised. Frequently the evaluation of specific relations by individual workers or groups of workers is influenced not only by the general structure of social relations but by their concrete form in a particular collective. Hence it is necessary to study and improve these forms of work, social intercourse and knowledge in which the general is expressed in the particular and the individual. Through the micro-environment and its specific features each of us comes to a specific understanding of the macro-environment: the experience and knowledge of our forebears and of the contemporary generation. Consequently, this process of interaction does not go directly from society to the individual, but via his own circle of communication and personal experience.

On the one hand, relations within the micro-environment cannot be reduced to merely inter-personal relations, for they also include social relations: economic, socio-political and ideological, but as refracted through the specific prism of the micro-environment, our direct social surroundings.

On the other hand, the socio-economic, political, ethical and other relations of socialism which spring from its social nature and in the final analysis define the relations and content of its micro-structure, cannot be reduced to social relations alone. Collectivism as a form of social intercourse in socialist society and as the general principle of the organization of all aspects of social life is specifically manifested in each particular work collective. Socialist society creates the conditions whereby the formation of the personality is not determined only by membership of a particular class, nation or social group. Increasing significance is attached to such factors as the characteristics of the work collective, the degree of its solidarity and social maturity, the character of its organization of labor, in a word a whole totality of micro-environmental factors which directly influence the individual.

Consideration should also be given to the fact that the social environment does not only include elements that exert a positive influence on the individual. Under socialism there are still certain elements of social inequality, differences between manual and mental labor and between individual, collective and social interests. It should be noted that these factors are manifested specifically within a micro-environment, according to different circumstances. For example,

different levels of organizing the work collective could have different effects on the process of erasing the differences between manual and mental labor and on the correlation between personal, collective and social interests.

From this it is clear, that raising the level of social maturity and the social organization of each production collective is a task of considerable social significance. Its fulfilment is impossible without further developing active participation in managing the collective and the democratic principles of such management.

The solution of these tasks is the aim of the social policy of the party, which promotes the further development of comradeship cooperation, raises the level of solidarity among the collectives and strengthens the social unity of their members. And this in its turn expands and strengthens the economic, social, ideological and cultural foundations of socialist democracy and largely predetermines the improvement of the forms and institutions of democracy in that most important sphere of social life—production.

The production collective is an important arena for the development of the social and political activity of the working people. Here the labor activity of the workers is organically combined with their social and political activity, for the production collective fulfils not only labor but also social and political functions. The organs of the collective play a major role in organizing the functions of management. The concrete tasks which they decide are linked to an analysis of all aspects of the life of the collective. The direct participation of the workers in the achievement of these tasks develops collective consciousness and a feeling of responsibility for production. Sociological research, carried out in various parts of the Soviet Union, shows that the level of socio-political and labor activity on the part of members of the collective is determined by the degree of its development and the maturity of intra-collective relations. But there is also a reverse dependence. The degree of maturity of collective relations is also characterized by the level of participation of the workers of the collective in labor and socio-political activity. Moreover the involvement of workers in that activity is the most effective mechanism for the improvement of intra-collective relations and the microenvironmental situation in which the personality is formed.

The production collective includes the primary cells of the fundamental components of the political organization of society (the administration and party organization, the trade union, the Komsomol and other public organizations). Through the public organizations the production collective acts as the agent of management. It is through the work collective that the working class performs not only its function as the producer of material wealth, but also its other function of managing public affairs and to a considerable extent realizes its leading role in society.

It is on the basis of the work collectives that the organs of state power are formed. The Constitution of the USSR grants work collectives the right to put forward candidates as deputies to the local and Supreme Soviets. According to the Constitution (Art. 107), deputies shall report on their work and on that of the Soviet to their constituents and to the work collectives and public organizations that nominated them. Deputies who have not justified the confidence of their constituents may be recalled at any time by a decision of a majority of the electors in accordance with the procedure established by law.

Developed socialist society sets the production collectives the fresh social task of organically combining their economic, social, ideological and educational functions. The role of the collectives is continually growing in solving the problems arising from the scientific and technical revolution. Enlarging the scale of the production collectives and strengthening their material and technical base, on the one hand, increases their relative independence and widens their democratic rights, and, on the other, increases their responsibility to society. All this contributes to a growth in the role of the collective.

The Work Collective and the Sphere of Management

The work collective is concerned that each of its members should actively participate in production management and the running of society.

Displaying initiative and creative energy in the various fields of social activity, including the organization of labor and the workings of management, is inherent in socialism as means for asserting the individuality of the workers. Un-

der socialism, together with the increased complexity and widening of the functions of economic management there is a broad tendency to involve more and more of the working people in this process.

The Central Committee of the CPSU has emphasized that party committees and industrial managers should consistently exercise democratic principles in running the enterprises and ensure a harmonious combination of one-man management and the extensive participation of the workers in industrial management. The party has resolved to make use of the party, trade unions and Komsomol organizations and the organs of people's control in drawing all industrial and office workers into decision-making on the most vital issues.

A characteristic of the socialist production collective is the community of interest among all workers including the administration which is itself part of the collective and fulfils special managerial functions in accordance with the common interest. The administration at a socialist enterprise does not monopolize the functions of management, which is the task of the whole production collective. "The modern leader," declared L. I. Brezhnev, "must organically combine within himself the Party approach and well-grounded competence, a sense of high discipline and initiative, and a creative approach to his work. At the same time, on every sector the leader must take account of the socio-political and educational aspects, be sensitive to the needs and requirements of the people, and set an example in work and in everyday life."¹

Society has not only given the leaders of the collective technical and economic functions, but cultural, social and ideological functions as well. The most important party and state function of the leader is to define the social aims of the collective in conformity with the social aims of society, and to determine the ways and means to their achievement. This to a large extent raises the role of the organizer of the collective in exercising the party's social policy. In conditions of developed socialism the manager must see not only the educative effects of economic measures, but the fundamental trends in the development of the social structure of his collective, and its social, cultural and other pros-

¹ *Documents and Resolutions. XXVth Congress of the CPSU*, p. 85.

pects. To completely express and protect the interests of his collective the manager must carry out his educative functions and show by way of example democratic management of the collective, involving all its members in the management process.

In the collective as in society as a whole there exist various spheres of management and different forms of drawing the workers into the performance of managerial functions. Members of the collective, for example, are drawn into the economic management of the enterprise through the standing production committees, the rate-fixing offices and the bureaux of economic analysis functioning on a voluntary basis, and come into direct contact with the economic services of the enterprise. There are many public organs linked with the department of the chief designer, the chief technologist and other sections which control the technical side of production. These organs include the bureaux of technical information, design and construction bureaux, bureaux for the scientific organization of labor, councils of innovators, branches of the scientific and technical societies, composite research teams, and institutions of worker research. An important role in the educational work belongs to the personnel offices operating on a voluntary basis, the councils of veterans, the comrades' courts, the factory club public councils and other bodies involved in raising the level of culture and education and improving leisure facilities.

The democratic character of management is also expressed in the broad participation of the working people in exercising public control over the work of the socialist enterprise. The party organization has the right to supervise and control the work of the administration and in all sections of the enterprise there are groups and posts of people's control. The work of the collective is periodically checked by such methods as public inspection and Komsomol spot checks.

The whole apparatus of management at the enterprise—both its administrative and public organs—functions on the single principle of democratic centralism, which guarantees initiative at all levels of the collective and promotes the creative activity of all its members together with their subordination to the single will and the achievement of a single objective. The public organs of the collective and the entire system of work organized on a voluntary basis open wide

opportunities for improving production and the quality and quantity of work.

To make full use of these opportunities it is necessary to achieve unity of will and coordinated action among the workers. This is the task of the administrative apparatus and to fulfil this function it has at its disposal services which embrace all aspects of the work of the enterprise; technical, economic, personnel, dispatch and others, as well as a system, whereby workers are subordinated to their leader or managers who enjoy the right of one-man management.

Unity of will and action is necessary for the achievement of the required objectives. These are determined by the needs and interests of society which find their concentrated expression in party policy. Guiding the production collective to the achievement of these aims and ensuring the correct approach to all questions that arise in the course of its work, an approach from the point of view of the interests of the state as a whole, are largely the task of the party organization in the production collective. It exercises political guidance over the administration and the public in the solution of social and economic problems and influences management directly through those Communists who work in the administrative and public organs of the collective.

Of particular importance in the life of all Communists and workers at the enterprise are the party meetings. Here wide exchange of opinion takes place and questions are raised on a principled, business-like basis and actively discussed by the Communists. The party organizations take particular care to make sure that non-party industrial and office workers participate at the open party meetings and join in the discussion so that non-party activists may be broadly involved in the work of the party organizations and in production management and public affairs.

Discussion of questions that arise in the course of the work of the production collective at party, trade-union and Komsomol meetings, at sessions of the elected boards of these organizations and at conferences of the party and economic executives, is an important form of implementing the principle of collective leadership, without which one-man management in a socialist production collective would be impossible. Collective leadership in management requires that those who are invested with authority take note of the

remarks and suggestions of the members of the collective. This is one of the fundamental requirements of democratic centralism.

Administrative decisions are therefore largely determined by the decisions of the party, Komsomol and trade-union organizations which function as organs of the whole collective. These organizations liaise between the various organs in the collective and give them ideological and organizational support.

The period of communist construction has produced many forms of mass participation in production management. This can be attributed to many factors, but particularly the considerable growth in the workers' social experience and skills in managing through the party, Komsomol and trade-union organizations, and a large number of people actively engaged in public life and participating in various commissions and factory inspections.

The numerous forms in which the production collective exercises its activity may be classified thus: 1) participation in the search for technical progress (the public design bureaux, the councils of innovators, the technical information bureaux, the research institutes operating on a voluntary, unpaid basis, etc.); 2) various forms of worker participation in the economic activity of the enterprise (production conferences, technical analysis bureaux, rate-fixing offices); 3) participation in the scientific organization of labor and in research work (scientific and technical societies on a voluntary, unpaid basis, work groups and public institutions for the organization of labor, etc.); 4) various forms of participation in the rationalization of extra-production areas, such as the provision of services, leisure and daily amenities, etc. and participation in cultural construction; 5) ideological and educational work and training on social principles. These forms have in general tended to develop from sporadic cooperation between engineers, technicians and workers in *ad hoc* production commissions and factory inspections, etc. to more complex collective forms of long-term work and cooperation for the purpose of solving more complex technical and organizational problems together with scientific and technical training and propaganda.

The requirements of production today condition the development of collective forms of labor such as composite teams, design bureaux working on a voluntary, unpaid basis, etc.,

which regulate the various spheres of the collective's activities. There are no grounds for considering these organs as independent groups, "collectives within the collective", as it were. They are simply bodies which proceed from the common aims of the collective and under the influence of its style, tone and opinions control the various spheres of its activity, such as, for example, hiring the work force (public personnel departments), economic activity (economic analysis bureaux and rate-fixing offices). Sociological research shows that the successful activity of these organs depends on the level of development of all links and relations within the collective. In this way, as the collective grows in social maturity new organs become increasingly necessary to control the various spheres of its activity in their entirety and interdependence.

Both the administrative and public organs must equally rely on the scientific principles of managing the collective and make correct use of the available levers of management. These include economic stimulation, planning, influencing public opinion, and education. Furthermore, the administrative organs must use specific administrative means, such as orders, instructions and other legal measures. It should be stressed here that in contemporary conditions and under a new system of planning and economic stimulation the carrying out of plan directives is not only guaranteed by administrative measures and the material interests of the whole production collective, but by the level of its ideological and political work and its consciousness of the social prospects for the development of the collective and society as a whole.

The whole system of industrial management makes the production collectives interested in the drawing up of intensive plans and the fuller utilization of production funds, the work force, material and financial resources, in improving technology and in raising the quality of production.

Economic methods of management inevitably require exact scientific calculation, reliable information on all aspects of the management process, concreteness, objectivity and competence. "In order to manage," said Lenin, "one must know the job." It is impossible "to manage without being competent, without knowledge of the science of management".¹

¹ V. I. Lenin. *Collected Works*, Vol. 36, p. 521.

Realizing the tremendous potential of the production collective today is therefore directly dependent on scientific, competent management and the active participation of all workers in managing the various aspects of the life of their enterprise.

The combination of administrative management and social self-management offers great opportunities for improving the organizational forms and methods of managing the production collective. On the one hand, the administrative organs are basically bound to strengthen and improve and the director of the enterprise will have broader rights, while, on the other, social principles continue to grow and the various forms of mass participation in managing the enterprise are being extended.

Socialism solves the problem of management on the basis of democratizing all aspects of social activity and encouraging the participation of the masses.

Under socialism the increasing complexity of the functions of management runs parallel with the extension of its scope. Broad masses of the people take an active part in production management and the running of all public affairs. This corresponds to the principle in socialist society whereby the managerial function is not the privilege of any particular class but is a sphere of activity open to all the working people. The organization of labor is therefore at the center of attention of the Soviet workers. As a rule, they have no feeling of social pessimism though some shortcomings do persist in the work of the collectives. Under capitalism workers consider such factors as the social significance of their work and an understanding of the importance of the finished product to be secondary in comparison with the fear of unemployment (a poll among American workers showed that the above factors were either given no consideration at all or held to be of minimal importance), whereas for the workers in the socialist countries it is ethical or moral incentives followed closely by creative incentives that are of prime importance. Even those workers who are themselves not gaining job-satisfaction refer to its collective, social significance.

A high level of social interest and the ethical, ideological and political stimuli that are developed in the worker by the system of socialism encourage him to actively participate in the running of his collective and society as a whole.

The characteristic feature of the socialist worker's attitude to his job is his initiative and involvement in the rationalization of production, the improvement of labor organization and innovation.

The administrative opportunities for all members of the collective have today risen to an unparalleled degree together with their cultural and technical level and organizational skills. Moreover, certain individual managerial functions do not require administrative control, being based on educational and moral factors. This has encouraged large sections of the working people to participate in production management. "Each conscientious worker," said L. I. Brezhnev, "who not only works well but is concerned about the success of his team, shop or enterprise, who boldly reveals the shortcomings that come to his notice and submits proposals to rectify them,—such a worker has every reason to say about himself that he takes an active part in managing his enterprise."¹

The degree of participation by the workers in production management on a voluntary basis and the effectiveness of this work is demonstrated, for example, by the experience of the work of the standing production committees. These exert a real influence on all aspects of the economic life of the enterprise: the development and improvement of technology, the organization of production and labor and the improvement of the quality of output.

The standing production committees are entitled to examine any question connected with production, place definite problems before the directorate and make economic recommendations. They have inexhaustible opportunities for realizing the economic potential of the enterprise. They function at all enterprises and building sites. An opinion-poll was carried out among members of the standing production committees at Sverdlovsk in the Urals to determine the extent of the influence on production of decisions taken by these committees. Forty-seven per cent noted that they did exert a definite influence on improving the organization of production, 31 per cent considered they improved the organization of labor, 30 per cent that they strengthened produc-

¹ L. I. Brezhnev. *Following Lenin's Course. Speeches and Articles*, Vol. 2, Moscow, 1970, p. 523 (in Russian).

tion discipline, 23 per cent that they raised productivity of labor and 20 per cent that they improved the quality of production.¹

Many enterprises operate public bureaux of economic analysis. These are bodies that function both on the shop-floor level and in the factory as a whole. Large enterprises have coordination centers for these bureaux called councils. Research carried out at enterprises in the Sverdlovsk region showed that 26.5 per cent of the work of these bureaux was devoted to analyzing the reserves for raising labor productivity, 25 per cent to finding ways to lower costs and recommending measures for economizing raw and other materials, 22.7 per cent to the technical organization of production and making recommendations for the more effective use of equipment. As a result of the work of the economic analysis bureaux the average yearly saving at industrial enterprises in the Sverdlovsk region alone amounted to more than ten million roubles.²

It is well known how important it is to replace experimental-statistical output quotas by those that are proved technologically and bring these quotas into line with actual labor input.

The scientific organization of standards inspection is helped by the rate-fixing offices. The offices use both photography and time and motion studies, and their work is of considerable economic importance.

The rate-fixing offices have certain advantages over the department of rate-fixing, for they revise output quotas not only with the consent of the actual workers themselves, but with their active participation. The quotas, determined in this way, are accepted by the workers as just since they are worked out by their own comrades who know the job. The rate-fixing offices help to avoid misunderstanding which sometimes arises through changing rates, between those directly involved on the shop-floor and the rate-fixing department, which is part of the administration.

The workers also learn production management through the All-Union Society of Inventors and Rationalizers, scientific and technical societies, the innovators' councils and the

¹ *The Creative Energies of the Working People and the Development of Socialist Democracy*, Moscow, 1972, p. 196 (in Russian).

² *Ibid.*, p. 198.

composite work-teams. An important part of their work is the implementation of organizational measures designed to accelerate the introduction of new technology.

Of particular importance are the organs of the collective run on a voluntary basis and concerned with the scientific organization of labor (SOL). The creative initiative of the masses gives rise to new forms of developing and introducing SOL measures on each work-bench, in each section, line, shop and at the enterprise as a whole. Today on the one hand, the SOL administrative services are set up in the form of sections, laboratories and bureaux and on the other, organs of the collective, run on a voluntary basis and concerned with the scientific organization of labor, undergo further development.

The work of the SOL involves analyzing conditions and factors which influence the creative activity of the production collective. These include problems related to the division and cooperation of labor, analysis of the social prerequisites for the scientific organization of labor, creation of a favorable environment for production, introduction of technical aesthetics into production and development of a rational system of work and leisure, taking account of all the psychological and physiological factors of production and in general provision of the favorable social conditions for the humanization of labor at the enterprise.

Today, of course, with the advancement of science and technology, these factors have assumed tremendous significance. It is now objectively essential to adapt modern technology to man and his psychological requirements.

Workers participate in production management and in the social processes at their enterprises not only by being involved in the work of the public organs, but also through carrying out assignments, speaking at meetings, writing in the factory press, etc. Research in the Sverdlovsk region showed that during a year more than half of those workers questioned had spoken at least once at meetings of the collective and 89.7 per cent of these had made various suggestions for improving economic performance, 8.7 per cent for improving the organization of production, 17.4 per cent for strengthening production discipline, 11.2 per cent for raising the quality of output, 16 per cent for improving material and technical supplies, 18.3 per cent for improving

organization and labor rates, and 16.1 per cent for improving equipment.¹

With the aim of developing the social principles of management particular importance is given to the involvement of young workers in the functions of management. In many enterprises these constitute more than half of the work force. Young people now enter the enterprises with secondary education and the desire to give their knowledge and labor to society. Extensive opportunities for this have been made available by their socio-political activity. Practical participation in this activity is the foundation of the political maturity of Soviet youth. Of special significance in this respect is Lenin's thesis that political consciousness "is created by the political experience of the masses, never by propaganda alone...".² Participation in the management of their own work collective is an important school for the training of young workers in running the affairs of society.

The Educational Role of the Collective and the Improvement of Democracy at Work

The development and improvement of socialist democracy is closely linked with the forms and methods of communist education.

Responsibility, competence and discipline are not only principles of organizing management, but the stable characteristics of the individual which are revealed in the process of his education.

Research on the problems of democracy "at a personal level" under developed socialism has acquired particular significance. The analysis of political democracy at the level of society and its structural elements does not run counter to the analysis of democracy at the level of the individual and his socio-political make-up. These two approaches are dialectically interlinked. "The materialist sociologist," Lenin wrote, "taking the definite social relations of people as the object of his enquiry, by that very fact also studies the real *individuals* from whose actions these relations are formed."³

¹ *The Creative Energies of the Working People and the Development of Socialist Democracy*, pp. 200-201.

² V. I. Lenin. *Collected Works*, Vol. 31, p. 84.

³ *Ibid.*, Vol. 1, p. 406.

Therefore research into democracy at the level of the individual implies an examination of the following points. First, the formation of political awareness in the individual and the ways and means to his political involvement. Second, the mechanism by which the political conduct of the individual is organized and social control over that conduct is implemented at the various stages of his development. The best answers to these problems can be found by studying the ideological and educational opportunities of the work collective and assessing its potential for social activity.

It is a well known fact that social activity objectively promotes the formation of a communist outlook and communist political and legal views. For this purpose the production collective possesses inexhaustible potential, for it is precisely here that active social involvement begins. Stressing the importance of ideological work at the current stage of communist construction, the Central Committee of the CPSU has determined that all work collectives must become genuine centers for the education of the new man, the establishment of communist attitudes to work and socialist property and the development of high moral relations among people.

The work collective includes various cultural facilities such as circles, seminars, libraries and palaces of culture. In many factories there are people's theatres, philharmonic societies, and numerous amateur organizations. These serve to widen the contacts and relationship between the individual and society and improve their character. The work collective encourages such contacts and consciously improves them, thus promoting the all-round development of the individual and the flowering of his talents. Participation in the work of this or that voluntary public organ helps to gradually train the individual in the competent running of society. Organizational work directed towards changing the micro-environment of the work collective is organically interconnected with ideological work.

An integral, comprehensive approach to the task of education, that is to say the close unity of ideological, political, labor and moral education with regard for the individual characteristics of different groups of workers was outlined in the Report of the CC CPSU to the 25th Congress of the Party as the way to raise the effectiveness of the ideological activity of the party.

The ideological work of the party is carried out both on the scale of society as a whole and within the framework of each production collective. The latter possesses vast potential for developing a communist outlook, collective consciousness and communist morality among its members.

All aspects of the ideological and educational work of the collectives are indissolubly linked in a single process, which is effectively managed by the work collective. Central to this management is the party organization of the production collective, which is its political nucleus. The party organization plays the decisive role in determining and implementing the lines of development for ideological and educational work and in improving its forms and methods. The party organization guides the educational work of the administrative, trade-union and Komsomol organs. The ideological and political education of the individual largely depends on the effectiveness of this work.

The production collective possesses various means for bringing ideological, political and moral influence to bear on the individual. These include the system of party and Komsomol political education, the channels of political information, the mass media (press, radio, public lectures), visual propaganda (monumental propaganda, museums of the revolution and museums of military and labor glory, political study rooms, slogans and posters) and the political and moral prestige of those in charge of production and the executive cadres.

An important means of ideological influence, affecting the most subtle aspects of human psychology, is individual education, which the most progressive and conscious members of the collective practise daily in their contact with their work-mates.

Thus the production collective makes for an optimum combination of the necessary mechanisms for effectively changing the individual's immediate micro-environment, and provides the means for his ideological and political education. All this creates the necessary conditions for the formation of such political qualities in the individual as are determined by the socialist way of life.

In a developed socialist society the widening of the social foundations of democracy and the active participation of the masses in the running of society and managing the affairs of each work collective are becoming increasingly dependent

on improving the ideological, educational, social and psychological spheres of social relations. This is becoming increasingly important for the further development of the democratic principles of socialism, the wider involvement of the working people in management and the fuller manifestation of the organizational abilities of the working class, the peasantry and the intelligentsia.

The main means to raise the social and political activity of the masses is the comprehensive solution to the socio-economic, ideological, socio-psychological and educational problems both on the scale of society as a whole and within the framework of the production collective.

The development of socio-political activity is the foundation for the further improvement of socialist democracy.

Socio-political activity, as an aspect of social activity, is inseparably bound up with human consciousness.

This gives added significance to the personal aspects of democracy, the problems of democracy and the socialist way of life, and democracy and relations between people within the socialist society. Socio-psychological research shows that the production collective, as a socio-psychological phenomenon, exerts an active influence on the morals, psychology, moods and opinions of its members.

Characterizing the socialist way of life as the main achievement of socialist construction in the USSR, L. I. Brezhnev said at the 25th Congress of the CPSU: "The atmosphere of genuine collectivism and comradeship, cohesion and the friendship of all big and small nations in the country, which gain in strength from day to day, and the moral health which makes us strong and steadfast—these are the radiant facets of our way of life, these are the great gains of socialism that have become the very lifeblood of our reality."¹ Collectivism is an inalienable feature of the socialist way of life.

Public opinion plays an important role in the creation of a favorable moral and psychological climate. L. I. Brezhnev stressed that "it is also very important for every enterprise, every collective to create the right kind of atmosphere, the right kind of public opinion, so that everyone is fully aware of who is working and how he is working, and

¹ *Documents and Resolutions. XXVth Congress of the CPSU*, p. 105.

everyone gets his due. Everyone must be confident that good work and worthy conduct will always be acknowledged and appreciated, will win the respect and gratitude of his comrades at work. And in exactly the same way everyone must know that absentees and shirkers, rolling stones and bad workmen will receive no indulgence or leniency and that nothing will shield them from the anger of their workmates." ¹ The party activists in the collective have decisive influence over the formation of public opinion. In developing criticism and self-criticism within the collective, improving the whole system of social work, and increasing the importance of production committees, meetings, comrades' courts and other public organs of the collective, the party organizations help to form public opinion, which is highly sensitive to the behavior of the members of the collective, evaluating it from the point of view of the interests of society as a whole, and consistently upholding the principles and norms of communist morality.

By relying on the party activists and their opinion the collective can eradicate any elements of petty-bourgeois, philistine mentality which may occasionally appear. With the help of the activists the collective can successfully dispel false impressions, discard outmoded views and eliminate conflict situations that may arise in any of its constituent parts.

An object of particular concern to the party organizations and an important aspect of the control which they exercise over the administration is improvement of the work style of the production executives, which is determined not only by the competence of the man in charge and his ideological and political outlook and convictions, but by such socio-psychological factors as are expressed in the character of his relationship with his subordinates. The work of the production director consists not only in taking administrative decisions and applying administrative and legal methods to ensure their precise fulfilment. This work requires the utilization of educational and psychological methods and the ability to unite the collective on the basis of the laws of collective life. This is only possible if the man in charge has the necessary personal qualities and fully understands and practises the principles of collectivism.

Soviet psychologists have determined the theoretical principles for a comprehensive approach to the selection of exec-

¹ L. I. Brezhnev. *Following Lenin's Course*, p. 16.

utive personnel for the collectives. Such an approach takes into consideration the psycho-physiological characteristics of the personality of the leader and his potential for acquiring the necessary skills in handling people. Various forms and methods exist for making this type of selection and they radically differ from the system of psychological tests which is widely used in the capitalist countries.

To win the trust and respect of his subordinates the man in charge must build his relations with them in such a way that they improve the moral and psychological climate of the collective.

The executive must be continually ready to seek the advice of his colleagues, encourage his subordinates to express their opinion and listen to it. He must respect the dignity of his subordinates and always look for positive characteristics in them. His decisive action and high exactingness must have the support of his subordinates and be combined with concern for them. He must show self-possession and tact and be unaffected by nervousness, irritability or arrogance.

In its organizational and educational work each collective must take into account the socio-psychological processes and phenomena conditioned by each individual micro-environment. Its specifics depend on the place which a given collective occupies in the system of social connections, on the nature of its activity, as relating to definite norms of professional ethics, on the concrete characteristics of the various aspects of its individual existence, i.e. its "individual history", on the stage of development which the collective has reached, and on the degree of psychological compatibility between its members as it influences the contacts between them. All this conditions the individual psychological interaction between people within the framework of a given organizational structure.

Therefore, even though the moral and psychological atmosphere of society as a whole may be positive, there may well exist negative trends in the moral and psychological climate of individual collectives. In these collectives insufficient account may be taken of the psychological peculiarities of the individual, whose interests and needs are today considered so important by the socialist system, or the conditions may not always exist for the all-round fulfilment of his gifts and talents, or insufficient importance may have been attached to the emotional side of his life. Some executives,

who may possess the necessary competence and political awareness, nevertheless do not have sufficient knowledge of the fundamentals of managing the social processes.

Possession of this knowledge is necessary for all workers in the administration and the social activists of the collective, for all in fact who are engaged in management.

Primary importance attaches to the support of the activists of the collective in the process of education, for it is they that are the guardians of the traditions of the collective, the guarantors of their continuity and the upholders of its progressive way of life. Every production collective has its advanced workers, who are the most conscientious and possess the best organizational abilities. It is from among these that the collective chooses its leaders who introduce innovation in the collective by their example and by virtue of their prestige. In what is essentially their educational activity they take account of the experience amassed by the collective, its possibilities, its level of development and the trends and prospects for its growth. By purposeful activity of this sort they ensure the continuous development of the collective from stage to stage. The maturity of the leaders largely determines the effectiveness of the whole self-administration system. The activists are able to mobilize the collective to perform interesting and important work which unites it.

Each collective passes through a series of stages in its development. As the collective develops, so do its members, while its activists grow stronger together, thereby increasing its prestige. The activists become the support which ensures the correct relationship between the executive and the collective.

In an immature collective the demands of the executive remain largely foreign to the collective, but once these demands receive the support of the majority of the workers and not just the activists alone, this marks a new stage in its development. A more favorable atmosphere exists for the executives who now rely firmly on collective leadership in the process of managerial decision-making. In a mature collective all the members, or the overwhelming majority are united behind the activists and the executives.

If the executive takes no account of the level of maturity of collective relations, he will not keep abreast of them. In such a situation the collective always throws up a leader

who is more suited to current requirements. Each collective is a concrete social organism. What is possible in one collective is impossible in another. A mature collective is characterized by the fact that the demands made by the leader (executive) correspond to the requirements of the members.

At the same time the level of development of the collective is determined by the presence of effective working organs, which are the result of the growth of intra-collective relations.

At the first stage of the development of a collective, the main organizational force is the administrator or manager. As the collective develops such force becomes the activists and, finally, in a mature collective all members contribute to the organization of its work. The connections within the collective becoming more intricate thus bring about the necessity for new organs and an increase in the number of activists.

The development of public opinion, the improvement of the socio-psychological atmosphere and the strengthening of contacts between the administrative and public organizations are all furthered by the work of the elective organs of the collective. It is through participation in these organs that the social functions of the workers expand and the individual increasingly becomes not only a producer, but an active social and political worker, a comrade, an organizer and an educator.

Raising the organizational level of the production collective and improving social relations within it unquestionably helps to further democratize the running of all its affairs.

On the other hand, involving wide sections of the working people in running the collective actively influences the qualitative level of socio-economic and ideological management in it, trains and promotes capable production and social organizers and guarantees their constant supply to the state and party apparatus.

Skilful utilization of the available means of building up the production collective,—that most important element of the micro-environment—allows the democratization of the whole sphere of managing it and the improvement of its moral and psychological climate, and actively encourages the socialist way of life within it.

All this ensures the achievement of that goal which L. I. Brezhnev set in his speech to the 16th Congress of the Komsomol: "We must strive to create a spiritual climate in production and in life, in fact in every collective which would elevate man, reveal his finest capabilities and foster intolerance of anti-social deeds."¹

The achievement of these objectives is of tremendous significance for developed socialist society because involving the masses in the management of their own collective, training administrative personnel, forming political awareness in the individual, improving the moral and psychological climate in every collective and in society as a whole are the most important means for the improvement and further development of socialist democracy. The work collective, as a fundamental social unit, is not only the field wherein these deeply democratic social processes develop, but the means to accelerate that development.

Social Planning and the Development of Democracy

At the 25th Congress of the CPSU L. I. Brezhnev noted: "Our country was the first to begin planned economic management. Dozens of countries have learned and continue to learn this complex art from us. But we too are now faced with the task of raising the level of planning and bringing it into conformity with the new scale and make-up of our economy, with the new requirements of the times."²

One such requirement is the transition to comprehensive socio-economic planning. It has become current practice in recent years to draw up and implement plans for the social development of the work collective on the basis of and along with the drafting of the national economic plans. Considering the results of this practice and extending it throughout all branches of the economy and regions of the country is the current objective of the theory and practice of social planning.

Planning the social development of the enterprises, associations and agro-industrial complexes has today acquired tremendous significance. The conditions, character and con-

¹ L. I. Brezhnev. *Following Lenin's Course*, p. 312.

² *Documents and Resolutions. XXVth Congress of the CPSU*, p. 70.

tent of labor, the skills and qualifications of the workers, the prestige of the different types of work, the structure of work time and free time, material security, the satisfaction of cultural needs and requirements and involvement in social and political activity on the basis of socialist democracy together with the many other social factors, which contribute to raising the level of the activity of the workers, are becoming a powerful vehicle for the economic and social progress of Soviet society.

The effectiveness of social development is directly dependent on scientifically based forecasts and planning and on their correlation and interaction.

Social forecasting is designed to determine the development prospects for a social system and its subsystems, set out all the possible variants for that development and make a scientifically grounded choice of the most rational and optimal means for attaining the desired objectives, whereas the plan pinpoints the means to this end. Consequently forecasting is the informational foundation of both the goal and the plan.

The goal is a reflection of a definite possibility and its implementation, while the plan is the concrete program for this implementation. The plan determines the stages, continuity, rates, times and means for the achievement of the forecast expressed in the goal. In this way the plan is concerned with the social possibilities and the available means and resources on the basis of which it sets out concrete indicators and their interconnection. Consequently the content of the plan is not only centered round the goal, it gives specific expression to it. The plan pinpoints the forecasted aim in terms of time and place, clearly defines it and directs the way to its achievement.

Implementation of the plan is, in terms of feedback, the criterion for the correctness of the forecast.

Together with determining the prospects for economic development, modern state planning also formulates the fundamental lines of social transformations in the planned period. These include such law-governed social processes as overcoming the social and economic differences between town and country and between mental and manual labor, which objectively leads to the elimination of social and economic inequality and the establishment of the social homogeneity of society.

The organic link between economic and social development and the deep, comprehensive elaboration of measures included in the social development plans for the industrial enterprises (which will be discussed below) are of great socio-economic as well as socio-political significance. First, the concrete production quotas for the state economic plan can be more satisfactorily met if they are stimulated by the concrete social benefits. Secondly, the social measures envisaged in the plan will be the more effective the more they are specified for those who will implement them.

Drawing up plans for the social development of the collective also has a more remote, but none the less deep social purpose. The scientific and technical revolution has brought tremendous possibilities for transforming the whole system of social relations. It inevitably gives rise to essential changes in the relationship between man and technology, and in a socialist society, furthermore, entails a higher level of organization, management and guidance of the social processes and the improvement of production and other relations in the work collectives.

The main purpose of social planning is to achieve the harmonious, optimal and rational management of the work collective, combine the results of the scientific and technical revolution with the advantages of the socialist system and raise the living standards of the people. The plan includes a scientifically based and materially guaranteed system of measures directed towards well-thought-out changes in the structure and working and living conditions of the collective, and towards the formation and fuller satisfaction of the material and cultural requirements of the people and the all-round development of the individual. It coordinates the technical and economic indicators of the enterprise with the social development of the work collectives and thus helps to improve production, raise the productivity of labor and educate communist attitudes towards duty, towards one's work-mates and towards society as a whole. The active and creative participation of the working people in drawing up and implementing the plans for social development marks a new manifestation of socialist democracy.

Each work collective possesses the necessary economic levers for influencing the social conditions of labor and everyday life. It is thus in a position to draft a long-term program for its activity in the field of technology, economy

and production organization and at the same time determine what means it will have available for material incentives and social and cultural purposes.

The 25th Party Congress examined social and economic development under the tenth five-year plan in its total complexity and established the most rational correlation between the various spheres of social development. An important guarantee for the successful fulfilment of the program outlined by the party for the current stage of communist construction consists in the increasingly wider introduction of social planning.

The first to come forward with a suggestion for comprehensive long-term planning of the work collectives' social development was the Leningrad party organization whose delegates spoke at the 23rd Congress of the CPSU.

In March 1966, the Leningrad association "Svetlana" was the first in the country to draw up a plan for long-term social development (1966-1970). The principal difference between this plan and those forms of planning the individual social processes that existed previously consisted primarily in the fact that being comprehensive and drawn up for a five-year period, it allowed a more purposeful distribution of resources and ensured the solution of relevant technical and economic problems and the attainment of the social objectives of the collective. On the basis of a system analysis of initial information at the enterprise, the plan envisaged the optimum (for that given stage) conditions providing for the satisfaction of the social requirements of the members of the collective. It coordinated measures for improving production, increasing labor productivity, raising the workers' standard of living and promoting their all-round harmonious development as individuals. The specific objectives of this five-year plan were set out and developed in a series of annual plans, particularly on the socio-psychological aspects of managing the collective and relations between its members. To sum up, the plan for the social development of the association "Svetlana" for 1966-1970 was of a high standard.

During the same period many other enterprises in Leningrad, Moscow, Sverdlovsk, Perm, Lvov, Gorky and other cities began to draw up and implement social development plans. In approving this initiative, the Presidium of the All-Union Central Council of Trade Unions (AUCCTU)

passed a resolution (June 28, 1968) recommending trade union central committees and councils together with ministries, departments and other economic bodies to utilize the experience of the Leningrad enterprises in long-term social development planning when drawing up plans for enterprises and organizations in industry, transport, building and agriculture.

Social planning has shown that it is meaningful and highly effective. Implementation of social development plans, as the experience of the leading industries has shown, helps to prepare the work collectives and each individual member for the attainment of current and long-term production goals, create the conditions for improved productivity, raise economic effectiveness on the basis of an increase in the technical standards and efficiency of production and the introduction of the scientific organization of labor. This results in improved selection, placement and training of personnel, stabilizes the work force and cuts down lost time. Thus the material conditions of the workers improve, their educational and cultural level rises and they become better trained and qualified for their trades and professions. Production discipline strengthens, an atmosphere of comradeship, trust and mutual respect and exactingness develops and the activity of the workers in managing production and in the social and political life of the country grows.

Of considerable importance for the effectiveness of social planning is research into its methodological problems.

First, social planning is based on the system of social information. However, averaged economic statistics as currently used by the Central Statistical Board of the USSR cannot underlie the drawing up of plans because they conceal important differences in the type of work, living standards, culture and education between the individual enterprises and industries. Consequently it is necessary to improve the system of obtaining information so that it reveals the dynamics of the social processes in all their concreteness, variety, complexity and contradiction.

Secondly, the study of the basic information must be approached not only from the point of view of the internal laws of the collective, but also from the external factors which unavoidably influence both the process of realizing available potential and its result. The high degree of dependence of the internal resources of the work collective

on the social environment in which it exists requires a study of the nature of this environment and a forecast of the changes likely to occur in it. Consequently, the appropriate tasks of the social development plan can be made authentic, feasible and put on a scientific basis only through the application of the Marxist-Leninist theory.

Thirdly, the activity of the work collective gives rise to not just one, but a large number of possibilities for its development. Thus it is necessary to reveal not only the "spectrum of possibilities" and ascertain the degree of their maturity and the real probabilities for their implementation, but to pick those whose implementation will be the most useful from the angle of the social effectiveness of the planned changes and the harmonious development of the work collective and of each of its members. The achievement of this result implies the application of the whole range of scientific methods of research.

Fourthly, it is often revealed in the course of the drawing up of social development plans that the work collective presents a variety of demands which cannot be fully met at the given stage in view of a lack of the required material resources. In this situation particular importance attaches to a struggle between rival claims with the result that the enterprise discovers just where its real priorities lie, and it is these which in the first instance are reflected in the social development plans of the work collective. They must, of course, be arranged in order of importance which depends on the facilities available for their implementation within the specified periods of time.

Finally the social development plan must clearly formulate its main objective, which is ideally the embodiment of the desires and goals of the whole collective.

Thus the following pattern emerges from the work of social development planning:

—selective social forecasting, which allows the collective to make a choice between the various alternatives for its development;

—an analysis of the chosen alternative from the point of view of its conformity with the social aims and ideals of society. This allows normative social forecasting which reveals the general trends in the development of the collective and lays down a program for managing the social processes;

—drawing up the social development plan on the basis of this program and setting out its concrete statistics and definite objectives;

—fulfilment of the plan, which is guaranteed by fixing time limits, appointing those responsible for the implementation of the plan, acquiring the materials, equipment, stock and other necessary resources, mobilizing the collective and introducing planned measures, and checking that the plan-schedule is adhered to.

What are the future prospects for the widespread development of social planning?

At its initial stages the introduction of social development planning was justified only at certain individual enterprises and then by way of an experiment and elaboration of appropriate methods, whereas today it is practised on a large scale.

Nation-wide social planning has given rise to a number of social problems, which are gradually being solved. First of all, there is the question of the need for social development planning to be introduced in all work collectives. Otherwise the social benefits will only be enjoyed to the full by workers in those industrial enterprises—as a rule the large-scale—which possess vast material and financial resources and which have already introduced social development planning. Those who work at the small industrial enterprises, which have not introduced social development planning, will be unable to fully enjoy these benefits. One way to solve this problem is to conduct social planning on the basis of cooperation between the small enterprises within certain territorial and departmental limits.

But a more universal solution to the problem is to combine social development planning at the enterprises and in the various branches of the economy with regional social planning. In recent years it has become fairly widespread to draw up district and town social development plans which unite the work of individual enterprises with that of the local party, government and other organizations. Simultaneously social planning is being also extended to various branches of the national economy.

These processes are quite logical. An analysis of the social development plans of individual enterprises has shown that for a number of problems being solved the needs of a single collective can and often must be coordinated with the

interests and possibilities of the corresponding territorial and administrative unit or branch of the national economy.

Experience shows that social development planning is only effective if it is long-term. First and foremost its prime targets must be organically linked with long-term production planning and consequently cover a five-year period.

The further extension and improvement of social development planning pursues a highly important goal—raising the material standards of the Soviet people, satisfying their growing cultural requirements, intensifying socialist production, deepening socialist democracy, encouraging the harmonious development of the individual, and bringing society nearer to communism.

Chapter IX

THE SCIENTIFIC AND TECHNICAL REVOLUTION, SOCIAL PROGRESS AND DEMOCRACY

The transition of mankind from capitalism to communism is taking place amid an expanding and accelerating scientific and technical revolution. This is one of the most important elements in the competition between opposing social systems and a factor determining the historical prospects for social progress.

In accelerating the process of socializing the means of production, the scientific and technical revolution deepens and aggravates the contradictions which exist under state monopoly capitalism, and at the same time gives rise to new contradictions, which specifically characterize the contemporary stage of its development. These are primarily the contradictions between the social character of contemporary production and the state-monopoly system that leads to the colossal squandering of resources, the antagonism between the interests of the overwhelming majority of the workers and the ruling financial oligarchy, and the contradiction between the unprecedented opportunities for improving the well-being of mankind and the obstacles which capitalism sets in their path.

In socialist society the scientific and technical revolution is characterized by qualitatively different attributes which correspond to the nature of the socialist mode of production. The scientific and technical revolution has meant speeding up the utilization of the reserves of the socialist system. "The Party regards scientific and technical progress as the core of its entire economic policy. It must penetrate all fields of production, encompassing daring scientific discoveries, hundreds and thousands of improvements in tech-

nology, new mechanisms and instruments—all that saves and facilitates work, that makes it more productive and interesting. 'In the final analysis,' said Lenin, 'labour productivity is the most important, the most essential thing for the victory of the new social system.' This Leninist injunction has assumed particular importance in the present epoch, an epoch of scientific and technological revolution. And our party never forgets about it."¹

Socialist ownership, the planned organization of social production and the active participation of the working people in the organization and management of the economy make possible the maximum utilization of the achievements of science and technology in the interests of man. Thus the scientific and technical revolution is one of the most important conditions for the development of socialist society at the present stage.

The Nature and Social Consequences of the Scientific and Technical Revolution

A tremendous contribution to the problems of the scientific and technical revolution was made at the 24th Congress of the CPSU which gave theoretical foundation to the universally important task of organically combining the achievements of the scientific and technical revolution with the advantages of the socialist economic system.

The term "scientific and technical revolution" is now firmly established in the program documents of the communist and workers' parties and in Marxist-Leninist political, economic and philosophical literature. Defining the nature and social role of the scientific and technical revolution has been one of the most important theoretical and political developments in the Marxist-Leninist theory during the second half of the twentieth century. The further development of this revolution lends particular relevance to the theoretical elaboration of economic, sociological and philosophical problems and at the same time explains the growing interest in these questions among large sections of the

¹ L. I. Brezhnev. *Following Lenin's Course*, p. 444.

public as well as the political parties and the state organs.

In the Report of the CPSU Central Committee to the 25th Party Congress, L. I. Brezhnev declared: "We Communists proceed from the belief that the scientific and technical revolution acquires a true orientation consistent with the interests of man and society only under socialism. In turn, the end objectives of the social revolution, the building of a communist society, can only be attained on the basis of accelerated scientific and technical progress."¹

A deep study of the scientific and technical revolution in a developed socialist society and its influence on the tempo and structure of social production and on the socio-political structure of society and the development of democracy is aimed in the first instance at rendering effective help to practical work.

An examination of the nature of the scientific and technical revolution reveals that there exist numerous definitions of this concept. There is general agreement that it began in the second half of the twentieth century with the hitherto unprecedented development of science and technology. But when it comes to the nature of the scientific and technical revolution there are nevertheless a number of mistaken interpretations. For example, certain authors identify the scientific and technical revolution with scientific and technical progress. This is invalid, since the scientific and technical revolution is not merely an evolutionary change, but has been accompanied by such qualitative changes as signify a deep revolution. It is similarly impossible to agree with those who refer to it as a second industrial revolution, for such a definition does not do justice to the social significance of the phenomenon. There is also a monostructural approach to the definition of the scientific and technical revolution which reduces it to automation in production and the application of cybernetics—a cybernetic revolution. The changes brought about by the computer are evident, but most important is the wide application of science and technology in all fields of human activity and the social consequences of this. The scientific and technical revolution has given rise to radical changes in the productive forces of society. The Programme of the CPSU declares: "Mankind is entering

¹ *Documents and Resolutions. XXVth Congress of the CPSU*, pp. 56-57.

the period of a scientific and technical revolution bound up with the conquest of nuclear energy, space exploration, the development of chemistry, automation and other major achievements of science and engineering." ¹

The scientific and technical revolution is conditioned by the level of the socialization of contemporary production, the presence of historically determined conditions for the rapid application of scientific and technological developments and for the advance of science and technology itself. The ground for the scientific and technical revolution was prepared by the course of development of the productive forces and the outstanding scientific discoveries made over the last decades.

The quantitative accumulation of changes has led to a deep qualitative transformation. According to the calculations of US Professor John Platt, "In the last century we have increased our speeds of communication by a factor of 10^7 ; our speeds of travel by 10^2 ; our speeds of data handling by 10^6 ; our energy resources by 10^3 ; our power of weapons by 10^6 ." ²

The scientific and technical revolution makes it necessary to develop a unified scientific and technical policy for society, and in a number of cases for the world at large. In the USSR and the other socialist countries scientific and technical policy is an integral part of the common economic policy of the state, which sets out the most profitable lines of development for science and technology and orientates them towards the solution of socio-economic problems.

An important part in the study of the scientific and technical revolution is played by methodology. Only firm reliance on the methodological principles of Marxism-Leninism provides valid answers to the fundamental questions of the theory of the scientific and technical revolution.

In very general terms it can apparently be said that the scientific and technical revolution is a radical qualitative transformation of the productive forces and the transformation of science into a direct productive force, with a corresponding revolutionary transformation of the material and technical base of social production and its forms and con-

¹ *Road to Communism*, Moscow, 1962, p. 472.

² *Science*, Vol. 166, No. 3909. Washington, November 28, 1969, p. 1115.

tent, the nature of labor, the structure of the productive forces and the social division of labor. All this has influenced the socio-political life of society and the people's everyday life, culture and psychology.

While exerting a growing influence on the socio-economic development of society, the scientific and technical revolution is itself conditioned by the level of this development. It has become possible only due to the high level of the socialization of production, i. e. the process which creates the objective conditions for the transition from the capitalist mode of production to the socialist. The scientific and technical revolution has increased the objective necessity for this transition and owing to this has become an important factor in the contemporary world revolutionary process.

Of course, the essence of the scientific and technical revolution is not to be identified with even the most important scientific discoveries or trends in scientific and technical progress. It is determined by the transformation of the whole technological base of production from the exploitation of materials and energy resources to machinery and forms of organization and management, as well as the place and role of man in production. The scientific and technical revolution has made it possible to unite within a single system the most important forms of human activity: science—the theoretical cognition of the laws of nature and society; technology—the totality of material resources and experience for transforming nature; production—the process for the creation of material benefits; and management—the means for the rational interconnection of meaningful activities in the process of fulfilling production and other tasks.

This unified system gives rise to far-reaching consequences for each of its components and strengthens the connections between them. A role of decisive importance in science is beginning to be played by the coordination of its separate branches. Noteworthy here is the increasing significance of the social sciences both in the positive solution of practical problems and in connection with the aggravation of the ideological conflict, which has arisen from the development of the scientific and technical revolution under conditions of the struggle between the two opposing socio-political systems. From the socio-economic point of view the main thing is that science is becoming an important element in the productive forces. This means that the

unity of scientific knowledge and productive activity is providing a powerful impulse for production.

The scale of development of modern science raises complex problems which demand new approaches and new forms and methods of managing this sphere of human activity.

Today there exist some 2,000 separate scientific disciplines, but alongside this process of differentiation which is increasing the number of scientific disciplines, the trend towards integration is also noticeable. The number of scientists working today is huge: in the USSR alone it is almost 1.2 million.

All this requires improving the structure of scientific management and determining scientific policy. Evaluating the current state of scientific research and looking at its future prospects has never been more necessary, for together with the growing expenditure of resources and efforts for scientific research, the cost of studying major contemporary problems has reached truly formidable proportions. Of great importance are the social criteria for evaluating scientific work, since the question of man's effect on the environment and the possible consequences of new discoveries are now thought to be of the utmost significance.

Considerable importance for the proportional development of scientific research attaches to econometrics, systems analysis, the general theory of systems and mathematical modelling. The application of these new methods of scientific research allows timely influence to be exerted on the development of production and other spheres of the life of society.

The rapid advance of the scientific and technical revolution raises interest in its future prospects, which is particularly expressed in the increasing number of scientific, technical and economic forecasts and in the development of political systems and democracy. Forecasting is limited by a whole range of objective and subjective factors, but nevertheless such work is carried out in many countries. In the USSR forecasts are worked out for all areas of scientific and technical research.

The definition of areas of scientific research and their specialist evaluation has today become a subject of international cooperation. In 1972 the International Institute of Applied Systems Analysis was set up in Austria. The

academies of science and special scientific commissions from 14 countries, including the USSR, the United States, Czechoslovakia, Poland, Britain and France take part in its work. The institute is concerned with the methodology of applied systems analysis and is running a number of projects on energetics, urban development, ecology and the utilization of natural resources.

Thanks to the close interconnection between science and technology, the creation of new materials and energy sources, the development of new types of production and the radical change in existing technological processes are beginning to play a paramount role. This is particularly apparent in new approaches to the utilization of natural resources which are of prime importance to mankind. We should note that the Constitution of the USSR obliges Soviet citizens to protect nature and conserve its riches.

Over the course of many centuries mankind has assumed the inexhaustibility of natural resources and so exploited nature that today there has almost been a geological revolution. Technology, being man's instrument in his contact with nature, has been applied rapaciously, amassing some substances and wasting other. Today this approach has been shown to be wrong and wasteful since resources are limited and the dispersal of products leads to dangerous pollution of the environment.

This has forced us to take a new look at technology and the utilization of natural resources. Environmental pollution is now considered as the undesirable loss of useful and necessary material. Of exceptional importance now is waste-free technology. Unfortunately the opinion is still fairly current that this form of technology is only necessary for the protection of the environment. It is less frequently considered as a means to the more rational utilization of natural resources.

It is this aspect of the new technology that is today beginning to interest engineers, scientists and economists more and more. It should be stressed that waste-free technology is becoming one of the most important practical measures for guaranteeing the recycling of natural resources whereby materials are used in production many times over.

The rapid development of science and technology has revealed the contradiction between the limitless potential of production and the limited resources of nature. Engels

already foresaw this situation when he wrote that we should not "flatter ourselves overmuch on account of our human victories over nature. For each such victory nature takes its revenge on us. Each victory, it is true, in the first place brings about the results we expected, but in the second and third places it has quite different, unforeseen effects which only too often cancel the first."¹

This contradiction appears in a variety of forms, so it is necessary to get to the heart of what is happening, learn to control the different processes and influence them in the required direction. This is only possible under socialist democracy. The global nature of the tasks involved means that the knowledge and experience of the broad popular masses must be used for their accomplishment.

At the 25th Party Congress it was stressed, that "the success of the scientific and technical revolution and its beneficial effect on the economy, on all aspects of society's life, cannot be ensured through the efforts solely of scientists. It is increasingly important to draw all the participants in social production and all the links of the economic mechanism into this historic process."²

In considering the state of technology today and its future trends mention must be made of the revolutionary role of the computer. The first computers appeared in the 'forties and 'fifties. The action of these machines was such that they could only perform several thousand operations a second. In the 'fifties appeared the first computers built on semi-conductor principles. The speed of these machines being considerably higher, they could perform almost a million operations a second. At the end of the 'sixties computers were built on integral schemes, which replace whole blocks by micromodules, which meant a considerable improvement in efficiency.

The evolution of the computer may be compared with the history of the motor car. The first automobile designers at the beginning of the twentieth century could never have envisaged that this new progressive means of transport would cause so many problems and be a source of atmospheric pollution. In the same way, attitudes towards the computer have shown both overestimation and underestimation of its

¹ F. Engels. *Dialectics of Nature*, Moscow, 1976, p. 180.

² *Documents and Resolutions. XXVth Congress of the CPSU*, p. 58.

potential. On the one hand, the computer should not be regarded as just a big calculator for this would mean that a large part of the logical operations which the machine itself completes would have to be performed by man. On the other hand, the computer should not be made into a fetish.

Norbert Wiener formulated the basic approach to the solution of this problem in the following way: "Render unto man the things which are man's and unto the computer the things which are the computer's. This would seem the intelligent policy to adopt when we employ men and computers together in common undertakings. It is a policy as far removed from that of the gadget-worshipper as it is from the man who sees only blasphemy and the degradation of man in the use of any mechanical adjuvants whatever to thoughts." ¹

These words of the founder of cybernetics, who gave constant thought to the social consequences of its development and application, present the problem whose solution is the highly complex and responsible task of management in the widest sense of the word. This solution is, of course, impossible given the stand of bourgeois social management. It can only be attained on the basis of the Marxist-Leninist science of society.

The Scientific and Technical Revolution and the Prospects for Social Progress

The scientific and technical revolution has given rise to truly revolutionary changes in production, both in its social structure and in its material and technical base. As a result of the comprehensive automation of production and management, and the creation of the technical means for fulfilling not only mechanical but also logical functions, human labor has radically altered. The most important social effect of these transformations has been the formation of the material and technical conditions for overcoming the essential differences between mental and manual labor, between agricultural and industrial labor, between town and

¹ Norbert Wiener. *God and Golem, Inc. A Comment on Certain Points where Cybernetics Impinges on Religion*. The M. I. T. Press, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Cambridge, Massachusetts, 1964. p. 73.

village, and between the non-productive and the productive spheres. Finally, management is becoming a form of social activity that is closely linked with all the fundamental elements of social life.

The basic lines of development of the scientific and technical revolution are the following:

- the discovery and utilization of new types of energy;
- the creation and application of new construction materials not existing in nature;
- the comprehensive automation of production including the creation of automated systems for controlling and managing production;
- providing a scientific foundation for all the basic types of production and related activity.

In all these areas the achievements of science, technology and production are organically combined, and mutually condition each other, with science taking the dominant role.

The growth of the role of science in the system of social production is a natural, logical process. More than one hundred years ago Marx wrote that depending on the general state of science and the degree to which it is applied in production, the character of labor changes in such a way that not only man acts as a regulator of the process of production, but the conditions of life as a whole come under the increasing control of universal intellect and are transformed according to its demands.¹ This tendency has been significantly developed in the age of the scientific and technical revolution.

But material production is not the only sphere involved here. As social life is becoming continually more complex, science and technology are increasingly penetrating into its different spheres, such as the organization of education and leisure, etc.

Of fundamental importance for an understanding of the essence of the scientific and technical revolution and for its socio-economic conditionality and social role is the teaching of Marxism-Leninism on the development of society. Marx's key concept for a materialist understanding of history, the "mode of production", has revealed the link between the development of production and social progress and

¹ See K. Marx and F. Engels. *Collected Works*, 2nd Russ. ed., Vol. 46, Part II, pp. 213-45.

substantiated the inevitability of the transition from capitalism to classless society.

Imperialism tries to compensate for the weakening of its economic and political positions with ideological counter-attacks in order to halt the march of social progress and impede the development of socialism. The material and technical base of capitalism allows it to maintain comparatively high rates of scientific and technical progress in a number of leading industries. However the process of revolutionizing production increasingly aggravates the contradiction between the social character of production and the private form of appropriation. Within the capitalist system the material preconditions for socialism develop rapidly. On the other hand the development of the productive forces of world socialism, which is accelerated thanks to the organic combination of the achievements of the scientific and technical revolution with the advantages of the socialist system, ensures its increasing supremacy over capitalism.

Bourgeois theoreticians try to evolve ideological interpretations of the scientific and technical revolution which would serve the imperialist forces in their struggle against socialism. Essentially they put forward two conceptions, which at first glance appear to be mutually exclusive, but which in fact fulfil analogous functions. The first of these may be described as relatively "optimistic", the second as "pessimistic". The first concept amounts to the assertion that capitalism is a satisfactory form for the development of productive forces, that profit is the most effective form for guaranteeing rapid scientific and technical progress and that the scientific and technical revolution can resolve all the social contradictions of capitalist society and make radical social and economic transformation unnecessary. The varieties of this optimistic conception take the form of the theory of convergence, the theory of the industrial state, the theory of a post-industrial society and the theory of the technotronic age.

Social pessimism expresses some of the real contradictions of capitalist society, but sees them as the contradictions of a "technological civilization" in general, i.e. virtually accepts the premises of the theory of a "single industrial state". Plunder of the natural conditions of human habitation, rapacious exploitation of natural resources and the negative consequences of the capitalist application of tech-

nology have all found their expression in the ideology of social pessimism, whose chief characteristic is the attribution of social ills, which are caused by capitalism, to the development of technology.

Both conceptions have the same social imperative — the imperative of the bourgeoisie. Distorting the social and socio-economic consequences of the scientific and technical revolution in capitalist conditions, they declare useless and unnecessary the struggle of the working class for the radical transformation of society, for social progress and democracy. The aim of this is to prevent the formation of a united front consisting of the working class, the broad non-proletariat masses and particularly that section of the intelligentsia which is increasingly coming to take an anti-capitalist stand.

The Marxist-Leninist thesis that by itself scientific and technical progress is not only incapable of curing capitalist society of its ills, but, on the contrary, deepens and aggravates its contradictions, has been borne out by the experience of the last few decades. The wave of "partial" crises that has swept the capitalist countries, which demonstrates the deepening general crisis of the system, has been accompanied by the growth of dissatisfaction among all sections of society. New forces are entering into active social and political struggle—representatives of wide sections of the intelligentsia, scientists and students. All this points to capitalism's inability to utilize the possibilities of the scientific and technical revolution for the benefit of society.

While considering the contemporary bourgeois theories of the scientific and technical revolution and disclosing their apologetic nature, it should not be forgotten that capitalism, despite its acute contradictions, is adapting itself to changing conditions. This, for example, is shown by the measures taken by the bourgeois states to avert ecological catastrophe. In this connection the capitalist countries are beginning to face the question of the social responsibility of big business and the activity of private enterprise, and to examine social priorities, etc. Research into the latest trends and directions of bourgeois socio-economic theory, which are conditioned by the contradictory development of the scientific and technical revolution in the capitalist countries, and their deep critical analysis from a Marxist position are one of the most important tasks.

The relevance of this task is determined among other things by the fact that in recent years there has been a considerable increase in scientific, technical and economic contacts between the socialist and the capitalist countries, and this trend seems likely to develop further.

The scientific and technical revolution has deepened the processes of internationalization in science, technology and economics. Detente and the consistent policy of the Soviet Union and the other CMEA member-countries, which is based on the principles of peaceful coexistence between states with different social systems, have allowed the expansion of mutually advantageous contacts which is in the interests of the whole of mankind.

The differences in ideology and social system between the socialist and the capitalist countries are not an obstacle to the development of business relations between them providing that these are built on the principles of sovereignty, equality, non-interference in internal affairs and mutual advantage.

However, though we make all-round efforts to develop scientific, technical and economic cooperation and are conscious of the necessity for collective international decisions and joint projects between states in the face of global problems such as the danger of a thermonuclear war, the ecological crisis, or the best utilization of the advantages of the international division of labor, we must nevertheless continually bear in mind the principal irreconcilability of socialist and capitalist ideology, which reflects the opposition of the very nature of these two social and economic systems.

One set of important and relevant problems is connected with the influence of the scientific and technical revolution on world economic processes and the character of the international division of labor. Under socialism the scientific and technical revolution considerably accelerates the internationalization of production and deepens the processes of integration which permit the formation of powerful international economic complexes presenting especially favorable conditions for the application of the achievements of science and technology.

The comprehensive program of economic integration of the CMEA member-countries clearly demonstrates the tremendous advantages of integration processes that are developing between the socialist countries, for each of which

there exist the most favorable conditions for the utilization of the achievements of the scientific and technical revolution and the improvement of the structure of its national economy.

The totality of problems presented by the scientific and technical revolution is extremely wide and varied. The conscious and purposeful management of this process demands a deep and comprehensive analysis of the trends in scientific and technical progress, the drawing up of a scientifically grounded policy and the implementation of organizational measures which guarantee more favorable conditions for the application of scientific and technical achievements in the interests of social and economic progress. "Socialism," declared L. I. Brezhnev in the Report of the CPSU Central Committee to the 24th Party Congress "the planned socialist economy offer the broadest scope for the all-round progress of science and technology. However, the scientific and technical revolution requires the improvement of many sides of our economic activity. In other words, it is a huge force favourable for socialism, but one that has to be properly mastered."¹

The connection between the scientific and technical revolution and social progress is rather involved. It is a deeply dialectical relationship showing unity and interaction. The all-round development of science and the practical application of its achievements in the interests of the whole of society requires special social conditions which capitalism is unable to provide. Such conditions are created by the transformation of society on socialist principles. This basic fact determines the social consequences of the scientific and technical revolution in different social and economic systems.

An important role is played by research and development and the new technology, insofar as the efficiency of social production rises in proportion to the progressive changes that take place in the technology-production system. Establishing criteria of effectiveness for the new technology becomes one of the central problems in the management of scientific and technical progress, as well as in the whole system of management. Particular significance is attached today to the questions of planning and stimulating the

¹ *24th Congress of the CPSU*, p. 49.

is the individual's way of life. The tremendous growth of social progress, the continually increasing influence that introduction of new technology and raising its effectiveness.

One of the most important indicators of social progress man exerts on the natural conditions of his existence and the positive and negative results of scientific and technical progress have all made it quite clear that production not only means the production of things, goods and services, but the production of the very requirements of the individual. More than that, production is reproduction of social relations, the material conditions of human existence, i. e. those conditions which determine the face of contemporary society.

In the USSR and the other socialist countries it has been decided to guarantee a high level of individual consumption of goods and services in optimum combination with the possibility of fulfilling individual capabilities both in the sphere of labor and in other aspects of social life. But this does not mean that success and social status are only measured by the level of consumption of goods and services. A most important indicator of the role of the individual in society is his creative social activity and his moral worth, but this implies not only a growth of material well-being, but the development of different forms of creative activity and the satisfaction of the numerous wants of the individual.

Among the measures directed towards the stimulation of the scientific and technical revolution and the combination of its achievements with the advantages of the socialist economic system prime importance attaches to raising the level of the education and training of personnel. The scientific and technical revolution makes new demands on the education and training system. The very development of the scientific and technical revolution is in the final analysis conditioned by the creative efforts of men and women armed with modern scientific knowledge, who guarantee the further development of science and technology and the introduction and practical application of their discoveries. In this connection a new significance is imparted to the various tasks in the sphere of education as they affect its whole system and content, the organizational forms and methods of personnel training and the planning and forecasting of specialist requirements. It is for this reason that the Con-

stitution of the USSR contains a special article (Art. 26) which declares that in accordance with society's needs the state provides for planned development of science and the training of scientific personnel and organizes introduction of the results of research in the economy and other spheres of life.

The Scientific and Technical Revolution, Management and Democracy

Important among the problems raised by the scientific and technical revolution is the question of the further democratization of organization and management. This runs through the whole complex of measures connected with the utilization of the scientific and technical revolution and the advantages of the socialist economic system. Under the scientific and technical revolution particular importance attaches to guaranteeing conscious, purposeful and democratic management of the increasingly complex processes of development.

The scientific and technical revolution makes qualitatively new demands on management. These demands consist in bringing the system of economic and social management into conformity with the requirements of the contemporary stage of social development.

Obviously, the variety of tasks facing socialist society at the present time makes the process of management particularly complex. The aim of management is becoming comprehensive, comprizing a whole series of objectives—social, economic, technical, ecological, etc. A comprehensive character is also imparted to the process of attaining these aims, which requires a consistent and coordinated solution of the tasks relating to various spheres of social life.

The socialist economic system objectively creates the possibilities for the maximum utilization of scientific and technical developments in the interests of society. However, the translation of these possibilities into reality does not come about automatically, but requires tremendous organizational work and effective socio-economic management. Organizing and directing the forces of socialist society is the historic mission of the Communist Party, which is

armed with the scientific theory of social development.

Under the scientific and technical revolution the leading role of the party increases in all areas of communist construction. This, in particular, is conditioned by the necessity of strengthening the comprehensive approach to social management, of combining the technological and social aspects of the scientific and technical revolution, and of closely dovetailing the interests of economic, social, political and cultural development.

Of paramount importance today is the work of the Communist Party in determining policy and setting out the fundamental long-term guidelines for the development of society. Determining the general perspectives for the development of society and the correct political line, and the organization of the working people for its successful implementation are the most important aspects of the work of the Communist Party.

All sections of the party rely in their work on the scientific cognition of the laws of social development. The vitality of the CPSU policy is due to the fact that it is continually guided by Lenin's words that the "party . . . must act on scientific principles".¹ From the first years of Soviet power Lenin urged the necessity to learn the science of management. It was most important for party leadership that "learning shall not remain a dead letter, or a fashionable catch phrase . . . that learning shall really become part of our very being, that it shall actually and fully become a constituent element of our social life."²

A scientific approach to guiding social life and the processes of social development is the decisive characteristic of party work and the activity of the Leninist Central Committee of the CPSU and party cadres. The objective necessity for such an approach is increased in conditions of the scientific and technical revolution. Now there exist more and more real possibilities for guaranteeing this scientific approach, and it is these that the party is consistently implementing. The party documents and L. I. Brezhnev's reports and speeches have given a deep analysis of the important problems today and answered the most fundamental the-

¹ V. I. Lenin. *Collected Works*, Vol. 31, p. 80.

² *Ibid.*, Vol. 33, p. 489.

oretical and practical questions which arise from contemporary social life. "The art of Party and state leadership," L. I. Brezhnev declared, "lies precisely in taking timely note of nascent problems, realistically assessing them and charting the way for solving them. Profoundly and comprehensively studying the situation and the trends of development, courageously laying bare difficulties and contradictions and showing the way to surmount them, the Party blazes the trail of communist construction, setting the people tasks that have to be carried out and inspiring them to perform creative feats of labour."¹

The state functions as the main instrument of social transformation and as the organization which solves the varied problems connected with the development of the scientific and technical revolution. These include drawing up and implementing the economic plans and forecasts, providing material guarantees for and encouraging scientific research and tying it up with production, modernizing the whole of production on the basis of the latest scientific and technological advances and the training and re-training of personnel. The scientific and technical revolution can only be fully understood and put to the service of society through wide application of the diverse instruments of state administration and legal regulation. This in the first instance refers to economic management.

Improvement of the system of economic management which is being carried out in accordance with the decisions of the 24th and 25th Party Congresses that were made more concrete at Plenums of the Central Committee of the CPSU, takes the form of a comprehensive, systematized program of measures, which embraces all aspects of organization and management. The scientific approach to the solution of the relevant problems of the development of the economy and other spheres of social life is the objective demand for planned, centralized management. In its turn, planned, centralized management creates the necessary conditions for fulfilling the needs of science, which is particularly important at the stage of mature socialism given the tremendous acceleration of scientific and technical progress.

Of course, the introduction of scientific principles and methods into planned management of the socialist economy

¹ L. I. Brezhnev. *Following Lenin's Course*, p. 282.

has nothing in common with organizational automatism or apolitical technocratism.

In contemporary conditions there is a growing need for a comprehensive approach to improving planning and economic management. This is predetermined by the closer interrelationship between the social, scientific, technical and economic factors in the development of socialist society.

The guidelines of social development as formulated in the program documents of the party constitute a point of departure for social and economic planning. At the same time increased importance is now placed on forecasting in the very process of planning. Improving the methods of economic planning must rely on a more careful study of social needs, on the scientific forecasts of economic potential and on a comprehensive analysis and evaluation of possible solutions and their immediate and long-term consequences. There is a clear organic link between socio-economic and scientific and technical forecasting on the one hand, and the system of centralized planning, on the other. Forecasting helps to foresee and calculate not only the different variants for the development of productive complexes, but their interaction with social and demographic processes and scientific and technical progress.

The long-term economic development plan (till 1990) for the USSR is heavily based on extensive forecasting which produced definite practical results. The institutes of the USSR Academy of Sciences together with the appropriate ministries and departments have drawn up a draft Comprehensive Program for Scientific and Technical Progress and Its Social and Economic Effects for the Period 1976-1990. At the same time it has become clearly necessary to more closely dovetail social, economic, scientific and technological forecasting and coordinate the activities of the planning and economic organs. Economic forecasting is now becoming an integral part of the work of the whole system of management and economic planning.

The Communist Party, which has set the task of raising the effectiveness of production, devotes particular attention to improving the organizational structure of management and setting it on a scientific foundation. Under the scientific and technical revolution there has been a further increase in the concentration of production. Events have proved the correctness of party policy in creating associations which

are eventually to become the basic, economically autonomous elements of social production. A resolution of the Central Committee of the CPSU and the Council of Ministers of the USSR provides for the transition of industry to a two- or three-tier system of management, increased concentration and cooperation in production and the creation of major associations and combines. Statutes now govern the All-Union and republican industrial associations and the production association (combine). Production complexes have been set up on territorial principles. A statute on the science-cum-production association has been approved. The ministries have determined general plans for industries which envisage a new management structure and an increase in the concentration of production.

The setting up of associations allows considerable simplification and acceleration in production specialization and concentration and the introduction of the latest advances in science and technology. This leads to the further socialization of production and the qualitative development of the productive forces in conformity with the major changes in the material and technical base, caused by the scientific and technical revolution.

Improving the organizational structure of management entails the solution of a number of problems involved in raising the efficiency and improving the qualitative performance of the Soviet economy.

Intensifying the scientific and technical revolution under socialism is organically linked with improving socialist democracy. The democratic character of management is one of the most important conditions and guarantees of the development of the scientific and technical revolution in harmony with the needs of society and in the interests of man. This particularly needs stressing, because, as was mentioned above, the scientific and technical revolution has its social aspect and it is only possible to give the necessary direction to the social processes it engenders if there is democratic management of society.

The development of the scientific and technical revolution in conditions of socialist democracy helps boost social production, raise the standards of living and stimulate the growth of culture, education and the working people's skills. On the other hand, the scientific and technical revolution requires the further improvement of socialist democracy it-

self and the involvement of wide sections of the population in the task of realizing its tremendous potential.

Socialist democracy is the most effective system for the development of the scientific and technical revolution insofar as the realization of its potential requires the efforts not of a narrow group of specialists, but the energy and creative powers of millions of people. This in its turn makes it necessary to optimize the structure of management and rationalize managerial activity.

In the West an idea has gained wide currency to the effect that the scientific and technical revolution inevitably leads to a weakening and even a withering away of the democratic forms of economic management and state administration. Democracy itself is regarded as a relic of the past, an anachronism in the modern age when management is supposedly becoming the privilege of the "chosen few".

These and similar ideas reflect the aggravation of contradictions in the bourgeois society today and are aimed at justifying the anti-democratic tendencies in its evolution. Such technocratic and elitist views are quite alien to socialism. While recognizing the important function of specialists, scientific socialism, as was noted above, has never linked itself, either in theory or practice, with a system of management in which power would belong to such specialists as an independent political force.

Of course, it is impossible to deny that the scientific and technical revolution under socialism intensifies the professional and technical aspect of management. Underrating the role of specialists and advocating an incompetent approach to work would mean belittling the significance of science and the scientific foundation of social management, which would contradict the very essence of the scientific and technical revolution.

At the same time account must be taken of another tendency, also engendered by the scientific and technical revolution and consisting in the formation of new conditions for expanding worker participation in management. This tendency is firstly expressed in the increased scale and complexity of social production, so that it now encompasses practically the whole working population. Secondly, there has been a rise in the educational level and occupational training of the people at large. Thirdly, the social structure of society is changing, encompassing changes within the

various classes and social groups, which reflect the scientific and technical revolution. Finally, there are wider possibilities for the rapid dissemination of information and for a greater amount of free time, which permits millions of workers to take a more active part in the process of management. As a result the social activity of the masses has grown together with their social initiative and consciousness. Ignoring this tendency would amount to a refusal to utilize one of the most important advantages of the socialist system in the organization of management and in controlling the processes of the scientific and technical revolution.

Thus under socialism not only is there no contradiction between the development of the scientific and technical revolution and the expansion of democracy, but, on the contrary, these processes are mutually connected and conditioned and make their most important social contribution in their organic combination.

The scientific and technical revolution means a growth in the importance of the various democratic forms of social management. The framework of this chapter does not permit a detailed examination of each of these, so it remains to stress only the three most important aspects.

First, the role of the Soviets—the leading form of democracy and the foundation of the whole state apparatus—has increased. It is the Soviets that fulfil the function of guiding and integrating the system of state administration, which is particularly important at a time when a comprehensive approach to the problems of management is needed. The Soviets are authorized to decide the fundamental problems in the sphere of management, determine the general membership of the government bodies possessing general competence and exercise effective and systematic control over the work of the administrative organs. It is not accidental that in recent years there has been an increase in the work of the Soviets at all levels—from the Supreme Soviet of the USSR to the local Soviets.

Secondly, there has been an intensification of the democratic principles of state administration. In recent years this has been reflected in the increased collective character of management. The importance of collective leadership has risen in connection with the setting up of councils of directors invested with wide powers. The role of the boards in the state committees and sectoral ministries has also increased,

The Program of the CPSU points to the need for the consistent implementation of collective leadership at all levels of the state and economic apparatus, with a strict personal responsibility of each man in charge. Stress should also be laid on the relevance of the program provision of the party which declares that the principle of electivity and accountability to the representative organs and the constituents will be gradually extended to all executives in the state organs and that increasingly wide sections of the working people will be encouraged to develop the skills of management.

Finally, the scientific and technical revolution has brought about an increase in the role of the work collectives and the importance of direct worker participation in the management of production. Democracy in the sphere of production has always constituted an important element of socialist democracy, which is natural under socialist ownership of the means of production. Now, when the scientific and technical revolution stresses the importance of production efficiency, the combination of centralized state management and production planning with the expansion of the initiative and activity of the work collective takes on particular importance. This multiplies the production potential of the enterprises, not to mention the possibilities for developing the collectives, which are not only the economic, but the social cells of Soviet society. It is not accidental that in the USSR the activity of the public organizations in the work collectives is being stepped up, socialist emulation is being widely expanded, and the role of the standing production committees is increasing.

Socialist democracy is a powerful lever, which society, led by the Communist Party, is able to make skilful use of for the purpose of ensuring dialectical unity between the scientific and technical revolution and social progress.

NAME INDEX

B

- Balzac, de, Honoré—168
Brezhnev, L. I.—5, 13, 19, 26,
37, 39, 41, 50, 57, 63, 70, 73,
91, 126, 146, 180, 181, 197, 203,
206, 226, 231, 237, 238, 242,
252, 263, 266, 267
Brzezinski, Zbigniew—122, 150
Burlatsky, F. M.—55
Burnham, James—122

C

- Cohen, Jerry S.—111

D

- Dahl, Robert A.—118, 119
Dye, Thomas R.—111, 112

E

- Engels, Frederick—11, 17, 28,
47, 51, 83, 97, 99, 100, 101,
137, 146, 148, 152, 168, 173,
174, 196, 203, 205, 256, 257,
258

F

- Farber, I. Y.—55
Friedman, Milton—163

G

- Galbraith, John—110
Grigoryan, L. A.—55

H

- Hegel, Georg Wilhelm Fried-
rich—172
Heidegger, Martin—176
Heilbronner, Robert—111
Hellinek, Walter—112
Hitler, Adolph—166
Hunter, Floyd—109
Huntington, Samuel P.—122, 150
Husák Gustáv—81

K

- Kosygin, A. N.—46, 220
Kravchuk, S. S.—77

L

- Lenin, V. I.—6, 10, 13, 23, 27-
30, 33, 34, 38, 39, 40, 47-51,
56-58, 60, 63, 64, 67, 72, 75,
76, 82, 87, 91-93, 96-98, 100,
103, 105, 115-17, 121, 123-25,
127, 132, 136, 137-44, 146, 148,
150-52, 154-55, 158-59, 160,
161, 163, 171, 184, 188, 195,
196, 201, 203, 229, 234, 251,
266
Lewis, Sinclair—168
Lippmann, Walter—108, 109
Lunacharsky, A. V.—127
Lynd, Helen—109
Lynd, Robert—109

M

Marx, Karl—11, 17, 28, 47, 51,
72, 83, 97, 99, 100, 101, 137,
146, 148, 152, 168, 172-73, 196,
205, 258

Mintz, Morton—111

Mosca, Gaetano—107, 108

O

Ortega y Gasset, José—106, 107

P

Pareto, Vilfredo—107

Platt, John—253

R

Ryerson, S.—164

Rzhevsky, V. A.—55

S

Sartre, Jean-Paul—176

Schumpeter, Joseph—108

T

Taylor, Frederick—160

Topornin, B. N.—53

W

Weichelt, Wolfgang—52

Wells, H. G.—168

Wiener, Norbert—258

SUBJECT INDEX

A

- Absenteeism—113
- Administration at a socialist enterprise—225, 227, 228
- Anarchism and anarcho-syndicalism—100, 101, 140, 141

B

- Bonapartism—168
- Bourgeois society—see Capitalism

C

- Capitalism—79, 101, 104, 105, 110, 111, 112-15, 120, 137, 164, 165, 168, 204, 260, 261, 262, 270
 - ideology of—112, 159, 163, 164, 203-206, 260-61
- Collectivism—49, 222, 237
- Communist Party of the Soviet Union (CPSU)
 - congresses of—26, 28, 32, 33, 36-37, 39, 41, 43, 44, 56, 57, 63, 127, 150, 151, 171, 180, 218, 220, 225, 235, 237, 242, 245, 252, 257, 263, 267
 - as the leading and guiding force of Soviet society—5, 8, 18, 19, 32, 34, 36, 38-40, 42, 44, 46-49, 56, 58, 61-64, 86, 95, 125, 134, 135, 136, 182, 191, 217, 220, 221, 235-

- 36, 265-68
 - policy of—13, 37, 38, 41, 135, 136, 262, 266
 - programs of—29, 32, 36, 39, 90, 252, 253, 272
 - resolutions of—27, 43, 50, 205, 213, 269

- Comprehensive socio-economic planning of the development of Soviet society—242, 243
 - implementation of social development plans—246
 - raising of the effectiveness of social planning—246-49
 - scientifically based forecasting and planning—243-44

Constitutions of socialist countries

- Constitution of Bulgaria (1971)—77, 87, 88, 90
 - Constitution of Czechoslovakia (1960)—77, 88, 93
 - Constitution of the German Democratic Republic (1968)—77, 89, 90, 92
 - Constitution of Hungary (1972)—77
 - Constitution of Poland (1952)—77, 90
 - Constitution of Rumania (1965)—77, 92
 - Constitution of Yugoslavia (1974)—77
- Constitutions of the USSR
 - Constitution of 1918—76, 89, 195, 196

- Constitution of 1924—8, 76
- Constitution of 1936—8, 31, 76
- Constitution of 1977—17, 18, 19, 70, 71, 76, 77, 180, 190, 191, 192-210
- continuity with former constitutions—31, 192
- development and expansion of socialist democracy—32, 34, 35, 77, 89, 192, 224
- Critique of bourgeois theories—13, 14, 92, 105, 106-109, 111, 112, 117-19, 121-23, 146-47
- Cultural revolution—154

D

- Democracy—11
 - basis of—6
 - under capitalism—103-06, 136, 137, 165, 169, 186, 270
 - characteristics of—15
 - direct—87, 90, 91, 183
 - representative—87, 90, 91, 92, 93, 183
 - sense and substance of—5
 - under socialism—7, 8, 10-13, 14-16, 19, 170-71, 186, 217, 218, 269, 270, 272
- Democratic centralism—18, 20, 47, 48, 87, 88, 143, 144, 146, 147, 226
 - essence of—137
 - ideological basis of—140
 - material and technical basis of—138
 - optimum combination of centralism and democracy—140, 141, 142
 - socio-political basis of—139
 - specifics of—143, 144
- Democratic control—155-57
- Democratic institutions of power
 - under capitalism—103, 137, 165, 169
 - under socialism—12, 169
- Democratic methods for the selection and placement of executive personnel—159, 160, 161, 162, 163
- Dictatorship
 - of the proletariat—6, 7

- terrorist (fascist)—166, 167, 168

G

- GOELRO—state plan drawn by the State Commission for the Electrification of Russia—33
- Government by the people (people's power, democracy) under socialism—72-76, 83, 86, 87, 88, 92-95
 - basis of—78
 - characteristics of—77
- Great October Socialist Revolution—28, 29, 116, 123, 138, 205, 207
- Guidelines for the Development of the National Economy of the USSR for 1976-1980 (draft directives)—45

H

- Humanism—99, 100, 103, 200

I

- Ideological struggle between the two social systems—163, 164
- Individual
 - bourgeois conception of—175, 176
 - under capitalism—112
 - freedom of—172, 173, 175-77, 179
 - Marxist-Leninist conception of—174, 175
 - rights and freedoms of citizens in Soviet society—14-17, 181, 200-04, 215
 - rights and freedoms of citizens under capitalism—13, 14, 204
 - under socialism—41, 184, 189, 192, 193, 196, 199-203, 205, 207-10
 - the state and individual in socialist society—181-84, 186-89, 194, 195
 - unity and equality of rights and duties (legal status of

the Soviet citizen)—18,
189-90, 200, 205, 206, 207,
209, 216

International Meeting of Com-
munist and Workers' Parties
of 1969—26

L

"Left" revolutionaries—101-102,
103

"Legal nihilism"—188

M

Maoism and Maoists—49, 102,
103

Marxism-Leninism—23, 46, 63,
72, 97, 99, 104, 117, 171-73,
174, 186

Masses

—under capitalism—111, 112,
113, 115-16

—participation in state man-
agement—130, 131, 153, 154-
56

—participation in state policy
—97, 215

—working people's class
struggle for their rights—
165

Material and technical basis

—of capitalism—260

—of communism—218

McCarthyism—165

Militarism—165

Morality, communist—71

N

Natural resources—256

O

Ownership

—under capitalism—104, 131,
165

—under socialism—138, 170,
178, 251

P

Paris Commune—11

Planned centralized manage-
ment—267-69

Political culture in socialist
society—125-27

—essence of—125

Political ideology—66, 67, 99

Political system

—of capitalism—97

—democratic political institu-
tions—52, 58

—political guidance—52, 54,
55, 57, 62, 69, 133

—of socialism—13, 52, 59, 67,
68, 72, 76, 94

—structure of—53, 59

Politics—96-99

Popular and state sovereignty—
80

Principles

—of proletarian international-
ism—51

—of socialist internationalism
—81

Production management under
mature socialism—219, 223,
230

Public organizations in socialist
society—43, 84, 85, 88, 94,
211, 212, 213, 215, 216, 227

—educational role of—213-14,
216, 218

—people's uniting in—212,
213, 215

—political activity of—211,
212

R

Revolution

—bourgeois—165

—socialist—24, 116, 169, 170

S

Scientific communism—103, 116,
149

Scientific management of so-
cialist society—129, 131, 155

- combining the principles of collective and one-man management—142
- essence of—131
- forms of—129-30
- and Party guidance—132
- Scientific and technical revolution
 - basic lines of development—259
 - under capitalism—259, 260
 - connection between the scientific and technical revolution and social progress—263
 - contradictions of—261
 - effectiveness of R & D and new technology—263
 - essence of—251-54
 - scale of development of modern science—254-55
 - under socialism—250, 262-64
- Socialism—8, 14, 33-35, 44, 55, 65, 67, 116, 128, 169, 171, 177, 184, 271
 - economic basis of—170
 - political system of—170
 - principle of—180, 202
 - socio-economic system of—170-71
- Socialist discipline—141
- Socialist economic system—30, 103, 179, 181, 265
- Socialist legality—18, 67, 68, 188-89
- Socialist society—7, 8, 13, 14, 17, 31, 32, 36, 103, 115, 132, 162, 183, 192, 222, 224
- Soviet people—32, 34, 73, 93, 178
- Soviet power—124, 145
- Soviet state apparatus—125
- Soviets of People's Deputies—7, 9, 34, 42, 76, 86, 88, 91, 92, 154, 178, 271
- Soviets of Working People's Deputies—see Soviets of People's Deputies

State

- bourgeois—110, 112-14, 165
- democratic nature of the socialist social system—82, 169-71
- of the dictatorship of the proletariat—20, 28, 29, 65, 75
- functions of—65
- main content of—24
- socialist state of the whole people—6, 19, 20, 55-57, 78, 79, 80, 85, 115, 116, 117, 169, 170, 186, 187, 189, 191, 267
- Supreme Soviet of the USSR—69, 70, 92, 271
 - laws passed by—69, 70, 90

U

- Union of Soviet Socialist Republics (USSR)—29, 34, 92, 271

W

Way of life

- under capitalism—31
- under socialism—6, 11, 31, 35, 41, 181, 237, 241, 264,
- Work (production, labour) collective—20, 224-26, 230, 231
 - administration of—225, 238-39
 - educational role of—234, 235, 236, 239, 241
 - essence of—218-19, 220-21
 - forms of creative work of—228
 - functions of—219-20
 - and improvement of democracy at work—234
 - labour productivity of—251
 - methods of managing a work collective—229
 - organs of—229
 - in production—219, 221, 223
 - and spheres of management—226, 230, 231

REQUEST TO READERS

Progress Publishers would be glad to have your opinion of this book, its translation and design and any suggestions you may have for future publications.

Please send your comments to 17, Zubovsky Boulevard, Moscow, USSR.