

**THE SOVIET UNION
UNDER THE NEW TSARS**

DK
274.3
W44
1978
MAIN

*bought in Red China book store in S.F.
summer 1978*

THE SOVIET UNION
UNDER THE NEW TSARS

WEI CHI



University of
Texas Libraries

THE UNIVERSITY OF TEXAS AT AUSTIN

FOREIGN LANGUAGES PRESS PEKING

First Edition 1978

Printed in the People's Republic of China

EDITOR'S NOTE

The Soviet Union, birthplace of the Great October Revolution, was the world's first socialist state founded by Lenin. However, since the Khrushchov-Brezhnev clique usurped Party and state leadership some 20 years ago, it has pursued a counter-revolutionary revisionist line in betrayal of Lenin and the revolution. A fine socialist country has degenerated into a social-imperialist one.

The Soviet revisionist renegade clique has restored capitalism on all fronts on the domestic scene. It enforces a fascist dictatorship and enslaves the people of various nationalities in the Soviet Union. The Bolshevik Party founded by Lenin has degenerated into an out-and-out revisionist and fascist party. A handful of bureaucrat-monopoly capitalists keep a stranglehold on the country's economy, and have turned the socialist ownership of the means of production into *their* ownership. Soviet literature, art and education, once instruments of the dictatorship *of* the proletariat, have become instruments of dictatorship *over* the proletariat. Soviet society today stinks of capitalism, of degeneration and corruption. This small handful of bureaucrat-monopoly capitalists and new bourgeois elements perpetrated a huge confidence trick which allows them to live off the fat of the land, while the Soviet working class and other labouring people are oppressed and exploited, reduced once again to wage-

slaves. With the deepening of class contradictions, national contradictions are also sharpening. In a word, the Soviet Union today is a paradise for a small number of bureaucrat-monopoly capitalists and new bourgeois elements, and a hell for the millions of labouring people.

On the international front, the ambitious Soviet revisionists stick their fingers into every pie. In their unbridled aggression and expansion they can hardly wait to swallow the entire world. They have turned Mongolia and some East European countries into their dependencies and colonies. As for the Third World countries, they have also extended their claws to a number of them for plunder, subversion and even direct armed intervention. In Western Europe they are engaged in infiltration and expansion, for Europe is the main area of their contention with the United States for world hegemony. At present Soviet social-imperialism has become the most dangerous breeding ground of war in the world.

This pamphlet shows how revisionism and capitalism reign supreme in all fields in the Soviet Union. From this source of teaching material by negative example, people everywhere can draw proper historical lessons from the case of the degeneration of the world's first socialist state.

CONTENTS

A FASCIST PARTY CLAIMING TO BE "A PARTY OF THE WHOLE PEOPLE"	1
THE BANKRUPT NINTH FIVE-YEAR PLAN	13
THE DECLINE OF AGRICULTURE	22
THE REAL NATURE OF STATE-OWNED ENTERPRISES	30
MAKING PROFITS BY ANY MEANS — An Analysis of Soviet State Commerce	38
MASTERS OF THE STATE YESTERDAY, WAGE SLAVES TODAY	46
BOURGEOIS DICTATORSHIP, BOURGEOIS EDUCATION	52
SOVIET REVISIONIST LITERATURE AND ART SERVE THE POLITICAL LINE OF SOCIAL-IMPERIALISM	61
THE DECADENCE OF SOVIET SOCIETY	72
A PRISON OF PEOPLES	83

A FASCIST PARTY CLAIMING TO BE
"A PARTY OF THE WHOLE PEOPLE"

Since the Khrushchov-Brezhnev renegade clique seized power and started pushing its revisionist line, the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, founded by Lenin and Stalin, has degenerated into the political arm of the Soviet bourgeoisie, a fascist party trying to hide its true features by claiming to be the "party of the whole people."

Chairman Mao pointed out: **"The rise to power of revisionism means the rise to power of the bourgeoisie."** The Khrushchov-Brezhnev clique, representing the interests of the old and new bourgeoisie, is a gang of revisionists who have sold their birthright to follow the capitalist road, though they have hidden themselves in the Party for a long time. As soon as this clique came to power, it altered the proletarian nature of the Party; did away with the dictatorship of the proletariat, reversed the country's socialist orientation and changed the Party's programme and its line.

As every Marxist-Leninist knows, a political party is always an instrument of class struggle, and the Communist Party is the vanguard of the proletariat, a party built on the revolutionary theory and in the revolutionary style of Marxism-Leninism. When the Soviet revisionists began to advertise their "party of the whole people," Marxist-Leninist Parties all over the world scathingly

denounced this rather sinister claim, pointing out that this "party of the whole people" was in fact nothing less than a political party of the bourgeoisie. The proportion of workers within the revisionist Soviet Communist Party has been decreasing steadily. For example, more than 70 per cent of the members elected to the Central Committee at the 19th Party Congress were dismissed during the Party's 20th-22nd congresses. In a single year, 1963-64, more than 160,000 members, mostly workers, were expelled from the Party. Great numbers of the real representatives of the working class, the real Marxist-Leninist revolutionaries, have been castigated and persecuted by the Soviet counter-revolutionary revisionists. Many have been removed from leading posts. Representatives of the bourgeoisie have usurped Party and state power, restored capitalism and become the chieftains of the dictatorship of the bourgeoisie over the proletariat.

In recent years Brezhnev and company have been insisting, with a guilty conscience, that the Party "has tightened control over the growth of its membership" so that "the working class has occupied a leading position in the social composition of the Party." They hope in this way to convince people that their so-called "party of the whole people" still "retains its class nature."

Lenin pointed out more than 50 years ago: "... **whether or not a party is really a political party of the workers does not depend solely upon a membership of workers but also upon the men that lead it, and the content of its actions and its political tactics. Only this latter determines whether we really have before us a political party of the proletariat.**" This statement shows up in its true light Brezhnev's claim about "the social composition of the Party."

FASCIST DICTATORSHIP

The C.P.S.U. has now been reduced to a tool used by the bureaucrat-monopoly capitalists to enforce a barbarous fascist dictatorship throughout the country. When Brezhnev and his cohorts flaunt the tattered banners of the "party of the whole people" and the "state of the whole people" and harp on the shopworn theory of the "dying out of class struggle" and "the democracy of the whole people," as Khrushchov did before them, their sole purpose is to cover up the fascist dictatorship they exercise both inside and outside the party. The Soviet revisionists have recruited deserters and renegades and constantly engage in factional activities for personal gain; they are ruthless in their persecution of all genuine Communists who adhere to Marxism-Leninism and of those who show any signs of upholding justice. It will be recalled how Khrushchov, on the pretext of "combating the cult of personality," lashed out at Stalin and how he openly rehabilitated old-line revisionists, counter-revolutionaries and bourgeois representatives of all shades, restoring their party membership and glorifying them. At the same time, he promoted his own lackeys to leading posts at all levels. Brezhnev is even more unscrupulous than his predecessor. He has enlisted old and new bourgeois elements and promoted them to dominant positions in all fields. Time and again the Khrushchov-Brezhnev clique has conducted massive party purges, suppressing many party members and cadres. A case in point is the recent "renewal of party membership cards." Between March 1973 and February 1975, nearly one million party members said to have "alien thoughts" were purged. The Soviet journal *Party Life* acknowledged that in the course

of renewing membership cards, party organizations have punished still more severely those members alleged to have "violated the requirements as set forth in the Party Constitution." During that period, large numbers of party cadres at the grassroots level in different parts of the country were removed from their posts and, in the armed forces, 30 per cent of the party cadres were dismissed. This purge, like previous ones, was directed first and foremost at party members who dissented from or resisted the revisionist ruling group.

In the Soviet "party of the whole people" and "state of the whole people," fascist rule is as brutal as in Hitler's Germany. The Soviet spy system extends to all parts of the country. The secret police organization, the State Security Committee (K.G.B.), has been so expanded that it employs several hundred thousand people, and has a comprehensive system both at home and abroad. It has sub-divisions throughout the country, in the union republics, regions and cities, and its agents infiltrate into all walks of life. In 1968, the Soviet "Ministry of Social Security," set up in July 1966, was reorganized into the "Ministry of Internal Affairs"; the "Bureau of Specialized Defence," the "Bureau of Night Police" and the "Motorized Police" equipped with sophisticated instruments for sleuthing, telecommunications and suppression were established to step up persecution of the Soviet people. Eleven specialized schools were set up to train top-level agents and police. Under various names, many auxiliary organs of dictatorship were either expanded or established. They include "the volunteer pickets," "the public committee," "the committee to prevent law-breaking incidents" and "the public and police station for social

security" and so on. In this way, fascist dictatorship over the people has been intensified.

Brezhnev and company have continued to strengthen the already modernized "Internal Security Force" which simply consists of troops put at the disposal of the ruling clique to suppress those Soviet people who dare to rise in rebellion. The Soviet revisionists have on many occasions ordered the troops out to shoot and kill so as to extinguish the flames of resistance of the people at home. According to information trickling through news reports from Tbilisi, Chimkent, Kharkov, Kaunas, Tallin, Minsk, Leningrad and Novosibirsk, mass strikes, parades, demonstrations and uprisings have been put down by the troops.

The prisons, concentration camps and "mental hospitals" built by the revisionists exceed those in Hitler's Germany in number and type. A report issued by the Legislative Proposals Commission of the Soviet of Nationalities states that the overwhelming majority of prisoners who are deprived of their freedom by court decision are kept in "labour reform camps." Former inmates have revealed the location of more than 250 of these concentration camps, while information from various sources provides an initial estimate of more than 1,000 such camps and a prison population of more than one million which is still growing.

A great number of people in the concentration camps are political prisoners who are dissatisfied with the reactionary rule of the new tsars. The methods of repression used by the revisionists lack all humanity: the political prisoners in the concentration camps are subjected to mental and physical torture. Following the lead of Hitler, the Soviet authorities keep prisoners in a constant state of hunger, or poison them by mixing chemicals with

their food. Nine political prisoners disclosed in a letter to the International Red Cross: "In the camps, every method is put into service with one objective — to break our will and force us into submission. . . . The entire establishment of the camp is aimed at transforming human beings into terrified and subservient animals. . . ." They also pointed out that anyone who did not submit would be confined in a cold, damp "punishment cell" or "solitary confinement cell." Some are handcuffed or put in straitjackets, and their daily ration is reduced to the minimum. Prisoners emerging from these "prisons within prisons" are barely strong enough to walk. The camp authorities encourage the guards in their barbarous practices such as setting dogs on the prisoners or stripping and searching them in the open air when the temperature is 30-40 degrees below zero. The guards even get two weeks' holiday for killing any prisoner trying to escape from a camp. The concentration camp on Wrangel Island, where various experiments are carried out on political prisoners, is a veritable Nazi "death camp."

RUTHLESS EXPLOITATION

The C.P.S.U. today is an instrument used by the handful of bureaucrat-monopoly capitalists for their ruthless exploitation of the working people. The revisionist rulers, the top bureaucrats in the party, government and army, are the plutocrats who monopolize the means of production and control the entire national economy. The series of economic plans and resolutions published by them in the name of the party and the state are all designed to force the working people and the rank-and-file party

members to submit in a docile fashion and create even more surplus value for them. Khrushchov divided the party into "industrial" and "agricultural" parties under the pretext of "establishing party organs according to the principle of production." Propagating his false, "goulash" communism and introducing "material incentives" everywhere, he intensified the exploitation of the Soviet people. Brezhnev, on his part, urged party cadres to master the "art of money making" and ensure the maximum profits. In the last twenty years, Soviet society has become increasingly polarized as a result of the policies of these traitorous leaders. While the few bureaucrat-monopoly capitalists appropriate as they please the fruit of the Soviet people's labour and live a life of dissipation and extravagance, the masses are being impoverished, and those who have lost their jobs are forced to roam from place to place.

The relationship between the Soviet revisionist ruling clique and the masses of working people and rank-and-file party members is clearly one between the oppressor and the oppressed, the exploiter and the exploited. Every law or decree on economic matters promulgated by the Soviet authorities is meant to intensify the exploitation of the working people. The C.P.S.U. Central Committee decided to implement, on a nationwide basis, the so-called "Shchekino System," which was devised, after a great deal of thought, by the manager of the Shchekino Chemical Combine and publicized under the slogan, "less men, more products." This system, which seeks to create high profits and big bonuses, has raised exploitation of the workers to the level of a science. It makes one worker responsible for several jobs, having him do the work of two or three others, and so results in the dismissal of

"redundant workers" in large numbers. The revisionist leaders lavished praise on the "Shchekino System" and had it widely publicized, claiming shamelessly that it conformed to the "principle of socialist management." But they themselves admitted that some factories had raked in 16 rubles and 60 kopecks for every ruble given to the workers as a "material incentive."

The Soviet bureaucrat-monopoly capitalist class has proved itself to be greedier than the old capitalists. Today workers in the Soviet Union are being exploited more severely than those in Western capitalist countries, and twice as much is being squeezed out of them as from their forefathers in pre-First World War tsarist Russia.

TOOL FOR AGGRESSION AND HEGEMONY

Apart from its role as an instrument of exploitation and fascist dictatorship at home, the C.P.S.U. is also used by the Soviet revisionist leading clique to carry out aggression and expansion abroad in its struggle for world hegemony. In recent years the Brezhnev clique has invented a series of social-imperialist theories such as "limited sovereignty," "international division of labour," "international dictatorship" and "the interests involved" to justify its aggression and expansion. While stepping up arms expansion and war preparations, the new tsars have been expanding their espionage activities in foreign countries and, using their lackeys abroad as a social-imperialist fifth column, have been interfering in the internal affairs of other countries, carrying out subversive activities there and bringing pressure to bear on them. The Brezhnev clique's clamour for "peace," "disarma-

ment" and "detente" and its claim to be a "party of peace" are simply smokescreens to hide the true colours of social-imperialist aggression and expansion overseas. Bloodstained Angola is the proof which rips away the Soviet revisionists' false mask. In a few months the so-called "true friend" of the Angolan people, using its mercenaries and agents, murdered 150,000 Angolans and created over one million refugees in a country whose total population is only six million. Public figures and newspapers all over the world have pointed out that the Soviet revisionists invaded and interfered in Angola for the purpose of imposing a new colonial rule on this country and establishing a new bridgehead of strategic value to further its scheme to control Africa. Some twenty years ago, the Soviet revisionists took advantage of the Egyptian people's difficulties and their eagerness to resist aggression and recover lost territories, used "aid" as a front, and wormed their way into Egypt under the guise of a "natural ally." Given an inch then, they wanted a foot. They unscrupulously interfered in Egypt's internal affairs, trampled on her sovereignty and exploited the Egyptian people. They went to every extreme in a vain attempt to force Egypt into submission — from keeping a stranglehold on the arms supply to stopping all supplies, including spare parts, from exacting high prices for the arms to pressing for debt payments. On March 15, 1976, Egypt resolutely terminated the Egyptian-Soviet "Treaty of Friendship and Co-operation." This great victory of the Egyptian people in their struggle against hegemony dealt a heavy blow against Soviet hegemonism and exposed the true nature of Soviet social-imperialism.

The Soviet revisionists' struggle with the other superpower, U.S. imperialism, has now taken on global propor-

tions. The unrest in Europe, the Middle East, South Asia, Southern Africa and elsewhere is invariably tied up with Soviet social-imperialist expansion and infiltration. In its contention with U.S. imperialism for world hegemony, this overly ambitious superpower takes a menacing offensive stance everywhere; it is the more adventurist one and has become the most dangerous source of a new world war.

THE WORSE THE OPPRESSION,
THE STRONGER THE RESISTANCE

Chairman Mao pointed out, "... **the masses of the Soviet people and of Party members and cadres are good, ... they desire revolution and ... revisionist rule will not last long.**" Since the Soviet revisionists usurped power and restored capitalism, the Soviet people and the rank-and-file party members have put up resistance in various forms. Let us look at the following instances of popular resistance that broke through the watertight Soviet news blackout in 1976.

When the "25th Congress" of the Soviet revisionist party convened in late February:

— the workers at a Leningrad telecommunication equipment plant, more than 20,000 in all, angrily went on strike in defiance of suppression by troops and police;

— a number of young Soviet people distributed leaflets on downtown Nevsky Street in Leningrad, calling for a "new revolution";

— leaflets exposing the fraud of the Brezhnev clique's so-called "improved welfare of the labouring people"

were seen in Stalingrad's streets, market-places and railway stations;

— tall buildings in the city of Togliatti on the Volga were painted with "Down with the dictatorship!" and other slogans;

On August 4, the slogans of "Down with the party bourgeoisie!" "The Soviet Communist Party' is the people's enemy!" and "The Soviet Union — a people's prison" appeared on Leningrad's biggest street, Neva Boulevard, and on the walls of the Tavrisheski Palace. A one-metre high and 40-metre long slogan, "You are smothering freedom but people's souls know no chains," was painted on the Fortress of Peter and Paul in the city.

On October 5, an 84-year-old man who had been a party member for 58 years announced his withdrawal from the Soviet revisionist party. In an open letter to Brezhnev, he denounced the present Soviet regime for autocratic rule and militarism at home. He pointed out that the Soviet leadership made up a "privileged caste" and were "wallowing in wealth, isolated from the people, riding roughshod over them."

Political prisoners in the concentration camps often wage all kinds of struggles, including refusal to work, hunger strike and insurrection, and expose and denounce the fascist crimes of the Soviet revisionist authorities through many channels to the Soviet people and the people of the world. All this constitutes a constant source of distress and anxiety to the Brezhnev clique. Hunger strikes occurred in concentration camps in Mordovo and Perm in December 1973, and from April to August in 1974. An Armenian engineer, thrown into the Perm concentration camp in 1973 for opposing the Russian chauvinism practised by the Soviet authorities, said: "We

know what is in store for us. But there cannot be freedom without sacrifice. We can be annihilated, but we will never submit. We will fight until final victory. That is our oath." A prisoner in Ryazan Region said: "Communism is the future of mankind. This is the only idea guiding all my activities. I will do my utmost to bring that day closer." One Communist, who had been put into a concentration camp for opposing the dark rule of the Soviet revisionists, fearlessly declared in court: "I was, am and will be a Communist. . . . My ardent love for socialism has made me the defendant. But even if I am put on trial ten times I will safeguard my communist ideal as long as I have the strength to do so." Underground revolutionary organizations have distributed leaflets calling on the Soviet working class and other labouring people to rise and overthrow the reactionary rule of the Soviet revisionist renegade clique and rebuild the dictatorship of the proletariat.

THE BANKRUPT NINTH FIVE-YEAR PLAN

Since the Soviet revisionists have restored capitalism in the U.S.S.R. and turned a socialist state into a social-imperialist one, a fundamental change has taken place in the nature of economic planning. Socialist planned economy no longer exists in the country. Economic planning is now the means whereby a few bureaucrat-monopoly capitalists extend their control over the nation's economy and step up their exploitation of the labouring people. The days when Soviet workers fought for the fulfilment of five-year plans with vigour and aspiration are gone. Time and again, the growth rates listed in the revisionists' five-year plans have had to be lowered in every sector of the economy. Nevertheless, many essential targets remain unfulfilled.

The communique issued early in 1976 by the Soviet Central Statistical Board on the implementation of the 1975 national economic plan indicated that the Soviet Union's ninth five-year plan (1971-75) had also ended in failure and that the country was in a worsening economic plight.

On the eve of the 25th Party Congress, Brezhnev declared that the ninth five-year plan carried out since the 24th Party Congress was one of the more successful five-year plans in history and that the Soviet people were enjoying an improved standard of living. But the cold facts have given the lie to his claims.

Was this one of the more successful five-year plans in history? Let's take a closer look.

The basic targets of the national economy all came a cropper. National income merely attained the target set in the five-year plan for 1974; that is, it took five years to accomplish the tasks set for four years. Growth of national income during the ninth five-year plan period was the lowest in the 20-year period of four five-year plans since the revisionist group usurped power; it came to only 72.5 per cent of the planned target, and half of the actual growth rate during the sixth five-year plan period (1956-60).

In industrial production, the average annual growth rate decreased by 40 per cent between 1956, the year of the 20th Party Congress, and 1964, when Khrushchov fell, as compared with the 1950-53 period. In the 11 years following Brezhnev's assumption of office, there was a further drop of 23 per cent as compared with the days under Khrushchov. In terms of gross output value, the growth rate during the period of the ninth five-year plan represented only 91 per cent of the projected figure and registered a 33 per cent decrease as compared with the sixth five-year plan period (1956-60).

A contrast between the results of the implementation of the 1975 plan as published by the Soviet Central Statistical Board and the previously published plan shows that over 90 per cent of the items of major industrial products fell short of the targets. Even more target failures were recorded than in the eighth five-year plan period. N. K. Baibakov, Chairman of the State Planning Committee of the U.S.S.R., admitted at a session of the Supreme Soviet in December 1975 that industrial production "is facing difficulties and problems," and that "the

production task of a series of the most important products badly needed by the national economy has not been fulfilled," N. I. Maslennikov, Chairman of the Planning-Budgetary Commission of the Soviet of Nationalities of the Supreme Soviet, admitted at the same session that in the Soviet Union, "there are quite a number of enterprises which have failed to fulfil the planned targets." He added, "there are many backward enterprises under the Ministry of the Coal Industry, the Ministry of Engineering for the Light and Food Industries and Household Appliances, and the Ministry of Fisheries." He noted that enterprises under the Ministries of Ferrous Metallurgy and of the Chemical Industry "have supplied to the national economy much less than the planned quantities of finished rolled materials, steel tubes, sulphuric acid, caustic soda and other products."

The picture in agriculture is even gloomier. The five-year average output value fell far behind the set target. Grain production dipped in four out of the five years, with the average annual output reaching only about 90 per cent of the target. Grain imports during the ninth five-year plan period rose sharply over the previous plan period.

Debts have piled high. Incomplete statistics show that since Brezhnev came to power in 1964, the Soviet Union has borrowed more than 20 billion U.S. dollars from the Western countries, more than 80 per cent of it secured in the ninth five-year plan period. The internal debts are in excess of 34.4 billion rubles or close to 50 billion U.S. dollars, which cannot be cleared until 1990.

Have the Soviet people really been enjoying a higher standard of living?

People have not forgotten the ceremonial unveiling of the ninth five-year plan in the midst of the vociferous claims that the "main task" of the plan was to bring about a "substantial rise of the standard of living" of the Soviet people, that "raising the standard of living is the supreme aim of the Party's economic policy," and that the plan was a "magnificent programme" directed towards that end. The revisionists proclaimed that the national economy would undergo a "momentous structural change" to ensure a higher growth rate in the consumer goods industries than in the capital goods industries, and promised to "supply the market with abundant consumer goods," as if they were really planning to reorient the Soviet economy from militarization to "a significant advance in the welfare of the people"!

What was the result? The industrial output value was only 91 per cent of the projected value, with consumer goods only reaching 76 per cent of the target. The growth rate in the consumer goods sector not only failed to surpass that in the means of production, but lagged far behind the latter, dropping to a lower level than in the three previous five-year plan periods and accounting for only 25 per cent of that in the sixth five-year plan period. The planned targets for cotton piece goods, woollen and silk fabrics, linen, ready-made clothing, leather shoes and granulated sugar were not fulfilled in any of the five years from 1971 to 1975. The actual growth rate of cotton cloth was only 44 per cent of the planned target, that of linen, 39 per cent, and that of leather shoes, 14 per cent. A. A. Smirnov, Chairman of the Consumer Goods Commission of the Soviet of Nationalities of the Supreme Soviet, disclosed in an article in the December 31, 1975 issue of *Izvestia* that the Ministry of the Light Industry

"failed to fulfil production and supply plans for some textiles, foot-wear and knitted goods, and did not do sufficient work in increasing the variety and raising the quality of products," and that the ministry "failed to meet the demand for many necessities." In fact, the consumer goods are inadequate in quantity and poor in quality. In the food industry, "Grade A" products accounted only for about 1.5 per cent of the total in the five years covered by the plan. Underproduction of consumer goods and bad harvests work in tandem to give rise to empty shelves in Soviet stores, high prices and a drop in the people's standard of living. The Soviet revisionist press revealed that at present the standard of living of one fourth of the population falls below the officially "guaranteed minimum subsistence level."

Facts clearly show that during the last five-year plan period, no structural change took place in the Soviet national economy, let alone a "momentous" change. The policy of "guns instead of butter" is still in force. If the Soviet people are not even assured of adequate supplies of food and clothing, how can they expect to see the realization of a "magnificent" programme for raising their standard of living? Brezhnev and his gang have offered the people nothing but empty words. All they can do, as the Chinese saying goes, is "draw a cake to satisfy their hunger."

Even if the plan of increasing consumer goods production had been fulfilled, the labouring people could not receive much in the present-day Soviet Union with its serious class differentiation. A handful of bureaucrat-monopoly capitalists are riding roughshod over the people. Whenever new housing is built, they have first pick. Apart from this they have their villas, and can buy im-

ported luxury goods at reduced prices. If there is any increase in the national payroll, they would acquire much of the money in the names of bonuses and subsidies. In a word, the "welfare programme" is intended for a small bunch of new bourgeois elements and not for the masses of the labouring people.

It should be pointed out, nevertheless, that there are certain sectors which have indeed advanced at "high speed" in the Soviet Union. These are the armaments industry and the related heavy industries, which have grown to hypertrophic proportions. The revisionists are furiously stepping up their arms expansion and war preparations in order to satisfy their needs in foreign aggression and aggrandizement and win world-wide hegemony. They have accelerated the militarization of the national economy and turned it into a lopsided war economy, characterized by a huge industry versus a fragile agricultural basis, an enormously inflated heavy industry, machine-building in particular, versus a low-productive light industry, rapid technological advances in the munitions industry versus backwardness in the civilian industries, huge stockpiles of nuclear weapons versus a low standard of living among the masses; ever rising investments in capital construction, which is centred on expanding military might, versus their diminishing returns. It is estimated that in the Soviet Union today, about 60 per cent of the industrial enterprises are directly or indirectly involved in arms production. During the ninth five-year plan period, the output of the machine-building industry, of automatic meters and instruments and of computers — all linked with arms production — grew by 70, 90 and 330 per cent respectively. Soviet expenditure on military research has been greater than that in the United States.

The rapid build-up of the armaments industry has made possible an intensification of Soviet military preparations. The strength of the armed forces has jumped from over 3 million to more than 4.2 million men. The dozens of Soviet divisions stationed in Eastern Europe have been re-equipped with the latest weapons in the past few years. The Soviet Union is increasing its nuclear armament in its struggle with the United States for nuclear supremacy and, according to news reports, it had 32 times as many ICBMs in 1975 as in 1962, and eight times as many SLBMs in 1975 as in 1963. The tonnage of the Soviet navy has doubled in the last ten years. No efforts have been spared in the development of conventional weapons, and there has been an extraordinary increase in the production of tanks, heavy artillery and other military hardware.

The continuous militarization of the Soviet national economy reflects the decadent, parasitical nature of the social-imperialist system, and has led to an even greater imbalance in the economic development. With a seriously impaired civilian industry and a backward agriculture, Soviet economy has become bogged down in insoluble contradictions, bringing deep suffering to the people.

In short, the five years after the Soviet revisionists' 24th Party Congress in 1971 were marked by the failure of the ninth five-year plan, the bankruptcy of the "welfare" slogan, intensified militarization and deepening economic difficulties.

The "Basic Orientations of Economic Development of the U.S.S.R. for 1976-1980" put forward by the Brezhnev clique in 1976 envisage an accelerated militarization of the Soviet national economy to direct it further along the course of war preparations. A few years back Brezhnev

and his cronies had proclaimed that the "main task" of the ninth five-year plan was to bring about a "substantial rise of the standard of living." What they have been emphasizing for the current five-year period, however, is the "paramount importance" of heavy industry which is closely related to munitions production and which constitutes the "basis for upgrading national defence capabilities and equipping the army and the navy with the best and latest weaponry." The current tenth five-year plan says nothing about the consumer goods industry achieving a faster growth rate than the capital goods industry. Instead, it states explicitly that capital goods will grow 25 per cent faster than consumer goods. Thus the gap between the two departments is further widened. The 1976 plan provided for an 80 per cent difference in growth rate between them, the biggest since the Khrushchov-Brezhnev clique came to power. For a time, the revisionist leaders talked sanctimoniously about paring down the defence expenditure; now they no longer even bother to go through the motions. The 1976 budget ruled out any reduction in military expenditure, and the 1975 figure was actually greater than that of Hitler's Germany before the Second World War and the current outlay of the United States, amounting to 20 per cent of the national income and 35 per cent of the total budgetary expenditure. This means that military expenditure in the Soviet Union has grown to a monstrous size. Commenting on the Soviet tenth five-year plan, London's *Daily Telegraph* pointed out: "It is a guns-before-butter economic plan." It added, "Despite a substantial reduction in Soviet economic growth rates, there is no indication of any curtailment of the Russian military programme." The tenth five-year plan will further sharpen the con-

tradictions between classes and nationalities in the U.S.S.R. and land Soviet social-imperialism in worse political and economic crises from which it can find no escape.

THE DECLINE OF AGRICULTURE

"GRANARY OF EUROPE" EXHAUSTED

Chaos in Soviet agriculture was one of the reasons Brezhnev used to oust Khrushchov in 1964. Right after he took office, Brezhnev pledged to exert every effort to achieve "steady advances" in agriculture. This, he said, was one of the important matters he was going to take personal charge of. Yet agriculture has continued to decline so much that Brezhnev is now reeling under the impact of the blow.

Official Soviet statistics reveal that since Brezhnev assumed power in 1964, grain production has dropped sharply seven times. During the ninth five-year plan period (1971-75) it showed a substantial decrease in four of the five years, and 1975 saw the poorest harvest in ten years and the biggest slump in twenty years. According to an article in *Pravda* on February 1, 1976, only 140 million tons of grain were produced in 1975, 75.7 million tons short of the year's planned output and only a little more than 64 per cent of the target. This was a 28.5 per cent drop from the previous year's figure. People still remember 1963, the year before the fall of Khrushchov, which witnessed a record fall of 22 per cent from the previous year's output. For political reasons, Brezhnev boasted about the bumper grain harvest in 1976. Yet analyses revealed that the figure was not even

up to the level of 1973 in the ninth five-year plan period. Because of the poor harvests and the needs in arms expansion and war preparations and foreign aggression, the Soviet revisionists have been rushing for grain on the international market on a scale unprecedented in the history of grain trade. Russia was historically known as the "granary of Europe." During the socialist period, the Soviet Union not only had sufficient grain for home consumption and a large reserve build-up, but was also one of the world's important grain exporters. It was only after the restoration of capitalism in the country that agricultural production started on its downward trend. In the eleven years when Khrushchov was in power, Soviet farming was already in a mess. Since Brezhnev took over, it has worsened. In the period 1965-76, the Soviet Union imported more than 100 million tons of grain, and was unable to make up for the heavy imbalance by its grain export. From 1971 to 1975, it imported about 70 million tons of grain, but exported only 30 million tons. Even in 1976, a "bumper harvest year" claimed by Brezhnev, the heavy imports continued. Apart from the previously ordered volumes, seven million tons were bought from the United States in the second half of the year, and shipment began on October 1.

Animal husbandry is in no better state. When Khrushchov began to publicize his phoney, "goulash" communism, he peddled all sorts of means to promote animal husbandry, such as breeders' contests, higher government purchasing prices, quick methods of fattening animals, etc. But the supply of animal products remained inadequate. Since Brezhnev seized power, there has been no pickup. In the ninth five-year plan, increasing the production of animal products was listed as an item of

"special importance." The upshot was a "special" one, too. None of the animal products such as meat, milk and wool were up to the planned targets, and meat is extremely scarce on the market. In its issue of March 27, 1976, *Pravda* revealed that the fall in grain production in 1975 had resulted in a very harsh winter for livestock. The paper admitted that a decrease in animal products was a common occurrence in many parts of the Soviet Union, and that many state and collective farms had greatly reduced their sales of meat and poultry products. Likewise, sales of dairy products dropped in many areas, while the calf population declined rapidly on many dairy farms in various regions. This grim picture was carried into the following year, according to Soviet press reports. *Pravda* admitted on August 17, 1976 the decline of the livestock population and the interruptions in fodder supply in many areas. Figures released by the Soviet Central Statistical Board indicated that the country's meat products in the first nine months of 1976 were down by 21 per cent as compared with the same period in the previous year.

While buying large quantities of grain abroad, the Brezhnev clique has tried to procure more and more meat, vegetable, fruit, eggs, sugar and dairy products almost everywhere in recent years. On March 20, 1976, the *Nihon Keizai Shimbun* published an article which quoted Japanese trade circles as saying that in the previous week the Soviet Union had purchased through barter from New Zealand 40,000 tons of mutton worth some 33 million U.S. dollars. The Soviet Union also rushed to buy beef from Australia, and as a result prices on the meat export markets in both countries were sent soaring. In its issue No. 18, 1977, the Soviet paper *Economic*

Gazette reported in a signed article that in 1976, the Soviet Union had imported 359,000 tons of meats and meat products.

The plight of Soviet agriculture has caused widespread discontent. Brezhnev and Co. looked everywhere for a scapegoat and a pretext to clear themselves of the responsibility. They blamed the weather and, at the 25th Party Congress, dismissed the Minister of Agriculture, D. S. Polyansky, who had earlier been kicked out of the Political Bureau and deposed as First Vice-Chairman of the Council of Ministers. The standard practice of the Khrushchov-Brezhnev clique is to start looking for scapegoats whenever there are crop failures. Since 1954, they have had, much to the astonishment of every other country, eight ministers of agriculture, each one lasting, on average, just under three years. They also blamed the Soviet farmers for their "lack of necessary love for the soil," but were unable to explain why. All their excuses have turned out to be mere humbug.

THE DEGENERATION OF SOVIET STATE AND COLLECTIVE FARMS

The decline of Soviet agriculture is the inevitable result of the Soviet revisionists' restoration of capitalism.

After Khrushchov and his cronies usurped power, the original Soviet collective and state farms degenerated. Once again, agricultural workers were oppressed and exploited as farmhands. Since Brezhnev replaced Khrushchov in 1964, he has gone still farther than his predecessor in pushing the revisionist policies in agriculture. The Brezhnev clique formulated the Principles of Land

Legislation and publicly abrogated the Model Regulations of an Agricultural Artel adopted in the 1930's, thus confirming in law the capitalist relations of production that had already been restored in agriculture. Today the Soviet collective and state farms no longer represent a socialist collective or state economy but rather embody a capitalist economy, and the leadership there has been seized by a handful of new bourgeois elements and new kulaks. The Soviet revisionists dismissed many of the original cadres on the farms on the excuse that these people of a worker or peasant origin had a "low educational level." Then they seized leadership on the farms by appointing their faithful agents.

A series of "regulations" and "resolutions" give the collective and state farm leaders the executive power and the economic means to penalize the peasants and farm workers. It was disclosed in the Soviet press that in one year the director of the "Victor" state farm in the Kemerovo Region issued 223 orders of penalty, punished 125 persons and made 350 persons pay for "material losses." In one year, 250 of the 652 workers of the farm were forced to go elsewhere. The Soviet press also acknowledged that many collective farm chairmen dictate everything and act like petty tyrants. The chairmen of the collectives and their inferiors, the agronomists and so on, form the "whip" to urge the reluctant workers on. In one year, the chairman of the "Road to Communism" collective farm issued more than 100 orders of penalty, or an average of one for every four workers.

The revisionist line and policies have led to profits and material incentives becoming the prime motive of the collective and state farms. Material incentives are the principal means of achieving success in the pursuit of

money — the final end of all activities. In this, Brezhnev has followed in the footsteps of Khrushchov. At a plenary session of the central committee of the Soviet revisionist party held in March 1965, which has been lauded as a gathering that had laid the foundation of the principles of current Soviet agricultural policy, Brezhnev declared that "the degree of profitability should really be taken as the basis for an objective analysis of the economic activity of collective and state farms"; he proposed to "make wide use" of economic stimuli "on all sectors of production" on the farms, and stressed that the "measures of economic stimulation" will serve as "a most important instrument" for "raising labour productivity and overcoming, within the next few years, the lag in this leading branch of farm production [grain production]."

Today, the collectives and state farms arrange their production according to the amount of profit expected from each kind of produce, and production is governed by the capitalist law of value. In an attempt to reap super-profits and win awards, the collective and state farm leaders are now developing production of high-income goods and eliminating those with small profits. These new bourgeois elements consider the workers on the state and collective farms nothing more than farmhands and exact surplus value from their labour. Now that the capitalist system of exploitation has been restored, the agricultural labourer is forced to work intensively at the hardest jobs, his hours are the longest, his pay the lowest. On the basis of official statistics, it is estimated that nearly 30 million people, accounting for almost 30 per cent of the rural population, are earning from their work on the farms and from their own

side-occupations less than enough for maintaining the subsistence level prescribed by the Soviet revisionists. At the same time, however, the incomes of the state farm directors and chairmen of the collectives are several or even scores of times higher than those of the masses. So the collective farm members and state farm workers have lost all enthusiasm for working for their revisionist leaders, and resort to slowdowns, absenteeism and leaving the land. It has been reported that on many collective farms as much as 60 per cent of the work force abstains from collective labour. Many people, particularly young people and machine operators, are leaving the countryside, and this mass exodus has taken two million workers from the rural areas in each of the recent years. The countryside is suffering from an acute shortage of manpower. It is reported that in the Georgia Republic, a collective farm had only 142 workers left out of an original work force of 1,160.

In the Soviet countryside today, the gap between rich and poor is growing. Speculation is rife, and groups of upstart profiteers and camouflaged farm owners and pasture land owners, with Brezhnev and his clique as their political representatives, are constantly being engendered.

The full-scale restoration of capitalist relations of production has inflicted serious damages on the productive forces in agriculture. And as the Soviet authorities have been using large amounts of manpower, material and money for arms production, investment in agriculture has often fallen short of the original target, and basic construction in the fields remains extremely backward. Military expenditure eats up 20 per cent of the national income and accounts for 35 per cent of the budgetary outlay. Farmland improvement has made little progress

for a number of years for lack of funds. From 1953 to 1975, the irrigated area in the country increased from 47 per cent of the cultivated land to only 5.7 per cent. Only 2 per cent of the grainfields are irrigated. Large stretches of land throughout the Soviet countryside are lying waste, the soil is becoming poorer, and the land is subject to serious damages. Thus, whenever there is some kind of natural disaster, production suffers drastic reductions. The basic reason why agriculture has long remained backward under the Soviet revisionists lies in their complete restoration of capitalism and their policy of arms expansion and war preparations which puts guns before butter.

THE REAL NATURE OF STATE-OWNED ENTERPRISES

Although it is claimed that the state-run enterprises in the Soviet Union are still under the "socialist ownership by the whole people," they have in fact slipped into the hands of the bureaucrat-monopoly bourgeoisie. This can be readily seen from the ownership of the means of production in these enterprises, relations between men in the process of production and the system of distribution.

N.B. After the death of the great Marxist Stalin in 1953, Khrushchov, Brezhnev and company, representatives of the new and old bourgeoisie, staged a counter-revolutionary coup, usurped party and state leadership by underhand means and turned the dictatorship of the proletariat into one of the bourgeoisie. Just as the nature of the Soviet state has changed, so the nature of the system of ownership has been fundamentally altered. Khrushchov, Brezhnev and company never underestimated the importance of the leadership and, once in power, began to remove those cadres who upheld Marxism and were not associated with them, replacing them at all levels with their own agents. They were thus able to take the state apparatus into their hands, monopolize the nation's economic lifeline and put the entire social wealth under their control.

Flaunting the banner of the party of Lenin and using the signboard of socialist enterprises, the bureaucrat-

monopoly bourgeoisie represented by the Soviet revisionist renegade clique worked through the state machinery to adopt a whole series of resolutions and regulations to bring into effect their revisionist line and policies on the principles of economic management, on the relations between men and on the system of distribution. Capitalist relations of production were restored in every respect, and the socialist ownership by the whole people was thoroughly abolished.

Soon after assuming office, Khrushchov introduced "economic reforms" in the industrial departments with the essential aim of abolishing principles of management characteristic of socialist ownership by the whole people and replacing them with principles of capitalist management, under which profit-seeking becomes both the guide and the ultimate aim of all economic operations and production. In 1955 Khrushchov and his followers had resolutions adopted for increasing the functions and powers of enterprise managers and plant directors. At the 20th Party Congress in February 1956, Khrushchov proclaimed that "the principle of giving workers a personal material incentive" must be consistently carried out. In February 1961 the Programme of the C.P.S.U. and Khrushchov's report adopted at the 22nd Party Congress emphasized "the enhancement of the forms of material incentives" and "the ruble control of economic work," and advocated that an "increase in the profit rate" should be made "the law governing the operations of Soviet enterprises" which should be provided with "more opportunities to handle their profits." In September 1963, *Pravda* printed two articles by Yevsei Liberman, an economist in the pay of the Soviet revisionists, who proposed that profit be

taken as the final yardstick in judging the efficiency of an enterprise. Khrushchov personally endorsed and promoted this programme.

Brezhnev pursued a line essentially the same as Khrushchov's. A "new economic system" with profit at the core was introduced on his orders in 1965. A resolution "On the Improvement of Industrial Management, the Perfecting of Planning and the Strengthening of Economic Stimuli to Industrial Production" and the "Regulations for Socialist State-Owned Production Enterprises" were drawn up to put the "new economic system" into practice and establish in law the capitalist relations of production which had already been restored in industry. This "new system" ensured control over the enterprises by the bureaucrat-monopoly bourgeoisie through the state apparatus and gave extensive powers to the managers appointed by the revisionist authorities to run the firms along capitalist lines. Thus Soviet state-owned enterprises were placed under the exclusive ownership of the bureaucrat-monopoly bourgeoisie.

The Soviet revisionists have recently established combines on a large scale, calling this the second stage in the application of the "new economic system." The report on the draft tenth five-year plan delivered by Kosygin at the 25th Party Congress disclosed that "at the beginning of 1976, there were 2,300 production and production-scientific associations, accounting for 24 per cent of industrial output." These combines, however, are no novelty, but are copied, despite their "Soviet" tag, from the blueprints of capitalist-imperialist monopoly organizations like trusts, *konzern's*, syndicates and so on. By establishing these combines, the Soviet bureau-

crat-monopoly bourgeoisie has furthered the centralization of capital and production and tightened their control of enterprises throughout the country. The number of Soviet industrial enterprises was reduced from over 200,000 in the 1950's to about 48,000 in 1974.

The nature of the Soviet bureaucrat-monopoly capitalist system of ownership determines that the relationship between the directors or managers and the workers is one between the oppressors and the oppressed, between employers and wage-slaves.

Under the "Regulations for the Management of Enterprises" the managers and directors, provided they guarantee control of the enterprises by the state of the bureaucrat-monopoly bourgeoisie, are entitled to "take possession of, use and dispose of" the property of the enterprises, buy or sell the means of production, and fix plans for production and sales. They are free to produce goods that have wide profit-margins, and can recruit, dismiss or punish workers at will. The facts revealed by the Soviet press are enough to startle anyone. The manager of Moscow's No. 15 Truck Repair Works dismissed 10 per cent of the work force in order to increase profits.

The form of ownership of the means of production and people's positions and their interrelations in production determine the form of distribution of products. Karl Marx pointed out that "**the prevailing distribution of the means of consumption is only a consequence of the distribution of the conditions of production themselves.**"

Capitalist restoration in the Soviet Union has resulted in a handful of bureaucrat-monopoly capitalists exercising exclusive control over the distribution of con-

sumer goods and other products. Apart from the large amount of surplus value which they appropriate in the form of state profits, they also make every effort to increase unearned income for themselves and their agents in the name of distribution "to each according to his work." High salaries, large bonuses, extra pay for additional jobs and a whole variety of allowances enable them to arrogate to themselves the surplus value created by the workers. While paying lip service to the principle of "to each according to his work," Soviet revisionism is actually conducting capitalist exploitation.

"Material incentives," by which the bureaucrat-monopoly bourgeoisie induces the workers to produce still greater surplus value for it, are simply a new version of intensified capitalist exploitation of the workers. At the Aksaisk Plastics Plant, for instance, a worker must create a surplus value of 16 rubles and 60 kopecks for the bureaucrat-monopoly bourgeoisie to get a bonus of one ruble for himself. The surplus value created by the working class is first of all grabbed by the bureaucrat-monopoly bourgeoisie headed by Brezhnev in the form of taxation and state profit. According to the *Yearbook of the Soviet National Economic Statistics*, Soviet industrial profit is more than twice as much as the total wage bill. The rate of exploitation is thus more than 200 per cent, double the rate in tsarist Russian industry at the beginning of the 20th century. This surplus value is used to keep the fascist state machine running, to cover the military outlays for aggression and expansion, and to enable the new bourgeois, who enjoy political and economic privileges, to lead a life of extravagance. A portion of it is put aside for capital accumulation to increase the exploitation of the working

people at home. As to the profit left for the enterprises themselves, most of it goes to swell the purses of the new bourgeois as their unearned income, including high salaries and big bonuses.

Apart from their regular pay, some of the new bourgeois get allowances for academic qualifications, extra pay for concurrent posts and other special remuneration, which add up to several hundred or even a thousand rubles a month.

Bonuses in Soviet enterprises come under a host of names, and run to over a hundred different kinds in some firms. Since they are issued in direct proportion to position and salary, most of them merely serve to line the pockets of a few, already highly paid new bourgeois elements. A survey of 704 firms where the "new economic system" was first introduced shows that workers only got 18.1 per cent of the profit allocated for regular monetary awards, while the rest went to members of the management and the engineering staff. The director of the Ryazan Agricultural Machinery Plant received 1,557 rubles in bonuses in the first ten months after his appointment to the post, although he did not take part in any actual work. The manager of an industrial construction trust in Lipetsk received in one month seven bonuses totalling 1,400 rubles. In 1975, an article in the Soviet journal *Economic Problems* disclosed that by falsifying reports on completion of production targets and other chicanery, the managerial staff of 17 enterprises under a construction company in the Russian Federative Republic obtained an extra sum of 56,500 rubles in bonuses, of which the leaders' share was 15,300 rubles. These examples show clearly the insatiable greed of the new Soviet bourgeoisie.

The actual income which the new bourgeois in Soviet enterprises acquire by these means is scores of times the income of ordinary workers. Lenin pointed out at the Eighth Congress of the Russian Communist Party (B.) that the difference in wages between bourgeois experts and unskilled workers in tsarist Russia before World War I was 20 times. The income-differentials between the new bourgeois elements and the workers in the Soviet Union today are far greater.

The new Soviet bourgeois, furthermore, use all sorts of illicit means to swell their incomes. Embezzlement, graft, corruption, turning public property into private property and acceptance of bribes are some of the ways by which many of them have amassed considerable fortunes.

The new, privileged bourgeois elements have taken possession of large quantities of commodities and money by all these means and lead a sumptuous, parasitic life, while the working masses, with meagre incomes, are being impoverished daily, and a considerable number of them have no security, either in work or in subsistence.

Lenin said, "**And what are classes in general? Classes are what permits one section of society to appropriate the labour of the other section.**" In the Soviet Union today, the new bourgeois are appropriating the largest part of the fruits of the working masses' labour. The higher their position and the greater their power, the more surplus value they grab. How can this be regarded as an application of the principle of "to each according to his work"?

Under Soviet revisionist rule, the state-run enterprises, which are still claimed to be under the socialist ownership of the whole people, have in fact become firms

under bureaucrat-monopoly bourgeois ownership. However hard they might try, Brezhnev and company cannot disguise this fact.

MAKING PROFITS BY ANY MEANS

— An Analysis of Soviet State Commerce

PROFIT-SEEKING IS THE FOREMOST AIM

Analysing the characteristics of capitalism, Marx pointed out: **“Production of surplus-value is the absolute law of this mode of production.”** Capitalists run industries or commerce with the aim of making profits, and the same is true of Soviet commerce today. After coming to power, Khrushchov enthusiastically advocated “increasing the role of profits and the rate of profit-making.” He regarded the amount of profit accrued as the “major target” of the economic sectors and laid down for commercial departments the capitalist principle which sets profit as the objective. Since ousting Khrushchov in 1964, Brezhnev has pushed Khrushchov’s capitalist principle even further. Under the slogan “fighting for greater profits,” he has turned Soviet state commerce into a system of capitalist commerce which helps the bureaucrat-monopoly capitalist class to grab maximum profits.

Brezhnev and his followers devised a capitalist “new system” to facilitate their pursuit of such profits, and enforced it in commercial departments. In March 1965, the Soviet Council of Ministers passed a resolution on implementing the “new system” in two stages,

the first being the application of a “new system of planning,” under which the “volume of commodity circulation and profits” was made the “major targets” of all enterprises and “profit quotas” were used to measure the “results of economic activities by commercial enterprises and organs.” This system, already enforced in all Soviet commercial departments by early 1967, also delegated greater power to heads of commercial organs and enterprises in order to give the bourgeois elements there more scope to grab profits.

The second stage began with the introduction of “new methods of providing economic stimuli,” whose “characteristic” lies in that “profit and wage funds become a source of material incentive for the workers and staff.” Since the material incentive funds in commercial departments “depend directly” on the “amount of profits accrued,” commercial departments are driven to “actively explore the possibility of increasing profits” and to “tap all latent resources to boost the rate of profit-making.” In its second stage, therefore, the “new system” has “greatly increased the role of profits.”

In its chase after maximum profit, the Brezhnev gang has reaped soaring profits through commerce, and the new bourgeois elements in the enterprises have increased their gains enormously. The Soviet book *The Economic Method of Commercial Management* discloses that profit-margins have grown considerably faster than the volume of commodity circulation since the enforcement of the “new system.” Experiments in the “new system” in about 10,000 state-run commercial enterprises showed that goods turnover increased only 27.4 per cent between 1967 and 1970 whereas profits were up 57 per cent, and most of that had found its way

into the hands of the ruling clique. A considerable portion of the "incentive funds" set aside from the profits of the enterprises went into the pockets of the bourgeois elements there. The journal *Soviet Commerce*, No. 2, 1974, reported that the enterprises themselves determined the method of paying bonuses. The annual bonuses for the manager and deputy-manager of the No. 2 food store in the Tushinski District, Moscow, were equivalent to 37 per cent of their average wages. The Moscow Department Store's reward regulations stipulate that the leading personnel, engineers, technicians and experts are entitled to bonuses equivalent to 30 per cent of their wages if they fulfil both the commodity circulation plan and the profit plan, and to an additional bonus of 4 per cent if they overfulfil these plans by an extra 1 per cent. The higher one's position and wages, the greater the bonus.

Apart from boosting their income through bonuses and other "legitimate" means, some shop managers use their positions to make money by speculation, embezzlement and theft. The Soviet paper *Trud* reported in January 1975 that the manager of the Tajikistan Store in Moscow, by reselling silks at high prices and profiteering in foreign exchange and imported goods on the black market, pocketed two million rubles, 40 kilogrammes of gold and other valuables.

This policy has intensified the struggle between commerce and industry for the division of surplus value. Industrial enterprises often disregard orders from commercial departments, turning out low-profit products in small quantities or even suspending their production while concentrating on high-profit goods. On their part, commercial departments refuse to buy many industrial

products, complaining that they are outmoded, of poor quality and unsuited to market needs. At the 1972 wholesale trade fair the Soviet Minister of Trade revealed that commodities worth about 3,000 million rubles were rejected by commercial departments because of poor quality and high prices. Among them, light industrial products accounted for 2,300 million rubles and cultural supplies and household goods, 700 million rubles. The fight for the division of profits between wholesale and retail departments is also intensifying.

HARSHER EXPLOITATION OF WORKERS AND STAFF

State-operated commerce in the Soviet Union today, under socialist ownership in name only, is in reality under the ownership of the bureaucrat-monopoly capitalist class. The workers and staff in commercial enterprises are again reduced to the status of oppressed and exploited wage labourers.

K. M. Skovoroda, Member of the Collegium of the Soviet Ministry of Trade, acknowledged in an article that, according to stipulations made by the Soviet authorities, the leader of a commercial enterprise has the right to sell "surplus" or "idle" equipment and implements and other means of production and materials. He has the right to fix the targets for circulation expenses, the composition of goods turnover, commodity stockpiles and financial planning. He also has the right to fix the number of workers and staff members of various categories, recruit or fire them, "decide on the

adoption of any one of the existing wage systems," work out the methods of rewarding the workers and staff and the sum of bonuses to be paid, or indeed "withhold or reduce the bonuses." In other words, the power of management, the employment and dismissal of workers and the fixing of the wages, bonuses and working hours are all in the hands of the heads of commercial enterprises appointed by the revisionist authorities who represent the bureaucrat-monopoly capitalist class.

The Soviet revisionists claim that the "new system" will bring more bonuses to the commercial workers, but in fact it is nothing less than another means for the bureaucrat-monopoly capitalists to step up the exploitation of these workers. Using bonuses as bait, the Soviet revisionists force the commercial workers to fulfil plans for a fast circulation of goods which require more intensive work. They also cut down the total number of workers in commerce and make people do "concurrent jobs" in order to appropriate a bigger amount of surplus labour performed by the commercial workers in the course of the realization of surplus value. The Soviet *Literary Gazette* revealed that normally each cold drinks station should have four store-keepers, two on each shift. Except for the larger stations, however, nearly all the others had discharged the fourth store-keeper, and the other three had to work 12 hours a day without any days off. The bonuses granted to the workers and staff are far from sufficient to pay for the extra surplus labour put in by them. Referring to the exploitation of the commercial worker in capitalist society, Marx said: **"His wage, therefore, is not necessarily proportionate to the mass of profit which he helps the capitalist to realize. What he costs the**

capitalist and what he brings in for him, are two different things." Speaking of the "great value" of "material incentive," Brezhnev admitted inadvertently that the fund used as "material incentive . . . will be repaid one hundred times."

WIDESPREAD CAPITALIST BUSINESS PRACTICES

Marx pointed out that swindling is one of the characteristics of capitalist commerce. Apart from participating in the division of surplus value, commercial capitalists force up prices, cheat on the amount of goods delivered, pass off inferior goods as good ones and even resort to adulteration to further exploit the working people and reap super-profits. These same methods are also used in Soviet commerce today to "actively explore the possibility of increasing profits."

The Soviet press disclosed that not a few Soviet commercial enterprises "have artificially forced up the prices of goods" to obtain additional profits. By jacking up prices at will and by other means, 36 furniture enterprises under the Ministry of the Timber and Woodworking Industry gathered in "additional profits of about 5 million rubles" in one year. *Dawn of the East* reported that a shop in Gali raised the price of cotton cloth from 2 rubles 60 kopecks per metre to 3 rubles 20 kopecks. In some stores, no price-tags are put on commodities because they are considered an "obstacle" to forcing up prices as one pleases.

The people's needs are ignored in the search for higher profits. The Soviet revisionist press reported that the markets in some areas often do not have such

goods as salt, small cooking pots, matches, soap and kerosene which produce little profit. The less profitable small goods in stock are not even taken out of the storehouse because that would cost labour and would not bring in much money. *Pravda* admitted that it had "received quite a few letters complaining about the unavailability of utensils, knives and forks, towels, hardware and other goods in great demand."

The "commercial service stations"—the middlemen on the free market—exploit the peasants by buying cheap and selling dear. Articles in the Soviet press have acknowledged that the station personnel are free to "go by themselves to out-of-the-way collective farms to purchase surplus farm produce at, of course, considerably reduced prices. . . ." *Trud* disclosed that, in order to make more profit, Retail Store No. 56 at Leninabad consistently deducted a few grammes in sales of sweets and butter. Some stores cheated the customers by giving short measures, even in selling five grammes of goods. Commercial enterprises swindle customers into paying money in advance to ensure "the fulfilment of turnover targets" and to obtain more bonuses. *Trud* reported that the management of the Kostroma Department Store notified citizens who had ordered refrigerators to come for their ordered goods. The customers hurried to the store and paid 200 rubles for each refrigerator, but when they wanted to take the refrigerators back home, the shop-assistants said: "You have to wait, maybe a day or a week. Keep coming in and see for yourself." Advance payment is required mainly for the "fulfilment of the plan." The paper admitted that "the customers had been deceived. The purpose is to

obtain bonuses by pretending to have fulfilled the plan."

Such cases are common in Soviet commercial enterprises today. Even *Pravda* had to admit that in some areas it is not unusual to find that "the prices of goods are fixed too high, the customers are given less change than due them, the amount of goods delivered is illegally reduced and meals served are of poor quality."

MASTERS OF THE STATE YESTERDAY,
WAGE SLAVES TODAY

The Brezhnev revisionist clique uses the country's means of production and social products, which are in their hands, to oppress and exploit the Soviet workers and peasants. The working people, deprived of the means of production, have been reduced to the position of hired labourers who earn their living by selling their labour power.

The system of wage labour prevails throughout the Soviet Union today and has long since been legalized by the Soviet revisionists through a series of laws and regulations. In 1965, pushing their "new economic system" with the profit motive as the nub, Brezhnev and company issued the "Regulations for Socialist State-Owned Production Enterprises," which gave wide powers to enterprise directors, including the right to "recruit and dismiss personnel."

In 1970 the clique proclaimed the "Guiding Principles of Labour Laws of the U.S.S.R. and the Union Republics," which state that "workers and employees realize their right to work through the conclusion of labour contracts for jobs in enterprises, offices and organizations," and that "the labour contract is an agreement between the worker on the one hand and the enterprise, office or organization on the other." This type of "labour contract" is actually one concluded

between a buyer and a seller of labour power, and essentially the same as the labour-management contracts in Western capitalist countries.

The "Guiding Principles of Labour Laws" allegedly guarantee the workers the "freedom to work without exploitation." But no such freedom is enjoyed by the working people in the Soviet Union today. They are exploited and are often subjected to lay-offs. These same "Guiding Principles of Labour Laws" give management extensive powers to annul labour contracts and dismiss workers and employees "who display any incompatibility with the position they hold or the job they are doing because of inadequate qualifications or feeble health, an incompatibility which hinders them from carrying out a particular job," or "who fail to present themselves for work for more than four months in succession as a result of temporary disability." No consideration is given to objections by the workers or employees concerned.

It is common knowledge that the wage-labour system is based on two premises: 1. the separation of the worker from the means of production; 2. the "freedom" of the worker to offer his or her labour power for sale. The Soviet revisionist labour laws and regulations for enterprises are a recognition of these two premises. The principle prevailing here is the "free" and "equal" exchange of commodities. As Marx made clear, **"Freedom, because both buyer and seller of a commodity, say of labour power, are constrained only by their own free will. They contract as free agents, and the agreement they come to, is but the form in which they give legal expression to their common will. Equality, because each enters into relation with the other, as with a**

simple owner of commodities, and they exchange equivalent for equivalent." Such bourgeois "freedom" and "equality" are, of course, utterly hypocritical. In the Soviet Union today, the workers who have been deprived of the means of production and are forced to sell their labour power in order to live, can shift "freely" from one place of work to another, but they cannot free themselves from the exploitation by the bureaucrat-monopoly bourgeoisie as a whole.

The Soviet bureaucrat-monopoly capitalists, however, considered their laws and regulations insufficient, and so bolstered them with the so-called "Shchekino experience." This "experience" permits the managers to "lay off those found superfluous for the work" and to use the money thus left in the wage fund as they think fit. The managers often fatten their own pay packets by laying off large numbers of workers and employees on the pretext of removing those "found superfluous for the work" or "curtailing the size of the organization." In recent years, Soviet managers have cancelled work contracts and dismissed workers and employees more and more frequently in the name of applying the "Shchekino experience" and introducing a "scientific organization of labour." K. A. Novikov, Chairman of the State Committee for the Utilization of Labour Resources of the Council of Ministers of the Russian Soviet Federative Socialist Republic, admitted that by the end of June 1973, the 292 enterprises in the R.S.F.S.R. which applied the "Shchekino experience" had dismissed 70,000 workers and employees. The Soviet journal *Communist* (No. 4, 1975) revealed that "in recent years, according to incomplete statistics from certain industrial departments, about 400,000 employees have been dis-

missed each year" since the spread of the so-called advanced experience of "scientific organization of labour." A quarter of the industrial workers in the Armenian Soviet Socialist Republic were fired in 1974, and the proportion was 12.3 per cent for the first half of 1975.

In the Soviet Union today, the workers have no guarantee of employment and those in jobs are constantly under the threat of dismissal. When employed, they are oppressed politically, exploited economically and personally humiliated. The managers of enterprises, using the power in their hands, work out regulations and rules which fleece and persecute the workers. They often unscrupulously abuse, interrogate and detain workers. The Soviet revisionist authorities are known to have thrown workers who dared to resist into "labour camps" and committed some of them to "mental hospitals." They have even installed "floodlighting," "supervisory posts," "people's censors," "comrades' courts" and so on to spy on and persecute the workers.

The Soviet workers in the plight of hired slaves become "talking tools" from whom the bureaucrat-monopoly capitalists extract surplus value. On the basis of the figures given in the *Yearbook of the Soviet National Economic Statistics*, it is estimated that the exploitation rate in Soviet industrial departments in recent years has exceeded 200 per cent, or double that in tsarist Russian industrial departments at the beginning of the century. The workers in the lowest wage brackets who account for more than half of all workers, can seldom make ends meet, and their conditions are appalling. Even worse off are the 40 million retired employees and workers who must live on pensions. Many

who are already old and failing in health have to look for new jobs.

In order to extract maximum surplus value from the workers, the bureaucrat-monopoly capitalists force them to labour under harsh conditions without the least labour safety precautions. In a metallurgical and metal products factory, the noise from the machines in a nail workshop impaired the workers' hearing ability within two years and caused deafness in four or five years, while quite a few workers in the zinc-coating workshop have lost their teeth and contracted a serious lung disease. A third of the miners in a copper mine in the town of Degtyarsk shake with palsy between the ages of 30 and 40. The Soviet bureaucrat-monopoly capitalists, who concern themselves solely with methods of extracting maximum surplus value from the workers, show them the factory gate when they are disabled, ill, or otherwise lose their capacity to work.

The revival of the capitalist system of wage labour in the Soviet Union has led to the migration of large numbers of workers. Soviet newspapers and journals reveal that floating workers account for 20 per cent of all workers in industrial enterprises, and that since 1970 the number of industrial workers on the move has exceeded six million every year. An article in the Soviet journal *Ekonomika Stroitelstva (Building Trade Economy, No. 4, 1976)* concerning the migration of building workers stated that between 1968 and 1974, the annual figure of those leaving their jobs amounted to over 60 per cent or even 74.8 per cent of the total number of workers in the trade. It took at least one or two weeks for people to find new jobs, and sometimes months or

even years. During this period the workers were actually jobless.

According to *Sovietskaya Rossiya* and other Soviet journals, "employment bureaus for residents" have been set up throughout the U.S.S.R. since 1969. These bureaus have been established in 116 cities in the R.S.F.S.R., in all the capitals of the autonomous republics and in the capitals of territories and regions if they are cities with a population of 100,000 or more. The function of these bureaus is to find jobs for people not engaged in social production. The Soviet press reports that these organizations are very busy, and in some places people file into their halls in an endless stream to look for jobs. The workers are driven from pillar to post like slaves, subjected to the bitterness of unemployment.

Chairman Mao pointed out: "**The rise to power of revisionism means the rise to power of the bourgeoisie.**" The revival of the capitalist wage-labour system in the Soviet Union testifies to the all-round restoration of capitalism there. But the cruel oppression and exploitation by the Soviet revisionist rulers have aroused ever stronger resentment and resistance on the part of the Soviet workers, who struggle against them by slow-downs, absenteeism, strikes, protest meetings and demonstrations.

BOURGEOIS DICTATORSHIP, BOURGEOIS EDUCATION

Schools in the Soviet Union today have become instruments of the dictatorship of the bourgeoisie.

In a society which is still divided into classes, education as an important part of its superstructure inevitably serves the political line of a particular class, and is one of the tools of class dictatorship. Different classes within society, therefore, adopt different educational policies. After the October Revolution, Lenin formulated the guidelines for the revolution in education so as to consolidate the dictatorship of the proletariat and prevent the restoration of capitalism. He said that **"the schools must become an instrument of the dictatorship of the proletariat"** and that **"to complete the work that began with the October Revolution in 1917"** it was necessary to **"convert the school from an instrument of the class rule of the bourgeoisie into an instrument for the overthrow of that rule and for the complete abolition of the division of society into classes."**

Khrushchov, Brezhnev and their like restored the educational direction and system of the bourgeoisie to maintain their reactionary regime and suit the needs of the social-imperialist economic base and political system.

Education becomes an instrument of dictatorship by a particular class which holds the sway and carries out

its political line in that field. The Soviet leaders have been energetic in pushing their revisionist line in culture and education, relying on bourgeois experts in running the schools and appointing bourgeois scholar-tyrants and reactionary authorities, who call themselves "Communists," to the leading posts in the educational departments. Consequently, schools are now under the exclusive control of bourgeois intellectuals.

Time and again Lenin emphasized that schools should be able **"to train a generation that is fully capable of building communism,"** and that education as a whole **"should be imbued with the spirit of the class struggle being waged by the proletariat for the successful achievement of the aims of its dictatorship, i.e., the overthrow of the bourgeoisie, the abolition of classes, and the elimination of all forms of exploitation of man by man."** Although the Kremlin revisionists talk glibly about the need for the young people to study communism, they are actually indoctrinating them with capitalist ideas. They have distorted Lenin's teaching about studying communism and attacked his theory on the dictatorship of the proletariat. They disseminate the notion of "the dying out of class struggle" among young people in order to cover up the stark reality of the brutal class oppression and fascist dictatorship exercised by them over the masses of the Soviet people. With ulterior motives they twist the meaning of studying communism and make it primarily a matter of mastering science and knowledge, spreading the lie that technical expertise will bring the age of communism.

As part of the reactionary educational line, Soviet school authorities trumpet the theory of "genius." They talk about "extraordinary gift" and "innate quality."

Khrushchov proposed the establishment of special schools for "children of genius" and boarding schools in scenic spots for students with "special genius." Brezhnev himself joined the chorus, maintaining that "knowledge, the genius of men, is the most important source of progress and strength for every single nation in the present era."

It is particularly shocking that the revisionists and their agents in education should have adopted from German fascists the reactionary theory of "genius by inheritance." A correspondence academician of the Soviet Academy of Pedagogical Sciences has elaborately classified, in accordance with bourgeois classification of the human race, Soviet middle school students into six categories belonging to either one of two types. According to him, the children of the privileged fall into the categories of "theoreticians, social activists and organizers" because it is preordained that they are the persons with real talent; those from the countryside belong to the so-called category of "the indolent" and are at best useful labourers and "law-abiding" citizens. The Soviet revisionists regard the children of the labouring people as "mediocrities" who are destined to be slaves, while they consider the children of the new bourgeois as "geniuses" who are entitled to a good education and will be the undisputed rulers.

As in their words, so in their deeds. The Soviet authorities have set up special "schools for geniuses" so that the children of the new bourgeois can receive special "training" in such courses as military affairs, mathematics, physics, chemistry, foreign languages and the arts. Over 95 per cent of the "talented graduates" from these schools become post-graduate students and,

later, "experts." They are regarded as the elite among Soviet students and "the future leaders of the Soviet Union" and live like tsarist aristocrats.

It is quite clear that this "education for geniuses" is bourgeois through and through. This is one of the Soviet revisionists' methods of exercising a bourgeois dictatorship over workers, peasants and their children, and of training successors to the bureaucrat-monopoly bourgeoisie.

The question of which class education serves is determined in no small measure by the kind of students the schools accept. In the time of Lenin and Stalin, priority was given to the education of workers and peasants and their children, and favourable conditions were created for their enrolment. Lenin said that in granting the chance to study there should be **"no actual or legal privileges for the propertied classes"** and **"priority must certainly go to workers and poor peasants."** But since the Soviet revisionists came to power, they have acted contrary to Lenin's precepts, depriving the workers, peasants and their children of this priority. They claim that all Soviet citizens, regardless of their property and social status, enjoy "equality" in education. This is another lie. "Equality" in education and other spheres of social life is not possible in a society where the different classes enjoy a different political and economic status. In the Soviet Union today, capitalism has been restored, and the bureaucrat-monopoly bourgeoisie represented by the Soviet revisionist renegade clique controls the state apparatus and the social wealth, while the workers and peasants have again been reduced to being wage labourers, are deprived of their right to run state affairs, and are subjected to oppression and

exploitation. How can their children enjoy "equality" in education with the children of the privileged new bourgeois class? Soviet workers and peasants and their children are discriminated against in schools. Brezhnev himself has had to admit that 34 per cent of the workers have received only a primary school education at most. Life is so hard for many children of workers and peasants that they are forced to leave school before graduation, and many others are thrown out of school for being allegedly "backward in intelligence" and "low in the level of knowledge."

Naturally, since they cannot even complete their primary education, these workers' and peasants' children have no access to higher education. A Japanese journal noted, "Soviet college entrance examinations offer the objective right of 'equality in education' to children of all social strata" but, in fact, "practically all the children of the intellectuals pass the examinations while nearly all the peasants' children fail" because "family conditions have given rise to inequality among the Soviet youth before the entrance examinations." A survey conducted by the Soviet authorities in Novosibirsk acknowledges that the chances for young people of various social strata to further their studies are not equal. It discloses that of the children of collective farm members and state farm workers who have graduated from middle school, only 18 per cent go to college, while 82 per cent of the children of urban intellectuals (including those in authority) go on to further education. In addition, it is likely that those children of the labouring people who have managed to get to college will be "eliminated" on various pretexts. In the Ural region, the drop-out rate among workers' and peasants' children

is as high as 45.7 per cent. All this gives the lie to the so-called freedom and equality which Brezhnev and company brag about.

A handful of privileged bourgeois elements now monopolize education, and higher education in particular. Practically all the sons and daughters of the privileged class can enter college, if they so desire, on the strength of their parents' political position, power and money. They score good marks in entrance examinations because they can, first of all, afford to go to expensive "supplementary classes" and "preparatory classes" or receive private tuition. They can also enter college through illegitimate channels. In the entrance examinations of the Soviet institutions of higher learning, all the social abuses found in capitalist societies, such as relying on political clout, bribery and fraud, are widespread. It is now common practice for members of the privileged class to use their official power to get their children and relatives into colleges. A factory director in Tbilisi actually paid the Party committee secretary and professors of a medical college 13,000 rubles (or ten times the average worker's annual wages) to have his daughter admitted to that institution. Children of bureaucrats and other privileged people can go unpunished even when they have committed criminal offences and still worm their way into colleges. According to a report in *Komsomolskaya Pravda* (January 29, 1975), a member of the collegium and concurrently head of a department in the Ministry of Engineering not only obtained a pardon for his son who had been convicted for rape, but also found him a job, made him a member of the Communist Youth League and sent him to college. There are also "firms" where candidates

may hire people to sit examinations on their behalf, "factories" which fake diplomas and "business enterprises" which run phantom colleges, and all of these are at the service of the sons and daughters of rich families as long as they are ready to pay a handsome sum. An article in *Izvestia* reported that several men had set up a "diploma factory" issuing "diplomas" from the various institutes of higher learning, such as the Trade Institute of the Soviet Union, the Business Administration Institute, the Shipbuilding Institute, the Northwest Engineering Institute, etc.; each diploma cost more than 1,000 rubles, and within two years the "factory" had sold several hundred of these "diplomas."

The Soviet education system rests on a strict division into ranks, with the schools and the types of education falling into one rank or another, and this rigid stratification continues when graduating students are assigned to their posts. It is very difficult for sons and daughters of workers and peasants to enter universities as "menial" labour awaits them when they finish primary school, middle school or vocational school. As for the sons and daughters of the privileged class, they become "experts" or "scholars" appointed to leading posts after graduating from institutes of higher learning, and so inherit the privileged position of their parents. All this clearly reflects the class nature of Soviet education, where the system of ranks is determined by the antagonism between the classes in Soviet society and serves to consolidate the ruling position of the bureaucrat-monopoly capitalist class. Soviet institutions of higher learning have become a ladder for children of the new bourgeoisie to attain wealth and position. Schools are used by the Soviet revisionist renegade clique to foster

the reactionary idea that "those who work with their minds govern, those who work with their hands are governed" so as to fortify the cultural autocracy of a handful of bureaucrat-monopoly capitalists over the working people.

The Soviet revisionists have introduced the principle of commodity exchange into the field of education and are peddling the bourgeois notion that "knowledge is one's own capital." Scholars in the pay of the Soviet authorities even say that "the purpose of seeking knowledge is to make profit," and tell the younger generation to play the part of "a coffer capable of bringing in interest at a high rate." In the Soviet Union today, knowledge has become private property, and the accumulation of knowledge a means of accumulating capital and entering into the ranks of the bourgeoisie in order to enjoy their economic and political privileges. Speaking of "the best educated representatives of the old bourgeois culture," Lenin said that "these people regard learning as their monopoly and have turned it into an instrument of their rule over the so-called common people."

The Soviet revisionist renegade clique has extended the dictatorship of the bourgeoisie to the entire field of ideology. They have been eliminating the influence of proletarian ideology and culture fostered in the days of Lenin and Stalin and have allowed the decadent ideology and culture of the bourgeoisie to swamp the country. They spread the bourgeois way of life in schools and poison the minds of the young people by teaching them the bourgeois world outlook of "regarding knowledge as private property" and "pleasure-seeking before everything else."

The working people in the Soviet Union abhor the present state of affairs. Sooner or later, they will raise once again the banner of the October Revolution and overthrow the fascist rule of the revisionist renegade clique. Then they will smash the bourgeois educational system and win back their position as masters of culture.

SOVIET REVISIONIST LITERATURE AND ART SERVE THE POLITICAL LINE OF SOCIAL-IMPERIALISM

The Soviet revisionist renegade clique has restored capitalism not only in the economic base but also in the superstructure, including all spheres of culture. Thus it uses the power it has usurped to press literature and art into the service of its reactionary political line. Soviet literature and art today are an essential means for the revisionists to mould public opinion in the interest of restoring capitalism in an all-round way and exercising bourgeois dictatorship at home and carrying out expansion and aggression abroad.

IMAGES OF THE NEW BOURGEOIS

Brezhnev's coming to power marked the completion of the evolution from capitalist restoration to social-imperialism. The new-type bureaucrat-monopoly bourgeoisie with Brezhnev as its chief representative has intensified its exploitation and oppression of the masses and fortified its fascist dictatorship ever more openly, using counter-revolutionary violence to maintain its rule. Catering to Brezhnev's political needs, current Soviet literature lauds his deputies in the enterprises as "heroes

of our time," who are but the mirror-images of the present-day ruling class itself.

The novel *The Legend of Director Pronchatov* is praised by Soviet revisionist critics as one of the best literary productions. Its hero is a bourgeois upstart who, as director of the Tagar Timber Rafting Service, keeps up with the fashion in dress, reeks of expensive perfume, and flashes an engagement ring. He has an ostentatious villa with a cook and a chauffeur at his disposal, as well as a luxury motor-boat. He refers to the timber rafting service as "the land of Pronchatov," considers it his own private property, and wants everything there to "revolve around himself." This, then, is the kind of new bourgeois that is held up as "the true mainstay of history" and "the hero of our time in literature."

Staged in scores of theatres across the country since 1971, the play *The Man from Outside* presents its principal character, Engineer Cheshkov, as a "personage of vital significance" who has appeared in response to "the mandate of the times." What kind of "personage" is this? He is a rank bourgeois, a leech on the workers. Whenever he steps inside the factory gate, he shows the workers a "cold and hard" face. To tighten fascist discipline, he uses two weapons against the workers. One is strict supervision, i.e., ordering the chiefs and assistant chiefs of the workshops to "force obedience" and "keep a firm hold" on the workers. The other is to hit them in the pocket by "confiscating half the bonus" of recalcitrant ones or, in other words, to "use the ruble as a whip." He also dismisses old, weak workers and those he considers "unruly." This "man from outside" gives us an idea of the kind of undertakers the Soviet bureaucrat-monopoly bourgeoisie assigns to its enterprises.

At the 25th Party Congress Brezhnev singled out for praise the character Anna Georgievna, the woman factory manager in the play *Story of a Capable Woman*. A labour aristocrat, she is just another of the bosses trained by the Soviet revisionists and does whatever she pleases in a 140-year-old textile mill. If a workshop does not fulfil its quota, she orders the workers of various shops to complete it on their rest days. If the workers do not observe her rules, she gets tough, abuses them, and threatens them with dismissal or eviction from their living quarters. She considers herself a ruler high above the workers. When Mania and other veteran workers demand equality in housing allotments, this "capable woman" lectures her: "No, Mania, we are not all equal with one another. And don't be offended: you are not my equal. True, we used to be equal, but then . . . I went to a technical school for four years and after that I spent five and a half years in college, and this made us unequal. Isn't that right?" These words of Georgievna, the type of factory director favoured by Brezhnev, lay bare the class relations in Soviet society today and the nature of the prevailing educational system. Anna Georgievna was once "equal with the workers," but after receiving a higher education and becoming mill director, she became their exploiter and oppressor.

Another play, *The Lucky Bukin*, depicts a new bourgeois who runs a farm of 400 workers. The "hero" enforces a "new" method of management so that the work of the 400 is done by 23 at high intensity. This makes the other 377 workers redundant, and they are dismissed. Soviet literature thus reflects the Soviet revisionists' exploitation of the workers by applying the so-

called "Shchekino experience" mentioned earlier in this booklet.

It is clear that the "heroes of our time" whom the Brezhnev ruling bloc has repeatedly prodded Soviet writers and artists to depict in recent years are simply its own agents — capitalists who grow fat on the fruits of the workers' labour. Lenin pointed out that the new capitalists, "in many cases, exploited the workers more than the old landowners and capitalists did."

Blatant roles are created in literature and art to bolster the social-imperialist political line. Did not Brezhnev favour a two-pronged tactic to raise "labour efficiency," i.e., by handing out bonuses on the one hand and by "tightening up discipline" and "enforcing the laws" on the other? (See his speech at a Tashkent meeting to issue awards, *Pravda*, September 25, 1975.) The "hero" in *The Legend of Director Pronchatov*, applying Brezhnev's orders "creatively," advances the slogan that "kindness must be combined with the fist" to raise labour intensity to the "required" level. His "kindness" means bonuses or rubles; his "fist" refers to "discipline" and the "laws." The message of Pronchatov's slogan is this: serve the bureaucrat-monopoly bourgeoisie like a lamb and you'll get your pay; otherwise you'll get the boot. Victor Lagutin, the hero in the play *The Steel Founders*, drives a bulldozer and smashes to smithereens a beer stall at the gate of the steel works in response to the official frown on drinking. The "fist" — in this case the bulldozer — is the violent means to attack the workers who frequent the beer stall. Such "heroes of our time" as Lagutin open the eyes of the world's proletariat and revolutionary people to the fact of capitalist restoration

in the Soviet Union where the workers have again become an enslaved class.

SELF-CONFESSED HEGEMONISTS

Since 1968 the Brezhnev clique has been encouraging literary and art works of "military patriotism" and has called scores of national conferences for the creation of such works. The purpose is to push its policy of aggression and expansion in a bid for world hegemony. Soviet literature and art in recent years have exhibited certain features adapted to the needs of the new tsars for military expansion and world domination: a shift from playing up the brutality and horrors of war and its destruction of personal happiness to a fanatic praise of aggressive wars and the touting of militarism. Whole batches of novels, films, plays and paintings have appeared, serving the social-imperialist policy of war and aggression.

Pravda commends *The Shore*, a novel published in 1975, as "a work permeated with the spirit of the times," because it is a clear expression of the Kremlin's ambition for expansion into West Europe, of its emphasis on Europe as the main area of contention. A German woman character in the novel declares, "Let there be war again, let 'em shoot and fire again, use violence with me again, only if the Russian lieutenant comes back . . . comes back to Königedorf, to Hamburg with his big guns." Novels on a theme like this reflect the extension of the Soviet revisionist claws of aggression into various parts of the globe. The novelette *Secret Mission*, the scenarios *Chronicle of a Night* and *That Sweet Word Freedom*, the documentary film *The*

Flaming Continent, the play *Unfinished Dialogue* and the novel *Mama, Don't Worry*, among others, show the contention between the Soviet Union and the United States in the Middle East, Asia, Africa, Latin America and other areas. The long "science fiction" novel, *More Powerful than Time*, thoroughly reveals the Soviet revisionist ambition to dominate the world. It spells out the long-cherished dream of the social-imperialists that after some years the U.S.A., "the last bastion of capitalism," will be wiped from the face of the earth, while the Soviet Union will become the head of a "federated world." All global issues will then be referred to Moscow, which will even exercise jurisdiction over "sentient beings" on other planets.

Contention for sea power is an important strategy of Soviet social-imperialism in its bid for world hegemony. The novelette *The Nuclear Submarines Set Out at the Alarm*, classified as a "documentary," distorts history by alleging that many of the "global navigation routes" were "discovered" by the Russian navy and consequently many islands "bear Russian names." It asserts that "in all cases, sailing the seas at any latitude" is a "usual, routine practice" for the Soviet navy. The documentary film *Ocean* shows the Soviet navy chief directing the fleets in the Pacific and Atlantic oceans, in the Mediterranean and in the Arctic, Black and Baltic seas, and thus glorifies the Soviet revisionists' maritime expansion. Other works, such as *Choosing the Target*, *Taming the Fire* and *Wreath on the Wave*, serve as a means of brandishing nuclear missile weapons and drumming up support for the drive for nuclear superiority; they point up Soviet revisionism's contention with the United States for world hegemony from a "position of strength."

This kind of "military patriotism" constitutes the new tsars' voluntary admission of their aspiration to world supremacy. The main characteristic of the works in this category, however, lies in using the "patriotic" label of "defending the fatherland" to camouflage the hegemonic and fascist nature of Soviet social-imperialist aggression.

The film *Here the Dawns Are Quiet . . .*, which won first prize at the All-Union Film Festival, lauds its "patriotic hero" in these words: "Fedot Vaskov had been used to carrying out orders all his life. He had been a transmission pinion in an enormous, well-adjusted machine: he revolved and in turn revolved others, without sparing a thought as to the source of the movement, its direction, its outcome." *The Nuclear Submarines Set Out at the Alarm*, in diary form, avidly propagates the idea that "the fatherland is everything." Here the "fatherland" is none other than the Soviet Union under the rule of the bureaucrat-monopoly capitalist class.

This literature of "military patriotism" also takes "historical themes." *Gorchakov Free from Trial* erects a monument to Tsar Alexander II's chancellor, Prince A. M. Gorchakov. *The Breakthrough* extols A. A. Brusilov, the tsarist Russian commander-in-chief during World War I. *The First Discovery* and *Versts Along the Amur* glorify the old tsars' aggression against China. Under the slogan, "carry on the Russian tradition," these works spread the fallacy that "aggression is justified" and openly invoke the ghosts of the old tsars in order to revive their legacy.

These works show that "military patriotism" is synonymous with militarism. The Brezhnev turncoats shout "patriotism" and "heroism" in the abstract and laud fascism and tsarism to the skies for the very purpose

which Lenin once exposed: "glorifying the imperialist war, describing it as a war for 'defence of the fatherland.'" They are trying to camouflage their expansionist policy and instil Russian chauvinism into the minds of the young so as to induce them to obey their orders docilely and carry out at any cost the "mission" bestowed on soldiers by the "fatherland," that is, to offer themselves as sacrifices for Soviet revisionism's policy of aggression and war.

ARISTOCRATS WHO FLEECE THE PEOPLE

The poisonous weeds abounding in Soviet literature and art today are an inevitable result of the renegades' pursuance of a revisionist line and their restoration of capitalism. To tighten their control over literature and art, they have been wooing the writers and artists politically and buying them over economically, and have been bolstering up the restorationists, so much so that the old and new bourgeois have turned out in force to corrupt people and society with their decadent, reactionary stuff.

After taking power, Khrushchov revered the old and new bourgeois elements in the literary and art circles as great treasures and put them in charge of key organizations and journals. Some of them even became members of the C.P.S.U. Central Committee. At the Third All-Union Writers' Congress on May 22, 1959, Khrushchov asserted that the struggle against revisionism in literary and art circles "is over," and that "representatives of revisionist viewpoints and sentiments have completely failed ideologically." He claimed that it was necessary to "unite all forces" and that "more care must be given

to those who were unfortunately 'possessed by devils.'" The Soviet revisionists also reversed resolutions of the C.P.S.U. (B.) Central Committee by "rehabilitating" discredited reactionary writers who had been criticized and expelled from the Writers' Union in the 1920s and 1940s. They published these writers' works in great quantities and lavished praise on them. This not only legitimized revisionism in literature and art, but gave the green light to the old and new bourgeois to assail the dictatorship of the proletariat and launch vengeful counter-attacks on it. Aided and abetted by the authorities, every sort of monster and freak was allowed to dance with glee.

The ruling clique attracted and corrupted writers and artists with high salaries, royalties and awards and other privileges, nurturing intellectual snobs to consolidate their revisionist social base. A spate of prizes were offered under various names, with the appearance of more than a hundred regular prizes in art and literature alone, of which the Lenin Prize and the State Prize may run as high as 5,000 to 10,000 rubles each. These prizes go only to the most loyal hacks supported by the Soviet revisionist ruling class. Since the revisionists assumed power, therefore, these prizes have invariably been awarded to the art and literary "elite" including such people as M. A. Sholokhov, K. M. Simonov and S. V. Mikhalkov, who were allowed to appropriate the fruits of labour of the working people for the services they rendered to their masters by producing much revisionist stuff.

The Soviet revisionists have also handed out many "honourable" titles, such as "people's writer," "people's poet," "hero of socialist labour," "Soviet hero," etc. Winners of these titles and medals enjoy political and material privileges. According to Supreme Soviet

decrees, writers who have won these "honourable titles" receive first-class pensions and enjoy the best apartments at half the rent. Those who own their homes pay only half the house and land taxes. They go to sanatoriums or rest homes once every year free of charge.

The Brezhnev clique has approved many rules and regulations protecting and consolidating the private ownership of copyright. Just as in capitalist countries, a Soviet author's work is his private property, a form of capital that pays him interest, so that the elite receive royalties for new editions of their works in addition to their high salaries. G. M. Markov, First Secretary of the Union of Soviet Writers and Member of the C.P.S.U. Central Committee, received 192,000 rubles, the equivalent of almost 200 years' wages of an ordinary Soviet worker, for a five-volume collection of his works published in 1972. In the Soviet Union today writing is no longer done to serve the people, but has become a means by which writers rob the working people to enrich themselves.

Soviet literary and art circles are controlled by old and new bourgeois elements who first served Khrushchov and now serve Brezhnev. Shortly after Stalin's death, writers and artists were incited by the father of modern revisionist literature and art, Sholokhov, and by Simonov, Ehrenburg and their like, to expose the so-called "seamy side" of socialist society and negate proletarian dictatorship. After the 20th Party Congress there appeared, under the direct influence of Khrushchov, the novels *One Day in the Life of Ivan Denisovich* and *Cruelty*, and the long poems *Stalin's Heirs* and *Terkin in Another World*, all directed against the dictatorship of the proletariat. They described the socialist system as "an old

wall nobody wants any longer" and clamoured for its "demolition." At the end of 1956, Sholokhov came out with his novel *The Fate of a Man*, preaching bourgeois pacifism as against revolutionary war, and trying his utmost to create public opinion in support of the counter-revolutionary revisionist line of peaceful coexistence, peaceful competition and peaceful transition and of the state of the whole people and the party of the whole people.

Brezhnev is just another Khrushchov with some slight superficial differences due to the different historical circumstances. Soviet revisionism completed its degeneration into social-imperialism under Brezhnev. Khrushchov had to negate the country's revolutionary past if he was to consolidate his counter-revolutionary regime, while Brezhnev's chief task is to uphold the status quo. He wants people to acclaim the "new creations" which he himself has "added," not to negate them; he wants literature and art to affirm his political line and depict the "heroic images" representing his class. The handful of Soviet revisionist writers and artists are bourgeois hacks always ready to change their tune to please their new master. Making a quick switch from smearing the socialist system to "singing the merits" of social-imperialism, they are beating the drums for the restoration of capitalism in the Soviet Union and the new tsars' unscrupulous deeds.

THE DECADENCE OF SOVIET SOCIETY

In the Soviet Union today, moral decadence and corruption are to be seen everywhere. Vice inherent in capitalism is spreading like an epidemic.

EVERYTHING BECOMES A COMMODITY

With the total restoration of capitalism, Soviet society has changed into a commercialized one. Khrushchov advocated that "the principle of free trade of products should gradually be expanded to all economic departments." (Report of December 15, 1958 to the Plenary Session of the C.P.S.U. Central Committee.) After the Brezhnev clique started its "economic reforms," Soviet economists tried vigorously to prepare public opinion for the all-out development of the commodity-money relationship. The ruble, they declared, is the "locomotive," "the motive force of the development of society" and the "leverage" of the national economy.

The Soviet revisionist renegade clique has put all this into practice. Over the years it has adopted a series of resolutions and regulations to abolish restrictions on the circulation of commodities and to give unlimited scope to commodity exchange.

This found expression first of all in the free trade in the means of production. As early as 1955, the Supreme

Soviet decided to lift its 1951 ban on the sale and exchange of idle equipment and materials among enterprises. A system of direct transaction between producers and commercial units was introduced in 1957. In 1959 the Soviet government decided to permit the free marketing of such important means of production as trucks, tractors and electrical machinery, ending their unified distribution. The 1965 "Regulations for Socialist State-Owned Production Enterprises" further stated that enterprises are free to buy or sell "surplus" means of production and lease out buildings and equipment "not in current use." Free markets offering a wide range of producers' goods are now common in the Soviet Union. Machine tools, cranes, generators, petroleum, seamless tubes, meters and instruments and even railway engines can all be bought and sold freely. Private "side-occupations" are growing unchecked in the countryside, and so the urban and rural free markets are experiencing an unprecedented "boom."

Just as the means of production are treated as commodities, so are labour power and everything else. In the Soviet Union, putting official positions up for sale has become common practice. The plenary session of the party central committee of one of the union republics had to admit that "some tricksters, corrupt elements and racketeers have wormed their way into leading positions by illegal means." (*Dawn of the East*, February 28, 1973.) The paper revealed on May 15, 1975 that some "party, state and economic organs are filled with careerists and persons guilty of corruption and acceptance of bribes." Marriage for purely economic reasons and polygyny have come into vogue in many places throughout the country. Prostitution is becoming an ever more serious problem.

According to a Western news report, an official of the Soviet Ministry of Internal Affairs confirmed that the city of Leningrad has a prostitute population of 16,000. Divorce is becoming more and more common because of the instability of family relations. *Economic Problems* (No. 4, 1974) revealed that the marriage-divorce ratio for 1972 was 100 to 33.3, while in 1950 it was 100 to 3. In 1972, 60 per cent of the divorces came after less than 5 years of marriage, and 21 per cent after less than a year. Thus the divorce rate in the Soviet Union has become one of the highest in the world.

In the Soviet Union today money is all-powerful. Everything has been turned into a commodity. The new bourgeoisie in the country "has left remaining no other nexus between man and man than naked self-interest, than callous 'cash payment.'" (*Communist Manifesto*.)

GRAFT, THEFT AND EMBEZZLEMENT

The Soviet bourgeoisie is a class of insatiable exploiters who hold sway in the party and the state, own the means of production, and squeeze people dry for high profits. Members of this class enjoy high salaries, bonuses and royalties, with incomes tens, even hundreds of times that of the common workers and peasants. This has, however, by no means satisfied the appetite of these exploiters. Taking advantage of the power they have usurped, government officials themselves act like thieves and plunder the people without scruples. Revelations in the Soviet press show that many top officials and leaders of party organizations from the central committee down to the grassroots units, in cities and rural areas, and in

government organs and schools, have made easy money at the expense of the people. Some of them have even directed gangs specializing in graft and embezzlement and not a few have become millionaires in a short period. Here we cite a few of such instances which are by no means rare.

Embezzlement of public funds and stealing of public property:

(1) A member of the party central committee of a union republic managed to embezzle over half a million rubles, or 400 times the average yearly earnings of a worker, and built a magnificent house for herself. (2) The boss of a Tbilisi synthetic products factory pocketed over 1.1 million rubles at one stroke. (3) The ill-gotten wealth of the head of a Sukhumi tobacco company amounted to millions of rubles. (4) The head of the Intourist Agency in Leningrad banded up with "several good friends" and stole goods worth 60,000 rubles. Some of the stolen articles belonged to foreign tourists.

Underground manufacturing and black marketeering:

(1) A leader of the Tbilisi Synthetic Fibre Factory joined a trading gang and built an underground plant using the factory's equipment and materials. This plant produced an assortment of best-selling merchandise and in a short while made a profit of 1.7 million rubles, which was pocketed by the gang. (2) The chairman and vice-chairman of the executive committee of the Soviet of the South Ossetian Autonomous Region sold scarce building materials for a high profit or transferred them for personal use.

Fraud by false billing and reporting:

(1) The manager of the Geoktsai Fruit Juice Factory at Baku colluded with the chief accountant and director

of production, forged purchasing and transport bills, used cheap chemical substitutes for real fruit juice, and made close to one million rubles for themselves in less than three years. (2) The manager of a non-ferrous metal foundry and his chief accountant banded together to make false reports on the fulfilment of their planned targets and received a bonus of 18,200 rubles for just one season.

Quick profits through speculation:

(1) An administration chief under the Ministry of Social Maintenance in Azerbaijan, in league with some of the managerial staff of enterprises under his administration, was found to be profiting in a big way from the black market. He dealt in gold coins, jewellery and foreign currency, particularly U.S. dollars and British pounds, in Moscow, Tula, Lvov and other places. The gold and jewels found in his home weighed 32 kilogrammes. The speculative profit he amassed in a few years amounted to over 280,000 rubles. (2) The manager of the Tadzhikistan Store in downtown Moscow and some of his cronies embezzled 40 kilogrammes of gold and over two million rubles in cash and valuables, surreptitiously sold over 220,000 metres of silk at a high price and colluded with people who travelled abroad to bring in foreign goods to sell on the black market. (3) The lands, houses and villas and garden plots attached to the houses along the Black Sea have become objects of frenzied speculation. The people involved in this speculation include leaders of party organizations, Soviets, agricultural and executive branches of the government, and members of the municipal military committees, city police chiefs, district judges, chief civil engineers, chairmen of collective farms and heads of state farms, etc.

These illicit activities of the new Soviet bourgeoisie are being condoned and supported by officials in the judiciary organs who participate in dividing the spoils. For example, in the Georgia Republic, an ex-head of the inspection department of the Ministry of Local Industry and almost all of his subordinates were guilty of graft and taking bribes, and acted as informers for the speculators.

EXTRAVAGANT LIFE OF THE ARISTOCRACY

The Soviet bureaucrat-monopoly bourgeois lead a parasitic life of extravagance and dissipation. They have no scruples about squandering the fruits of labour of the Soviet people.

The Soviet chieftains own large villas extending over several acres, and hunt on grounds reserved exclusively for their use. Some of the villas are designed by French architects and furnished with imports from Finland. Other amenities in this villa community include swimming pools, tennis courts and other physical culture facilities, dining halls, cinemas, exclusive clubs and stores catering only to this class of people. In addition, imported de luxe limousines, monthly "Kremlin bonuses," and what not, are among the privileges enjoyed by these high lords whose life-style is as extravagant and decadent as any bourgeois noble ever had.

Next to them, the new bourgeois elements in the Soviet Union commonly own spacious residences and fine, comfortable villas too. These are either government assigned or built by the owners with materials supplied by the state. Such houses have mushroomed in recent years,

thanks to the bourgeois elements' heated "contest in the initiative for building the best house."

According to Western press reports, each of the top men in this stratum has an "unrestricted account" in the state bank for expenses on villas, limousines and so on. Special grocery and department stores provide them with traditional Russian delicacies and every description of goods available in the West. In their exclusive restaurants, they spend several hundred rubles just for one meal. A millionaire from Georgia is in the habit of giving banquets in such restaurants in Moscow, Kiev and Alma Ata costing several thousand rubles each time. The head of the Yakushevsky State Farm in Kaluga and his fellow embezzlers go in for regular feasts, and several sacks of empty bottles have to be cleared from their offices each week.

YOUTH AND CRIME

In the days of Lenin and Stalin, the young people of the Soviet Union were filled with revolutionary aspirations. Great numbers of heroic figures surged from among them and accounts of their deeds moved all hearts. But nowadays, under the corruptive and poisonous influence of the Soviet revisionist ruling clique, many have turned to the pursuit of fame and money and a luxurious way of living. The bourgeois life of the West is their envy, and dissipation or crime their end.

As has been admitted in the Soviet press, the dream of many a Soviet youth is money, a beautiful woman and a comfortable home. They loathe to think of the hardships of the bygone age, and have adopted the view that

the meaning of life is to seek self-interest. Many young people recoil from the idea of working in the countryside, for that would not lead to fame and a comfortable life. Meanwhile, for some, jazz and Western dances are popular "stimulants." The black market for grotesque Western fashions has grown; decadent films from the West attract large audiences.

Even the Soviet authorities admit that in recent years there have been numerous cases of juvenile delinquency; the rate of law-breaking among youth is very high, and 50 to 80 per cent of the crimes are committed by groups. College students are found in rackets speculating in foreign currencies, and their dormitories have become centres for selling foreign merchandise. A gang of youths in the Saratov region committed robbery, theft and murder over a long period, its members sealing their pledges in blood. A gang of the same nature is active in Kharkov, killing, looting stores, and breaking into houses at night.

Alcoholism and drug addiction among the young are on the rise in the Soviet Union. The first vice-chairman of the Council of Ministers of Georgia revealed that "narcotics addiction, among Soviet youth in particular, has given rise to grave worry among the public." But such crimes among the young are hardly more than side shows in Soviet society as a whole where these evils have long been grave, insoluble problems. It is reported that the rate of production of alcohol has been rising three times as quickly as the country's population growth. Per capita consumption of liquor in the Soviet Union is twice as much as in the United States. Six to seven million drunkards are sent to "rehabilitation centres" annually.

Under Soviet revisionist rule, workers take to drinking to dispel their frustration because they cannot give vent to the strong resentment they feel. In a Moscow factory, a surprise morning check-up showed that 280 of the factory's work force of 410 had hangovers and were unable to turn up for work.

REVIVAL OF RELIGION AND SUPERSTITION

The Soviet revisionist renegade clique has adopted a two-pronged policy to secure their reactionary rule: suppressing resistance by fascist violence, and making use of religion and superstition to numb the minds of the people. For a good many years now, the Soviet authorities have been condoning and giving assistance to religious and superstitious activities — publishing Bibles and prayer books, building churches, opening up theological schools, and even praising the church in books where religion is said to be “communism,” and the Orthodox Eastern Church “an instrument of transforming social relations,” whose doctrine is said to have developed into a “communist Christianity” endowed with socialist “functions.”

In the Soviet Union there are more than ten religions with more than 50 denominations and more than 20,000 religious organizations. The number of assorted devotees exceeds 50 million, over one-fifth of the population of the U.S.S.R. The scope of religious activities has been widened, and the number of churches is rising.

The rank of young worshippers has swollen conspicuously, and many workers are addicted to religion and superstition. One sample revealed that in a small city

factory, among a work force of 2,000 or so, more than 200 are church members.

In the Soviet Union today, even some members of the Communist Party and the Youth League are devoted Christians. *Pravda* admitted that in some regions, Communist Party members and Youth Leaguers are attending church services. A book on religion published in the Soviet Union in 1974 tells the story of a young engineer and long standing league member, Victor, who handed in a statement to his league organization saying that after a long and traumatic conflict, he had resolved to be a true Christian. Another party member, who had attended the Higher Party School, declared: “I am a member of the Communist Party, but I don't see any conflict between that and being a devoted Christian at the same time.” A. K. Tarasova, an actress of the Moscow Art Theatre and a party member of 19 years' standing, left a will requesting a religious burial.

The various church denominations are now competing with one another in their activities — preaching, recruiting members, publishing Bibles, hymn-books and ecclesiastical journals, and giving religious education. Baptism of babies is in vogue and, according to an official survey in Moscow, over 60 per cent of the babies there have received baptism. Church weddings are gaining in popularity, and there are increasing numbers of young workers and students who apply for admission into theological schools. Religious worship, praying for the dead and so on are being practised on an ever wider scale.

Lenin said: “Religion is one of the forms of spiritual oppression which everywhere weighs down heavily upon the masses of the people, over-burdened by their perpetual work for others, by want and isolation.” Today

the Soviet people are once again being hurled into the abyss of calamities under the rule of the new tsars. With troubled minds, they seek passively for some kind of spiritual anchor and comfort in church-going, and this constitutes the most profound social cause behind the revival of religion and superstition in the Soviet Union.

*

The festering of social ulcers in the Soviet Union is a necessary result of the betrayal of the cause of the October Revolution and the over-all restoration of capitalism by the Khrushchov-Brezhnev clique. It reveals the reactionary, parasitic and decadent nature of Soviet social-imperialism, which is rotting away and can do nothing about the further spread of the vices. The Soviet authorities are in deep trouble because of this. Brezhnev himself has had to admit the gravity of the various "social evils" in Soviet society, and has promised to "struggle against them." But this is only a thief crying "stop thief." As an old Chinese saying goes, he who steals a hook may come to the gallows; he who usurps the throne becomes the sovereign. The Soviet revisionist renegade clique is a bunch of arch-thieves who have stolen the state itself, and their gigantic bureaucratic machinery is the command headquarters for all criminals. They have ruined a fine socialist country. The chief culprit responsible for the growing seriousness of bourgeois decadence in Soviet society is the Brezhnev clique itself.

A PRISON OF PEOPLES

The fanatic advocacy of Russian chauvinism by the Soviet revisionist renegade clique serves a double purpose: oppression of the non-Russian peoples in the U.S.S.R. and the bid for world hegemony.

Khrushchov, Brezhnev and their followers took every opportunity to make reports or speeches advocating Russian chauvinism and pan-Slavism. Soviet works of literature and art and the Soviet press are also full of sickening propaganda along the same line.

Speaking on the national question, Lenin stressed: **"In any really serious and profound political issue sides are taken according to classes, not nations."** For counter-revolutionary purposes, the Soviet revisionists have been preaching a supra-class "Russian spirit" in complete betrayal of Lenin's teaching. At the 24th Congress of the Soviet revisionist party, Brezhnev claimed that the Russian nation has "quite legitimately won the sincere respect" of the other nations in the U.S.S.R. for its "revolutionary energy," "dedication," etc. The Soviet press asserted more openly that an "eternal, unchangeable Russian spirit" has existed since ancient times. The non-Russian nationalities, it is claimed, are "the loyal sons of the great Russia." Anyone who expresses disagreement or disgust at such nonsense is accused of "national arrogance" or "wanton haughtiness" by the new tsars.

Many of the leading cadres were dismissed in the

Union Republics of Ukraine, Georgia, Azerbaijan, Armenia, Tadzhikistan, Uzbek and Moldavia after Brezhnev came to power. Among the major "crimes" they had allegedly committed was their weak hand in suppressing "nationalism."

The revisionist policy of Russian chauvinism has once again turned the non-Russian nationalities into oppressed peoples. The Soviet Union under the new tsars has again become a "prison of peoples."

HEIRS TO THE OLD TSARS

In the name of "national amalgamation" and "national integration," the Brezhnev clique took over the legacy of the old tsars and claimed that in the Soviet Union today "a new historical community of men has taken form." This is nothing but a veil to conceal the ever sharpening national contradictions in the Soviet Union resulting from the Russian chauvinism it has forced on the country.

Marxist-Leninists hold that national differences cannot possibly disappear before the abolition of all classes and the withering away of the state. Lenin pointed out that mankind "can arrive at the inevitable integration of nations only through a transition period of the complete emancipation of all oppressed nations." Stalin commented on Lenin's attitude to the question of nationalities: "Lenin never said that national differences must disappear and that national languages must merge into one common language within the borders of a single state before the victory of socialism on a world scale. On the contrary, Lenin said something that was the very opposite of this, namely, that 'national and state differences

among peoples and countries . . . will continue to exist for a very, very long time even after the dictatorship of the proletariat has been established on a world scale.'" [Stalin's italics.]

In the Soviet Union today, the prerequisite for the integration of nations stated by Lenin does not even exist, for the "complete emancipation" of the oppressed nations is still out of the question. The revisionist clique is simply following the policy of the old tsars in this respect, a policy of integrating non-Russian groups into the Russian nation, on the excuse that a nation cannot be considered as a vanquished one so long as it still preserves its own religious belief, language, customs and laws. Did not Catherine II once issue a decree for achieving the homogeneity of customs among all nations in Russia? And now let us see what the new tsars are up to.

They have tried every means at their disposal to eradicate the languages and cultures of the non-Russian nationalities. The Soviet *Vestnik Statistiki* (*Statistical Bulletin*, No. 7, 1972) declared that "millions of people of the different national groups have adopted the Russian culture as their own" and that this is an important aspect of "the development of the multi-national Soviet socialist state." The Soviet *World Population Handbook* states that in the Soviet Union today "one group of people after another have changed their language and, with time, have often altered their national (ethnic) status as well." Russian has been imposed on secondary schools, universities, technical schools and so on throughout the Republic of Ukraine and, with rare exceptions, official business and public functions there are conducted in Russian. The imposition of Russian has even spread to the kindergartens and day-care centres, so that Ukrainian

is gradually being wiped out of existence. The number of books and periodicals published in Ukrainian in the republic dropped by one-fourth between 1960 and 1975. Ukrainian theatrical groups no longer perform any works of Ukrainian culture. The Brezhnev clique has also decreed that political prisoners from non-Russian nationalities use Russian in communications with the authorities, in correspondence and even when they are visited by their families. The people of Georgia are extremely dissatisfied with the measures taken by the new tsars to impose Russian on them and discriminate against the non-Russian languages. The new tsars attacked this attitude as "national narrow-mindedness" and forced every Georgian to learn Russian.

Another of the policies adopted by the new tsars is to induce the non-Russian peoples to leave their ancestral homes, and then disperse them throughout the Russian districts, accelerating their Russification. Official Soviet reports showed that by 1970 more than 390,000 or 14.6 per cent of the Moldavians had been forced out of the Republic of Moldavia, and five million Ukrainians, or 13.4 per cent of the Ukrainian population, had been transferred from the Ukraine. Under the suppression of the old tsars, the non-Russian population increased very slowly, and in some cases was decimated or even annihilated. History is repeating itself in the new tsars' Soviet Union. It was disclosed in the book, *Theoretical Questions of the Establishment and Development of the Soviet National State*, that some of the nationalities no longer existed as independent ethnic groups because of "amalgamation" and other reasons, and that each new census registers decreases in the number of minority national groups; the two censuses taken in 1959 and 1970

record a fall from 126 to 119. And yet the Soviet revisionists are boasting about the "all-round prosperity of all nationalities, large or small."

The new tsars plunder and exploit the non-Russian nationalities. Brezhnev has stated that in the Soviet Union, a "unified economic mechanism" has come into being across the country. This means essentially a system of "supra-republican economic zones" which places the vital economic departments of the republics under the control of Brezhnev and Co. and inhibits the economic growth of the non-Russian republics. In the name of "the specialization of the economy" and "regional division of labour," an abnormal, colonial-type economy is imposed on these republics for the benefit of the exploiters and plunderers.

As dictated by the Brezhnev clique, the Ukraine is to preserve its traditional, tsarist-day role as a coal-mining-metallurgical and sugar-beet base. Its consumer goods industry has been dislocated, resulting in a serious market shortage. Members of the committee of national economy of Lvov likened the industry of the republic to a monster with gigantic feet, a tiny head, and an undergrown body in between.

In the Uzbek Republic where for more than a decade cotton output has accounted for 65 per cent of the total in the U.S.S.R., little has been done to develop the local textile industry. The republic produces only 3 per cent of the cotton piece-goods of the Soviet Union, against 83.5 per cent made in the Russian Republic which grows no cotton.

The Moldavian Republic was a country of vineyards, vegetable fields and tobacco plantations in tsarist days. The picture has changed little ever since, for industrially

the republic remains one of the most backward in the Soviet Union.

Such "specialization of the economy" and "regional division of labour" has deprived the non-Russian republics of their independence and resulted in the imbalance of their economy. Moreover, the ruling clique in Moscow exploits the non-Russian republics by a price discrimination against their farm products, which are often sold below the cost. Thus the non-Russian workers earn even less than the Russian workers and are in deeper distress.

"JUNIOR RELATIVES"

Today's new tsars enthuse about pan-Slavism because it is essential to their seizure of world hegemony. Pan-Slavism is simply an extension of Russian chauvinism, which forms its very core. Time and again the revisionists have appealed to the "traditions of Slav identity from time immemorial" between the Russians and other Slavs, and have stressed "the ever-growing political, economic and cultural role of the Slavs in the modern world." The *Outline History of Southern and Western Slavs* published in the Soviet Union declares that the southern Slavs "have been linked with Russia from time immemorial because of the closeness of their languages, culture and religious beliefs." The book even calls the Russian nation the "grandad" and other nations his "junior relatives," saying that "this strong, kind and brave Grandad Ivans" "will liberate his junior relatives, the Balkan Slavs." One of the Soviet leaders has even openly claimed that "those who oppose the Russians are opposed to all Slavs."

Engels pointed out in 1882 that "in reality pan-Slavism is a swindle for world domination under the mask of a non-existent Slavic nation." The new tsars are again resorting to this old ploy.

National chauvinism is always based on a theory of racial superiority. Hitler's chauvinism was based on the fallacious belief that the Aryan race was superior to all others. Brezhnev and company's case is similar. They have the effrontery to say that "there has never been a greater human character than that [of the Russian nation] at any time or in any place of the world" and that "the Slav nation, the Russian nation in particular, is most capable of inheriting and developing the wisdom created by all nations for generations." The logic of the Soviet revisionists inevitably leads them to the conclusion that since the Russian nation is the best of all nations, it should naturally play the role of "saviour."

An alternate member of the Political Bureau of the Soviet Party Central Committee proclaimed at a meeting in October 1975 that the Russian nation is a "leading nation" which "undertakes the major responsibility of striving for the social progress and happiness of mankind." This represents the hypertrophy of Russian chauvinism. The new tsars lavish praise on the Russian "heroes" who have taken part in aggression against other countries, and shamelessly indoctrinate the Soviet people with the idea of "justified aggression" so as to use them as cannon fodder in the scramble for world hegemony. They openly claimed that "an eagerness for conquest of unexploited land is forever the major aspiration of the Russians." In the eyes of the self-styled "loyal Leninists" it was "good" indeed for people to be cannon fodder in tsarist Russia's conquest of the world! What

they preach bears not the slightest resemblance to Leninism; it only echoes the words of the old tsars.

Wherever there is oppression, there is resistance. While pushing a policy of Russian chauvinism and ruthlessly oppressing the non-Russian nationalities, the Soviet revisionists have encountered a fierce, daily growing resistance from the people of the various nationalities. National contradictions are steadily sharpening. The press has reported that a group of people in the Ukraine have, in a letter to the authorities, expressed their "opposition to undermining and obliterating the Ukrainian language," pointing out that this is exactly the policy implemented by the powers which had occupied the Ukraine. In May 1972, a member of the Communist Youth League in Lithuania immolated himself in protest against the revisionist oppression of nationalities. After that thousands of students and workers took to the streets shouting "Freedom for Lithuania" and continued to demonstrate for two days. Demonstrations and strikes like this have taken place over the last few years throughout the non-Russian areas. Some non-Russian nationalities have already set up organizations to resist the Soviet revisionists and publish underground journals and books to expose the oppression of the nationalities. The flagrant actions of Soviet social-imperialism have intensified the contradictions between itself and the oppressed people and nations of the world. The Soviet social-imperialists are sitting on top of a volcano which is inevitably going to erupt and which will seal their fate when it does.

DUE	RETURNED
PCL PCL PCL JUN 22 2007	

\$1.00

UNIVERSITY OF TEXAS AT AUSTIN - GEN LIBS



3017157920

0 5917 3017157920

新沙皇统治下的苏联

外文出版社出版(北京)

1978年(32开)第一版

编号:(英)3050-2785

00050

3-E-1428P