abc OF SOCIAL AND POLITICAL KNOWLEDGE

WHAT IS Labour?

P. SAVCHENKO

ABC of Social and Political Knowledge

Paul Savchenko

WHAT IS LABOUR?

WHAT IS LABOUR?

PROGRESS PUBLISHERS · MOSCOW

Translated from the Russian by *Nadezhda Burova*

Editorial Board of the Series: *F. M. Volkov* (Chief Editor), *Ye. F. Gubsky* (Deputy Chief Editor), *F. M. Burlatsky, V. V. Krapivin, Yu. N. Popov, V. V. Sobolev, F. N. Yurlov, V. D. Zotov*
The cover: detail of a painting by *Fernand Léger*

АВС СОЦИАЛЬНО-ПОЛИТИЧЕСКИХ ЗНАНИЙ

П. Савченко
ЧТО ТАКОЕ ТРУД?
На английском языке

Printed in the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics

С $\frac{0604020103-159}{014(01)-87}$ 32–87

CONTENTS

PREFACE

"What Is Labour?" holds a special place in the series ABC of Social and Political Knowledge. This book deals with the role of labour in the rise of man as the main productive force and a vehicle of production relations.

Labour, its conditions and results are studied by different sciences. Natural sciences study labour in its psycho-physiological aspects, while social sciences examine it as a socio-economic phenomenon. Each science uses its own approaches and methods. Marxist political economy ranks first among the social sciences studying labour. It deals with the social form of labour and the social structure of labour, that is,

relations among people stemming from their participation in social labour.

The author describes the historical stages in the development of labour from the point of view of both their common and specific features. Labour has always been a domain of exchange between man and nature. The content of labour may remain the same at different stages in man's history. For instance, the transition from feudalism to capitalism is not necessarily accompanied from the outset by changes in the technical basis of production. The character of labour, however, undergoes revolutionary changes whenever one mode of production is superseded by another.

Objectively essential to man's vital activity, labour is his eternal companion. However, the essence of man's attitude to labour differs depending on the social form of the latter. The author focuses on the analysis of the social form of labour under capitalism and socialism.

Under capitalism, labour takes on the form of hired labour. Hired labour is a historical form of labour which emerges when the means of production become counterposed to man as an alien force, as capital. Man cannot work before he sells his labour power, i.e. his ability to work, to the owner of capital – the capitalist. Their interests can never coincide because the capitalist uses the means of production, machin-

ery and technology, which are in his possession, to exploit hired workers. For all the variety of its forms, coercion is the common feature characterising labour in antagonistic societies where the coercive nature of labour is predetermined by its social form.

Socialism has eliminated the hired labour system and modified the mode in which the means of production and labour power come into contact. With exploitation and economic coercion to work ruled out, the character of labour fundamentally changes. Under socialism, it is the public duty of all members of society to work in order to satisfy their needs. This duty is a law of life. Whereas under capitalism scientific and technological progress conduces to growing unemployment, under socialism, it ensures full employment.

Under socialism, man's labour is a measure of his participation in social production and a criterion relied on in distribution and consumption. The higher the productivity and effectiveness of social labour, the greater is the opportunity to raise the level of well-being of society as a whole and of each of its members. However, under socialism, labour is not yet man's prime vital need. It is primarily a means of subsistence. At the same time, under developed socialism, there emerges an economic basis for labour to increasingly assert itself both

as a means of satisfying social needs and as a prerequisite for the development of man's abilities.

Labour is a most important factor in the evolution of world civilisation. However, it is only under socialism that it turns into the main stimulus for the development of social humanism and optimism.

Chapter One LABOUR, MAN, AND SOCIETY

Man, just as the society he lives in, is inseparable from nature with which he constantly interacts. Man cannot exist without providing for his primordial, natural, biological needs – the need for food, clothing, shelter, protection against the harmful effects of the elements (natural calamities), etc. Nature cannot provide everything that man needs in a ready-made form. Much has to be produced by man himself. That means that man has to work. As he starts producing the goods he needs, man comes into direct contact with nature. Even the gathering of fruit that nature offers to man in a ready-made form, even hunting and fishing, constitute a process

of interchange between man and nature, a process through which man exerts his influence on nature and transforms natural conditions.

As labour processes developed, man distanced himself from nature. Engels provided a brilliant analysis of the historical significance of labour in his article "The Part Played by Labour in the Transition from Ape to Man" (1876). He examined the rise of man and primitive human association in the course of the development of human labour, labour activity and production by man of the means and conditions for his own survival. Thus, labour itself is among man's basic vital needs. The genesis of human society is inseparably linked to man's labour activity and to the development of material production.

What is labour?

Labour is man's purposeful activity through which he adapts natural objects and uses them to satisfy his needs. In any labour process, man expends his physical, nervous and mental energy. Labour results in the emergence of useful products.

However, the role of labour in man's life is not limited to its serving as a necessary condition of man's existence and development, to its being a source of his strength and wealth. While acting on nature in the process of labour, man transforms himself, develops his

material and spiritual culture, his physical and mental abilities.

What is the history of this process?

At first, man obtained the material wealth he needed from nature in a ready-made form. This stage lasted for many hundreds of thousands of years. As time went by, man learned to make things from the available primitive natural materials such as wood and stone. In order to secure his vital needs, man had to constantly improve his tools and the process of making them. As he did so, his labour skills were perfected.

It is due solely to labour that the human hands have attained a degree of perfection high enough to conjure into being irrigation systems, the Eiffel Tower, the statues of Michelangelo and colour television. In their collective labour, human beings arrived at a point where they had something to say to each other. Necessity conditioned the emergence and development of articulate speech. As human beings interacted and communicated in the process of labour, their mental abilities developed. Today, man's mental abilities have reached a truly fantastic level making possible the creation of spacecraft, computers, nuclear reactors – in a word, making it possible for man to translate his most daring dreams into life.

At first sight, man's labour resembles the

"work" of animals, for instance, ants, bees, beavers and birds. However, man's labour and animals' "work" are essentially different. While human labour is always a purposeful, rational activity, animals are guided by instincts. The worst architect differs from the best bee in that before building a honeycomb he has it built in his mind.

Another characteristic feature of man's labour lies in his using implements of labour he has made himself to produce various goods. Some animals are known to apply "tools" in procuring food. The Egyptian vulture, for instance, uses stones as tools. The Galápagos woodpecker uses little pointed sticks to pick insects out of wood. The sea otter may use a stone to pry mollusc shells open. The chimpanzee applies a whole variety of tools. However, these examples illustrate something that is occasional in the life of the animals. None of the animals makes implements of labour. Through his labour man harnesses the forces of nature making them serve his goals, while animals adapt themselves to these forces without being able to consciously act on them or master them. In this lies man's essential difference from the animal, a feature he owes to labour.

As the educational function of labour evolves, labour turns into a means of self-expression, a means of developing man's creative potential.

The need for labour rests on a natural foundation since it is dictated by human nature.

Thus, there are three important elements in the process of labour.

The first one is labour *per se*, or labour as a *purposeful activity*.

The second essential element is the implements of labour, sometimes referred to as *means of labour*,– the things man uses to act upon nature and to adapt natural objects for his own use. There are material and mental means of labour. Among them, a special place is held by the *means of production*– tools, machines, instruments, etc.

Man uses the means of production to reinforce, as it were, the organs of his own body. For instance, unable to discern the structure of an animal or vegetable cell with his naked eye, he has equipped himself with an electron microscope.

Production premises, structures, installations, ventilation systems, railways, highways, and other roads, and canals are also important means of labour. Land, too, is a means of labour as it is the place of labour, an embodiment of natural properties essential to agricultural production and a storeroom of natural wealth (iron ore, diamonds, gold, bauxites, copper, uranium ore, oil, gas, potassium salts, etc.).

Many millennia ago man first took a stick – or a stone – in his hand, thus enhancing his natural strength. Today, using the tools he has made, man has succeeded in "reaching" the Moon, the Mars and the Venus.

The entire history of man's conquest of nature is contained between these two extreme points of progress. It is, however, only in a figurative sense that one can talk about man conquering nature. Man is part of nature. The basis of man's life – labour – is inseparable from the material provided by nature. But the point is that unveiling the secrets of nature and opening its treasure-houses calls for continuous and intensive labour. The efficiency of this labour is the higher, the greater the number of electric, mechanical and other appliances, or "helpmates" that man employs.

Here are some data that give a general idea of the role of the "helpmates" man relies on in the process of labour. Over a century ago, human manual labour accounted for 15 per cent of the energy expended in the production of goods (draught animals and machines accounted for 79 and 6 per cent, respectively). At present, the share of human labour is 3 per cent, while the proportion of the energy expended by draught animals and machinery is 1 and 96 per cent, respectively.

The third element in man's purposeful activ-

ity is the *object of labour*, i.e. the materials which are to be transformed or processed. Some of the objects of labour – for instance woods, coal- and oil-fields, ore and diamond deposits, etc. – are provided by nature. These are primary objects of labour. The rest have to undergo preliminary treatment before further use. For instance, grain has to be milled into flour before baking, and coke has to be fired before it is used for smelting. These objects of labour are referred to as raw materials or secondary objects of labour.

While primary objects of labour predominated at the dawn of social production, secondary objects of labour acquired importance at subsequent stages of social production. In our time and day, man-made objects of labour – artificial fibres, plastics, polymers, alloys, etc. – have a major role to play. There are also supplementary materials used in production – fuel, lubricants, etc.

The instruments and objects of labour essential to manufacturing the things that man needs are the material elements of the labour process. In their totality, they constitute the *means of production*.

Although the means of production have a major role to play in the process of production, they would be useless without man. Yarn, unless it is used for knitting or waving, is just cotton

or wool put to waste. Leather would never turn into footwear unless man applies his labour to it. For yarn, leather and the like to become useful, "live" labour of conscious human beings must be applied to them. To this end, the means of production have to be brought into contact with man's labour power. The term "labour power" is taken to mean man's physical and mental abilities, occupational skills and production experience which he uses to produce material goods with the help of the means of production.

The means of production and man's labour power constitute in their totality the *productive forces* of society. The growth and improvement of the productive forces give man more power over the forces of nature and lay the foundation for the development of human society.

The dominant role in the productive forces belongs to people. Not only do they use the means of production, they make them. Endowed with an ability to work and to set in motion the means of production, people constitute the main element of productive forces.

Man has never produced material goods alone. Even primitive men hunted and tilled land together. Modern enterprises sometimes employ many thousands of workers. Each enterprise receives raw and other materials from dozens and sometimes hundreds of enterprises. For

instance, automobile factories rely on hundreds of suppliers. Knowledge, skill and experience are used on an increasing scale. Thus, in the process of labour human beings come into contact with one another of necessity, which makes their labour social by nature. Production is always *social production* and labour is always *social labour.*

Those who argue that labour is not necessarily social cite the example of Robinson Crusoe, a character invented by the English writer Daniel Defoe. During his 30 years on a desert island, Robinson Crusoe engaged in farming, cattle-breeding and handicrafts. However, people tend to forget that he had at his disposal the instruments and tools he had obtained from his wrecked ship and that he grew crops from the grains he found in his pockets. The tools and the seeds were the results of the labour put in by many other people. Moreover, Robinson Crusoe relied on the skills he had acquired from other people. And yet, Daniel Defoe could not make his hero live in complete isolation for a long time, so he let Friday keep Robinson Crusoe company. Thus, Robinson Crusoe's story does not disprove the argument that human beings have always procured the means of subsistence jointly rather than in isolation.

In the process of production, distribution, exchange and consumption of material goods

people inevitably, involuntarily and unconsciously enter into social relations which are referred to as *production relations*. Man's labour can take place and production can be maintained only within the framework of these social ties and relations. These relations wholly depend on the *form of ownership of the means of production*. A form of ownership is a certain mode in which people appropriate the means of production and, consequently, the fruit of other people's labour.

The position of an individual in the system of production relations depends on who owns the means of production.

The position of the owner of land or any other private property – factories, workshops, banks, etc. – radically differs from that of the worker, engineer, technician, or anyone else who sells his labour power to those who own the means of production. People's relations with respect to the ownership of the means of production thereby predetermine the objective difference in their social position, their relation to one another in the process of labour and their place in the social system as a whole.

Private ownership of the means of production predetermines the lasting dependence (both economic and extra-economic) of the majority of participants in the material social production process, those who are deprived of the means

of production, on an insignificant minority who own the natural wealth, workshops, factories, retail shops, banks and other means of production.

As human society developed, different forms of private ownership – slave-holding, feudal and capitalist – emerged.

In contrast to the forms of ownership listed above, *public ownership of the means of production* is based on the collective appropriation by the people of the means of production. Hence, all the participants in the production process, i.e. all the members of society, have the same relation to the material conditions of their labour activity. Distinguished among the forms of public ownership are: group ownership which existed in primitive-communal society, public (state) socialist ownership (whereby the means of production are the property of the entire people) and collective-farm-cooperative socialist ownership (whereby the means of production belong to work collectives).

The highest form of public ownership will emerge in the future as communist ownership of the means of production.

Historically, each of these forms of ownership has manifested itself in a specific mode of production, i.e. a way whereby the producers come into contact with the means of production.

Primitive-communal production relations were characterised by the communal (group) ownership of the primitive means of production.

In slave-holding societies, production relations were specific in that the means of labour and the worker (the slave) belonged to the same owner. Both the means of labour and slaves, being the property of slave-owners, were treated as things.

Feudal production relations, based on large-scale land proprietorship (landlordism), were highlighted by the exploitation of the peasants by the landowner (the feudal lord). The peasants were forced either to farm the feudal lord's land without pay, or to regularly pay him the rent and duties.

Capitalist production relations are based on private ownership of the main means of production (factories, mines, pits, etc.). Under capitalism, the producers, i.e. the labour force, are free from personal bondage to the owner of the means of production. Personally free, but deprived of the means of production, the producers are forced to sell their labour power in order to secure the means of subsistence for themselves. Having acquired their labour power as a commodity, the owner of the means of production (the capitalist) seeks to make a maximum use of it in an effort to amass profit. Thus, on the one hand, the producer gains

access to the means of labour and, by coming into contact with them, becomes involved in the process of production. On the other hand, the employer seizes the opportunity of getting richer by appropriating the surplus value (profit) produced by the labour force over and above its own value. The profit is appropriated by the capitalist.

Things are radically different under socialism. *Socialism constitutes the first stage of communist production relations* and features public ownership of the means of production. The latter eliminates the antagonistic character of production relations. In laying the foundation for a fundamentally new type of production relations, socialism puts an end to the exploitation of man by man and eliminates conditions essential to the existence of those social classes which live by appropriating the results of other people's labour. Nonetheless, with the establishment of socialist economic relations the differences between the two main working classes – the workers and the peasantry – do not immediately disappear altogether. They persist because socialism does not immediately remove the differences between the two different types of social property – state and cooperative-collective-farm – in the means of production. These differences will be overcome as developed socialism evolves into communism.

Thus, the history of human society shows

that the development of production – i.e. of each concrete *mode of production* in the totality of productive forces and production relations involved in it – is determined by the form of property. The passage from the primitive-communal to the slave-holding society and then to the feudal, capitalist and communist societies is the history of the different modes of production superseding one another. Basically, it is the history of the successive forms of ownership of the means of production which likewise supersede one another.

Why does one mode of production give way to another mode of production?

Production relations are brought into existence by definite productive forces and, for their part, they exert a strong influence on the latter. Progressive production relations, which correspond to the nature of the productive forces, promote and accelerate the latter's development and stimulate material production as a whole, enhancing its effectiveness. Outdated production relations, on the contrary, hinder and slow down the development of production forces.

This happens according to the law of correspondence of production relations to the character and development level of productive forces. As a mode of production based on private ownership and exploitation develops, this law is violated. The incongruity is caused by

the contradiction between the relatively mobile productive forces and the production relations that tend to lag behind and slow down the former's development. As the contradiction deepens, there arises a need for a radical change in the social organisation in whose womb this contradiction gradually develops into a conflict. There emerges a need for a social revolution to remove the outdated production relations and institute new ones.

Production relations, i.e. relations of ownership, production, exchange, distribution and consumption in their aggregate, constitute the *basis* or the economic structure of a society. It is on this basis that various social relations, ideas and institutions appear and develop. The basis of each society underlies the latter's superstructure, i.e. political, ideological, legal, moral and religious relations backed up by corresponding organisations and institutions (the state, political parties, social organisations, the church, etc.) and forms of social consciousness (ideas, theories, views). The superstructure is class-oriented as it serves and protects the basis, expressing the interests of the society's predominant class. In the course of a social revolution, the old basis is eliminated and the superstructure undergoes a simultaneous change.

In a society that has attained a certain stage in its historical development, the mode of

production, the economic structure (the basis) and the corresponding superstructure are inseparably linked to one another, constituting an integral organism referred to as a *socio-economic formation*.

The historical process is a succession of socio-economic formations which supersede one another. Each successive formation constitutes a higher scale of civilisation, a higher level of social development.

In class-antagonistic socio-economic formations (slave-holding, feudal and capitalist), an insignificant minority thrives by exploiting and oppressing the majority, i.e. the working people. Irreconcilable interests of the poor and the rich classes give rise to a strife between them. The irreconcilable *class struggle* results in transition from one formation to another. The class struggle is the motive force of the development of antagonistic socio-economic formations, while social revolution as a culmination of class struggle is the law which determines the transition from a lower formation to a higher one.

Each formation features specific forms, content and character of labour (discussed in more detail below). At the same time, all the socio-economic formations were influenced by forces whose effect is universal. The division and cooperation of labour ranks first among such forces.

As the *division of labour* becomes ever more pronounced, labour has an increasingly important role to play in the rise of man. In the long run, the division of labour in all its aspects serves to increase the labour productivity of man as society's main productive force. The division of labour promotes the accumulation of labour experience, improvement of skills, and greater competence and knowledge.

The division of labour as the isolation of various types of labour activity can take place on two levels – within the entire society and within an individual enterprise.

The intrasocietal division of labour manifests itself in the existence of various branches of production (industry, agriculture, transport, construction, etc.). For their part, these can be further divided and subdivided. For instance, industry is divided into mechanical engineering, ferrous metallurgy, chemical, food, textile and many other industries.

The division of labour within individual enterprises implies the division of labour between people of various professions and trades – steelmakers, miners, carpenters, actors, etc.

Division of labour is an important aspect of the socialisation of labour. What is meant by the socialisation of labour is the economic ties conditioned by the social division of labour between people in the process of production,

exchange, distribution and consumption of the social product. As productive forces and productive relations develop, economic ties grow ever more complicated.

Specialisation of production is a most important form of the social division of labour. It is manifested in the growth of the number of individual, independent branches of production which specialise in producing certain types of goods.

Specialisation conduces to the mass-scale production of batches of goods which, in turn, allows for the application of highly productive modern equipment and for bringing in new processes and more efficient forms of organising labour and production. In a word, specialisation is a most important prerequisite for scientific and technological progress.

The development of human society is accompanied by the growing division and cooperation of labour.

Cooperation of labour is a form of social labour involving a considerable number of people who interact with one another as they perform identical or interconnected operations.

Cooperation of labour has great advantages over individual, non-cooperated labour, in that it makes it possible to perform a large volume of work and complete large construction projects within a short time.

Both the division and cooperation of labour are historical phenomena. As economic ties among the producers grow more and more complicated, there emerges the need for the cooperation of labour on the scale of the entire national economy.

Like cooperation of labour, division of labour has two aspects to it – the technico-economic, and socio-economic. The former involves the cooperation of machinery, technology, labour, and material and financial resources. This aspect of cooperation is linked to the development of society's productive forces. The socio-economic aspect is conditioned by the form of property in the means of production. We shall first consider the technical and economic aspect, that is, the impact of machinery and technology on the content of labour.

The *content of labour* is conditioned by the means of labour and raw materials used as well as by the worker's operations and the product being manufactured. The development of the implements of labour is the main factor causing changes in the content of labour operations. In order to understand the way the content of labour changes as the implements of labour are improved, suffice it to compare the work of a navvy digging a ditch with a spade or a hoe and that of a suction-dredge operator, or the work of a miner wielding a pick and that of

a cutter-loader operator.

The content of labour changes as different types of raw materials and stock are used. For instance, the use of agricultural machinery and aircraft, mineral fertilizers and herbicides alleviates the work of the farmers and makes it increasingly similar to industrial labour.

The content of labour changes not only with the improvement of the means of labour, but also with the development of man's ability to perform increasingly complicated operations and ever more complicated tasks. The content of labour changes from generation to generation as labour becomes more diversified. Thus, as labour acquired increasing importance in the development of human society and in the division of labour, there emerged – apart from hunting and cattle-breeding – farming, spinning, weaving, metal-working, pottery, and navigation. Apart from trade and handicrafts, there appeared art and science. Mental work became distinct from physical work and the town became separated from the countryside. The content of labour changes not only with the accumulation of experience and improvement of skills, but also with the rise in the workers' educational and training levels.

The content of labour also depends on the scope of the use of new machinery and technol-

ogies which reduce the amount of monotonous manual work.

From the point of view of its content, labour can be simple or complicated, mental or manual, creative or non-creative, managerial and subordinate.

Simple labour, for instance, the work done by shop hands or loaders, does not call for special training or high qualification. It is also referred to unskilled labour.

By contrast, turners, fitters, adjusters, operators, etc., have to undergo more or less prolonged training before they start to work. Skilled labour requiring special training is referred to as complicated labour. It is in fact multiplied simple labour.

Under capitalism, this accounts for the further exacerbation of the *contradiction between the town and the countryside*. In rural areas, simple, less industrialised labour is subjected to increasingly intensive exploitation by the capitalist town with its factories and banks, skilled labour force and higher labour productivity.

In a sense, the contradiction between "the town", i.e. the developed major imperialist states, and "the countryside", i.e. the developing countries of Asia, Africa and Latin America (or, as it is often described today, the contradiction between the North and the South) has developed into a grave economic crisis.

The neocolonialist policy pursued by big monopolies, inequitable international economic relations, and the staggering foreign indebtedness estimated at 1,000,000,000,000 US dollars have brought many of the developing states to disaster. The inequitable terms of trade with developed capitalist countries result in the price of the developing states' goods – minerals, sugar, meat, bananas and other traditional export commodities – tumbling down and the prices of imported machinery and equipment soaring.

In 1984, the Latin American countries alone suffered a loss of 20 billion dollars as a result of the deterioration of trade terms. In this context, indebtedness and the aggravation of the contradiction described above appear unavoidable.

As for mental and manual labour, their separation from each other and further independent development are a form of the most profound social division of labour. Man's labour organically combines the workings of the brain and of the muscles into a single process whereby man acts upon nature and transforms it. However, the combination and interaction of man's mental and physical activity in the process of labour is complicated and contradictory, and is fraught with the possibility of their separation in the course of the productive forces' development.

At a certain stage in the development of the productive forces, mental activity as a process of mastering the laws that govern the development of nature and society isolates itself from the process of labour and starts evolving independently in the form of science, art, etc. Before the isolation takes place, mental activity remains a component of labour and its evolution is hindered by the predominance of physical labour that consumes all of man's time and strength. The less developed is labour and the lower is its productivity, the more physical effort is spent by society for biological reproduction (achieved by satisfying man's minimal requirements for food, clothing and shelter), the less strength and time is left for any other activity, above all, mental activity.

The division of labour of a kind when the majority of people are predominantly engaged in physical labour and a minority (usually, these are members of the ruling classes) are engaged in mental labour (management, administration of state affairs, science and the arts) generates a *contradiction between mental and physical labour*, as individuals engaged in mental work exploit those engaged in physical work.

The development of the elements of mental activity in labour conduces to the latter's evolution into a creative process. In the process of creative labour the worker spontaneously makes

non-trivial decisions consciously seeking to fulfil his assignment. To be able to do so, the worker must be well trained and well versed in the latest achievements of science and technology. Non-creative labour is always monotonous, pre-programmed as it were. Assembly-line production is an example of non-creative labour.

Managerial labour is usually creative because the manager has to display initiative in organising his subordinates' work and assigning them their jobs. By contrast, subordinates' labour is narrower and more specialised. It depends on other people's instructions and is therefore less creative.

As to the socio-economic aspect of the division of labour, it wholly depends on the form of ownership of the means of production and has a decisive effect on the character of labour. This deserves a more detailed discussion.

We have already mentioned that the implements of labour – tools, machinery, equipment, etc. – are the key element of productive forces. Their development level is the measure of man's mastery of nature and of the development of labour power, i.e. the productive ability of individual people and society as a whole. Moreover, the implements of labour constitute a most mobile element of productive forces. Each historical stage in the development of production is distinguished, above all, by the degree

of development of the implements of labour.

The way people work – collectively or individually – depends on the instruments of labour they use. That is why one can say that the character of labour implements, i.e. whether they are intended for collective or for individual use, determines the *character of labour.*

Consider an example. The primitive-social character of man's earliest tools predetermined the need for collective labour under the primitive-communal system. The common use of tools, i.e. *common labour*, explains why the form of appropriation of the means of production was collective and why the first historical form of ownership of the means of production was communal, group ownership. This form made it impossible for some people to appropriate the means of production and other people to be deprived of them. Thus, it ruled out the exploitation of man by man.

Man improves his tools in the process of production as he seeks to turn out as many products as possible and thereby satisfy his requirements to an ever greater extent. The improvement of tools under the primitive-communal system led to the individualisation of tools. Individual tools are the ones more suitable for individual use.

The individual, specialised character of the instruments of labour – the plough, the potter's

wheel, the spindle, the bow, as well as the corresponding type of labour – *individual labour* – called for a change in the form of appropriation of the means of production, for a transition from their collective appropriation to private appropriation, i.e. to private ownership of the means of production. This transition was inevitable because both production and man's manner of involvement in it had changed.

Thus, the character of labour depends on who – private owners or society as a whole – possesses the key means of production – land, factories, railways, airlines, etc., on who controls their use in the process of labour. As relations of property in the means of production develop, the nature of relations among people in the process of labour changes, too.

Thus, the character of labour is closely linked to the development of the social system, each social system being characterised by a form of labour specific to it.

In the *primitive-communal system*, the tools (stones and sticks) man used to procure his scanty means of subsistence were extremely primitive. Group ownership and equalizing distribution made it possible to compensate for the production failures of some by the successes of others and thus to satisfy, on the whole, the minimum requirements of all. For instance, the food procured by the members of a commune

either collectively or individually was placed at the disposal of the entire commune. The tools used in hunting and fishing were also disposed of by the entire tribe or clan. The labour of each was labour for all.

The primitive-communal system persisted throughout a long period in the development of human society when the social division of labour was growing ever more pronounced. Farming, cattle-breeding, crafts and trade evolved into independent spheres of material production. The transition from fruit-gathering and hunting to the growing of crops, fruit and vegetables and to the breeding of domesticated animals marked a qualitative leap forward in human development. The transition from the use of primitive tools to the manufacture of more complicated ones was an essential factor in the development of labour at that stage of mankind's progress.

One should distinguish between live and objectified labour. *Live labour* is man's purposeful activity aimed at producing certain material goods. *Objectified labour* is man's past labour which has been expended on turning out the means of production (machinery, equipment, buildings, fuel, raw materials, etc.).

The proportion of objectified labour in the process of production grows with the development of productive forces. Correspondingly, the owners

of the means of production exert a growing influence on the relations among people in the process of production, exchange, distribution and consumption. The owner of the means of production has a stake in acquiring more of them so as to secure for himself a larger amount of material and cultural benefits. Therefore, he makes those who do not own any means of production work for him.

The emergence of private ownership of the means of production made the division of labour even more pronounced. An increasing amount of goods was produced for exchange for other goods rather than for personal consumption by the producer. The owners of the means of production specialised in making definite types of goods. That made the market essential to people's vital activity.

With the development of exchange, labour acquired a *two-fold character*. The point is that the emergence of exchange called for the need to determine what quantity of goods was equivalent to a certain quantity of other goods. People learned to compare labour expended to produce various commodities regardless of its content. Labour which is objectified in a commodity (provided that what is produced is a commodity or a service required by other people) is called *abstract labour*. Abstract labour lies in the basis of the cost of a commodity, that is, it de-

termines the amount of money or other goods offered for the commodity at the market.

At the same time, any kind of labour is *concrete* as it yields use value, that is, the properties of the commodity which are required by other people.

As labour acquired a two-fold character, private labour became distinct from social labour. In the final analysis, any production involves dozens of people of various trades and professions. Things are made because somebody needs them. This means that the labour of each commodity producer is part of social labour and is social by nature. However, in a society based on private ownership, commodity producers are disunited, working in isolation from one another. Therefore, their labour, although essentially social, takes on the form of private labour. Its social character manifests itself through exchange.

It is on this basis that the contradiction between private and social labour emerges, and the product of man's labour comes to dominate him. Relations among people manifest themselves as relations among commodities. This contradiction is only revealed on the market, when the problem of the sale of commodities arises. The product's grip on man is made even tighter because the commodity's value is determined by the socially-necessary expenditure of labour, rather than by the individual expenditure of

labour. The socially-necessary expenditure of labour is measured by the working time required to produce a commodity under the average social conditions of production, that is, at the average level of technology, producers' skill and intensity of labour. As a rule, the socially-necessary expenditure of labour depends on the production conditions under which the bulk of the given type of commodities is produced.

The emergence of private property and the development of commodity exchange led to the division of the primitive tribe into the poor and the rich. The impoverished individuals found themselves in debt-slavery to the rich and were thus forced to work for the latter. By waging aggressive wars, turning the captives into slaves and selling their fellow-tribesmen into slavery by way of exacting debts, the rich established their full sway over the enslaved poor. The primitive-communal socio-economic formation was thus replaced by the slave-holding system.

The *slave-holding system* was the first socio-economic formation in the history of mankind to be based on private property and the alienation of labour. This system was characterised by the slave-holders' private ownership of both the means of production and the workers, that is, slaves.

The alienation of labour originated when some groups of people started to appropriate

the product of other groups' labour. The labour of the people who were deprived of the means of production and of the products of their labour became alienated from them. That accounts for their indifference and even aversion to labour. Slaves, being the property of individual or collective owners, possessed neither the means of production nor the means of subsistence. Just as the results of their labour, the slaves were the property of the owner. Their exploitation was achieved through outright violence, that is, by way of extra-economic coercion. The intrinsic contradiction of the slave-holding system stemmed from the coersive manner whereby the producers (slaves) came into contact with the means of production. As they were not interested in the results of their labour and in displaying a solicitous attitude to the implements of labour, the slaves resisted any attempts to make them work harder. They regarded the instruments of labour as a means of enhancing exploitation. Slave labour, in its entirety, took the form of unpaid work done for the slave-holder.

Under the slave-holding system, the content and character of labour, were changed. Stone and wooden tools were replaced by implements made of copper, bronze and, later, iron. However, the slave-holders preferred to issue their slaves with the most primitive implements of labour

because the latter, hating their forced labour, took no care of expensive and complicated tools, misplacing, losing or damaging them. The overwhelming majority of slaves served as a mere source of muscular energy in various branches of production (farming, cattle-breeding, construction, transportation, mining, etc.). They did arduous manual work. Only the ruling classes could engage in the administration of state affairs, in science and art. Mental labour became opposed to physical labour.

In Antiquity, the upswings in economic and cultural development were the outcome of the cruel exploitation of slaves, the fruit of slave labour. It was with the arduous labour of huge numbers of slaves that canals and roads were laid out, large tracts of land irrigated, mines worked, large workshops established, and bridges, dams, pyramids, palaces and temples constructed.

Various branches of human knowledge evolved. The slave-holding society produced such famous figures in culture and science as Mo Zi in China, Aristotle and Pythagoras in Greece, Kalidasa in India, and Cicero in Rome.

For all that, the potential for the use of labour under the slave-holding system was limited as the slaves worked to the crack of overseers' whips. Brimming with hatred for their owners and full of aversion for their forced labour, slaves would now and again rise against the exploiters. Slave

labour gradually ceased to promote economic development. As for the slave-holders, they regarded physical labour as something unworthy of freemen, a disgrace to them. This approach gave rise to a situation when even the poor refused to work and expected sops ("bread and circuses") from the rich.

Idleness and labour are incompatible. There came a time in the development of the slave-holding system when the predominant production relations began to hinder the development of the productive forces. The irreconcilable contradiction between the productive forces and the production relations resulted in the downfall of the slave-holding system. The emergence of *coloni* heralded the advance of another mode of production, feudalism. The *coloni* were former slaves or ruined peasants to whom land and implements of labour were leased. They had a stake in producing abundant crops because they retained a share of them. By special legislation, the *coloni* were bound to the land, deprived of the freedom of movement, the right to serve in the army, etc. This system exhibited some of the features which were to become typical of the feudal socio-economic formation.

The slave-holding system gave way to *feudalism.* A higher development level of the productive forces under feudalism caused changes in the content of labour. There emerged new

sectors of the economy. In urban areas, the methods of processing raw materials were gradually improved, and crafts became more and more specialised. In 1600, the belt loom was invented in Europe. The 15th century saw the invention of the blast furnace, the compass, the mechanical watch and book-printing.

Improved methods of farming (the two- and three-field systems) were developed. New crops – potatoes, tomatoes, tobacco and sunflower imported to Europe from America – became widespread. The instruments of labour were improved. The iron plough and other agricultural implements made of iron were used on a growing scale. In their drive for mastery over nature, people acquired vast experience and new skills.

However, feudal technology, based as it was on the large-scale application of manual labour, developed at a comparatively slow rate. The majority of the peasants, who were not free, used primitive tools.

Nonetheless, the character of labour was changing. The division and cooperation of labour became more pronounced. There emerged specialised branches of agriculture, such as butter manufacturing, bee-keeping and gardening.

Under feudalism, commodity production acquired a new dimension and was concentrated in towns. With trade ties established among the hinterland regions of the countries, national

markets began to take shape. The development of commodity production, based on the social division of labour and intended for sale, for the market, for the exchange of products among various households, bolstered the role of labour in the improvement of the productive forces.

Under feudalism, the social form of labour had a greater potential for increasing the role of labour in the rise of man as society's main productive force. In contrast with the slaves, the peasants and craftsmen were interested, to a degree, in the results of their labour. They owned some means of production and were thus able to engage in independent economic activity – to till land, breed cattle or follow crafts – whenever they were free from quit-rent and corvée, i.e. work on the land owned by the feudal lords, attending to the latter in their castles, and performing other compulsory service.

In terms of time, the serfs' necessary labour was distinct from their surplus labour, i.e. unpaid labour appropriated by the feudal lord by virtue of his being the owner of the land, water, woods, etc. The peasants, who were not freemen, were compelled to work for the feudal lord not so much because of their economic dependence on him as for the reasons of direct extra-economic coercion which manifested itself in their being subject to their lord's will and jurisdiction. The feudal lord could at any time sell or give

away his peasants with or without the land they were bound to. Feudal landownership, and the peasants' dependence on the landlords for the land to till, determined the character of the exploitation of labour under feudalism. Effected in many different ways, it was embodied in the feudal rent, which absorbed the whole of the peasants' surplus labour. Various duties and exactions left the peasants with the minimum means of subsistence.

The antagonisms inherent in feudal society continuously widened the gap between mental and physical labour, between town and country.

The peasants were unwilling to put up with their subjugated position. The epoch of feudalism abounded in peasant uprisings.

The crisis of the feudal mode of production became especially pronounced when the social form of labour based on feudal landownership and the peasants' being in personal bondage to the landlords fettered the development of productive forces. The production of commodities intended for exchange was growing in scale. As the market expanded, the more or less substantial commodity producers started to hire ruined farmers and craftsmen to work for them. This meant that in the womb of the feudal society there originated *the capitalist mode of production* based on *capitalist private ownership* and *the exploitation of hired labour.*

Chapter Two LABOUR UNDER CAPITALISM

1. Labour Process under Capitalism

In contrast with the preceding socio-economic formations, capitalism bolstered the role of labour in the development of society's productive forces. Under capitalism, the process of labour underwent changes due to technological improvements. Capitalism equipped man not only with new skills, but also with empirical and professional knowledge.

Under the capitalist mode of production, the process of labour has the following distinctive features. First, as the means of production are owned by the capitalist and labour power becomes united with the means of production only after it has

been bought by the capitalist, the hired worker is economically bound to capital, and his labour is controlled by the capitalist rather than by himself.

Second, the product of labour is the capitalist's property by virtue of his owning the means of production. In the case of simple commodity production, the producer owned the means of production and, consequently, the product of labour. Under capitalism, factories, enterprises, shops, land, railways, banks, airports, post and telegraph offices, etc. belong to the capitalists who do not personally participate in the production of material goods and services. Under capitalism, the public wealth is created, in all its forms, by the hired workers who, being deprived of the means of production, are subject to capitalist exploitation. Although the hired worker is juridically free, he is economically bound to capital.

For a hired worker's labour to become united with the means of production, the capitalist must buy machinery, raw materials, fuel and labour power at the market.

Just as any commodity, labour power has use value and value. *The value of labour power* is determined by the socially necessary working time spent to produce the means of subsistence for the worker and his family. The *use value* of the worker's labour power is the ability of

the worker to create, in the course of labour, a value that is greater than the value of his own labour power. The excess value created by the wage-workers over and above the value of their labour power is referred to as *surplus value*. It is appropriated by the capitalist without remuneration. That explains why surplus value is the goal of capitalist production.

From the capitalist's point of view only that labour is productive which produces surplus value and increases his capital.

Under capitalism, the division of labour into productive and non-productive labour is based on the two-fold character of labour. On the one hand, labour creates a commodity's use value; therefore, labour whose use value meets the demands of the buyer is productive. On the other hand, labour creates both the value of the commodity and the increment over and above it, that is, surplus value. If the worker's labour secures surplus value for the owner of the means of production and thus turns him into a capitalist, he regards it as productive. Therefore, under capitalism, one and the same form of labour can at once be both productive and non-productive, depending on whether or not it yields surplus value to the capitalist. For instance, a textile factory worker is engaged in productive labour because his labour creates surplus value for the factory's owner. An artisan making cloth

in his workshop does not produce surplus value for anybody and, as the capitalist sees it, is thus engaged in non-productive labour.

Labour is divided into productive and non-productive in both material production and creative work. A singer hired by an impressario – a capitalist – brings profit to him. Therefore, her labour is productive. If she works on her own, at her own risk, she is engaged in non-productive labour.

As it emerged in the womb of the feudal mode of production, capital subjugated labour at first without effecting revolutionary break-up of the material basis of production in the society's productive forces. Typical of that period was what is referred to as *formal subordination of labour to capital*, which means that labour was not entirely subjugated by capital. In that period, capitalism was developing on the basis of primitive craft technology which did not allow for any substantial increases in the production of commodities. The content of labour was not affected by any profound, revolutionary change. Labour involved the use of such means of production which did not transform production techniques. Manual labour remained the material foundation of production.

However, qualitative changes occurred in the mode of production and the character of labour. The feudal mode of production gave way to the

capitalist mode of production, to the institutions of capitalist private ownership and to hired labour. From then on, production was aimed at obtaining surplus value. In the early days of capitalism, however, the capitalists could only acquire more surplus value, that is, to increase the degree of the exploitation of workers, by lengthening the working day. The surplus value obtained through the absolute lengthening of the working day is *absolute surplus value*. The capitalists' goal in the period of formal subordination of labour to capital was to obtain absolute surplus value.

With the formal subordination of labour to capital, the content of labour came into contradiction with the character of labour. As the technical base of labour did not allow for the complete subordination of labour to capital, various methods of extra-economic coercion were applied. These measures included the enclosure (seizure) of peasants' land, efforts to drive them off their ancient places, and the adoption of harsh laws. Compulsory government legislation (for instance, that of 1349), required all persons between the ages of 12 and 60 who did not own land or other means of subsistence to work at capitalist enterprises. Leaving one's employer before the expiry of the term of hire was punishable by imprisonment. Under the Statute on the Workers issued in 1351, those who

refused to work were to be put in stocks and imprisoned. The workers who left their employer were outlawed and branded.

In their drive to prolong the working day, the capitalists went to the extreme. If they could, they would have made their employees work 24 hours a day. Yet the physiological need to eat, drink, sleep, etc., set physical limits to the working day. However, apart from physical limits, there are moral limits imposed by the need to satisfy cultural and social requirements.

With labour formally subordinated to capital, the capitalists sought to extend the working day to its physical limits. In England, under a law enacted in 1446, the working day in spring and summer lasted from 5 a.m. to 7 p.m. or 8 p.m., with three meal breaks adding up to three hours. In other words, the actual duration of the working day amounted to 11 or 12 hours. Under the law, the working day in winter lasted from 5 a.m. until dusk. Such laws made the workers' labour and life itself a hell.

As capitalism developed, both the implements of labour used by craftsmen and manual labour itself gave way to machinery. The social division of labour and the division of labour within individual capitalist enterprises underwent far-reaching changes. The industrial revolution enhanced the prevalence of the past objectified labour over live labour. Past labour swelled

rapidly due to the appropriation by the capitalists of the unpaid labour of hired workers. Surplus value was absorbed, on an increasing scale, in machinery, installations and buildings which grew in number at an unprecedented pace. As it pumped out more and more surplus value from the hired workers, objectified labour was increasingly turned into accumulated surplus value. Objectified labour became the sword of Damocles, as it were, urging people to labour on and on. This subordination of labour to capital which is characteristic of the era of the industrial revolution is referred to as *actual subordination*.

In the period of momentous growth in productive forces, possibilities opened up for the capitalists to increase surplus value by reducing the necessary working time without reducing the working day. This method does not involve any absolute increases in the duration of the working day. The surplus value obtained by the capitalist through reductions in the necessary working time and the corresponding increases in surplus time is referred to as *relative surplus value*.

Increased productivity of labour is essential to the production of relative surplus value. Increases in the productivity of labour in the industries producing the workers' requisite means of subsistence lead to reductions in the latter's cost. For their part, reductions in the cost of

the means of subsistence entail reductions in the cost of labour power. Hence, a reduction in necessary working time entails an increase in surplus working time.

Thus, the capitalists increase the degree of the workers' exploitation not only by establishing a longer working day (thus obtaining absolute surplus value) but also by promoting higher labour productivity (gaining relative surplus value).

Under capitalism, there were three stages in the growth of labour productivity. At the first stage in the development of capitalism in industry, the process of labour mainly depended on the use of manual techniques, just as it did in craftsmen's workshops. There was no division of labour within an enterprise. However, the process of labour in a capitalist workshop differed from that in craftsmen's workshops in at least one respect: the collective labour of many hired workers toiling under the command of a capitalist had replaced craftsmen's individual labour at their own enterprises. This stage in the development of capitalist production is referred to as *simple capitalist cooperation of labour.*

The second stage in the development of capitalism in industry was different from the first stage in that the collective labour of many hired workers at capitalist enterprises now involved not only simple cooperation but also the division of labour among the workers. The production

of a commodity was divided into a series of operations with different workers responsible for each. This stage in the development of capitalist production is referred to as the *manufactory period of capitalism.*

A manufactory is an enterprise functioning on the basis of the division of labour and manual craft techniques. Manufactories emerged in two ways: craftsmen specialising in the same field were united under the command of a capitalist in one workshop, each of them performing one operation, or else, craftsmen specialising in various fields worked together, under the command of a capitalist, in the same workshop, performing successive operations. By contrast with the artisan who worked on his own and performed all the production operations alone, the manufactory worker was responsible only for a part of the production process. He was thus a partial, or detail, worker. He could not work outside the manufactory because he owned no means of production and because he was not skilled enough to produce commodities on his own, performing all the operations by himself.

The working conditions at the manufactories were harsh. The work, which involved endless repetition of simple operations, degraded the workers both physically and morally. The working day lasted for 18 hours or even longer, and the pay was miserable.

The rise of manufactories led to a considerable expansion of capitalist production. However, since manufactory production was based on the application of handicraft techniques, there came a time when its narrow technical basis and the kind of labour it employed entered into contradiction with the requirements of the expanding capitalist production and the market.

The rise of manufactory production created prerequisites for a transition to the third stage, the stage of *large-scale machine industry*. The manufactory was replaced by the factory. A factory is an industrial enterprise based on the application of the *machine system*. A factory, just as a manufactory, uses the collective labour of hired workers. However, the division of labour at a factory differs from that at a manufactory. In the case of the latter, the division of labour is based on the detail worker and his tool. At a factory, the backbone of production is the cooperation of machinery.

The capitalist factory marks a new stage in the enslavement of labour by capital. At the factory, the worker turns into an appendage of the machine. The capitalist manner of the application of machinery leads to longer working hours, the involvement of women and children in production, the formation of an army of the jobless, and the increasing impoverishment of the proletariat. Under capitalism, however, there

are certain limits to the application of machinery. The capitalists introduce machines only when their cost is lower than the wages of the workers which they oust. The capitalist uses machines only if they yield profit. That is why machine production never fully eliminates the need for manual labour.

The capitalist factory makes the antithesis between manual and mental labour more pronounced. Arduous physical labour devoid of a creative meaning is the manual workers' lot. Mental labour becomes clearly distinct from physical labour and is performed by a small number of hired employees (engineers, technicians, etc.). Apart from being responsible for technical management and supervision, they participate, on behalf and in the interest of the capitalists, in organising the exploitation of wage workers. Having relegated the functions of running the production to hired managers, the owner of a capitalist factory concentrates supreme power over labour in his own hands.

The three stages in the development of capitalism in industry are at the same time three stages in the development of the production of relative surplus value. That is why there can be no equality between objectified and live labour. Objectified labour serves as an instrument for the enslavement of live labour and has a complete sway over the latter.

The actual subordination of labour to capital transforms the content, character and process of labour. At the same time, the general characteristics of formal subordination do not fade away at the stage marked by the real subordination of labour to capital. This is due to the fact that the two kinds of subordination of labour to capital evolve on a common basis – capitalist private ownership and the exploitation of hired labour.

2. Labour as a Means of Existence

Under capitalism, labour is a means of a worker's existence only if the worker sells his labour power to the capitalist. He can buy the articles of personal consumption he needs if he receives wages or a pension or is covered by some other form of social security. If he fails to sell his labour power, he joins the unemployed.

Wages have a special role to play in the process whereby labour is subordinated to capital. Superficially, wages appear as the price of labour power and therefore conceal the exploitation of labour. Wages do not reflect the division of the working time into necessary, surplus, paid and unpaid working time.

As far as the working man is concerned, under

capitalism, labour is merely a way for him to make money. All the labour expended by the worker is nothing but a means of getting the things which are essential to his existence. That is why the worker believes his wages to be a payment for his labour. The worker gets his wages only after he has expended his labour power. This bolsters his illusion that his wages are a payment for the entire work he has performed.

In actual fact, wages mask relations of the exploitation of workers by capitalists because they erase any trace of the division of the working time into necessary and surplus working time, and into paid-for and unpaid-for working time. Under capitalism, the division of the working day into necessary and surplus working time is camouflaged by the relations of sale of labour power. In the course of production, the worker creates a value that is larger than the value of his own labour power. Therefore, wages constitute part of the newly created value. The rest of the latter – the surplus value – is appropriated by the capitalist without any remuneration paid out to the worker.

The size of the wages is an essential indicator of the living standards of the working class. There are nominal and real wages. The sum of money received by the worker for the sale of his labour power to the capitalist is referred to as *nominal wages*. *Real wages* stand for the

quantity of goods and services that the worker can actually buy with his money wages at a given level of the prices of his means of subsistence and at a given level of his nominal wages.

Under capitalism, the level of real wages always displays, in the long run, a tendency towards decline. This is due to numerous factors which often have opposite – increasing and decreasing – effects (changes in the cost of labour power, growing unemployment, greater proportion of women and children who work for low wages, etc.).

The level of workers' wages is not the same in different capitalist countries. This is due to many reasons. It would certainly be wrong to assume that the capitalists in some countries display a more generous attitude towards the workers than the capitalists in other countries. In every country, the capitalists seek to reduce wages to the minimum. However, when comparing wages in different countries one should take into account the historical conditions under which the working class in the given country has been formed, the level of the workers' material and spiritual needs, the cost of acquiring skills, the productivity of labour, the class struggle, the climate, and other factors.

The wages are especially low in developing countries. This is one of the grave consequences of colonialism. According to UN statistics, the

average worker's wages in Africa are currently equal to at most one-tenth of a worker's wages in West European countries. Even at the industrial factories of the developing countries the majority of workers drag out a semi-beggarly existence. Apart from large-scale factory industries, developing countries still have traditional – domestic and artisan – industries where the level of remuneration is much lower than at the large-scale factories.

The origins of the wage system applied in the traditional industries date back to the epoch of colonialism when the workers were subjected to rapacious exploitation as a homogeneous source of cheap muscle power and when the colonial powers gave no heed to the adequate reproduction of labour power.

A comparatively higher level of factory wages is attributable to the fact that the development of factory industry generated a need for more skilled labour. Since the cost of such labour power was higher, the wages had to be increased. Even the wages of semi-skilled workers in factory industries are often 3 to 5 times as high as the average income of workers in the traditional industries. On the whole, in the developing countries the differences between wages in various sectors of the economy are more pronounced than in the developed capitalist states.

Within the factory industries, the rates of remuneration of labour differ greatly depending on the size of the factories and the workers' skill grade. At the larger factories with a higher level of mechanisation and more complicated production processes requiring high quality work, the remuneration is higher.

In the developing countries, a skilled worker earns two or three times as much money as an unskilled worker. The differentiation is made even greater due to the fact that large factories are covered by social security and insurance systems, the minimum social guarantees established by the state, profit-sharing systems, and by services granted free of charge or at a discount (medical care, company transportation to and from work, subsidised meals, child-care facilities, etc.). Workers at large factories are often provided with cheaper housing. However, the mass of the proletarians have no access to the benefits and guarantees which supplement the working people's direct income and elevate their living standards.

On the whole, an analysis of the differences in wages determined by the conditions of production reveals the following tendency: the further is the distance from the modern economic sectors to the traditional ones, from industry to agriculture, from large enterprises to smaller ones, from large cities to outlying districts, the

lower the workers' wages.

The differentiation in payment for the work done is largely influenced by differences in wage levels between the public sector and the private sector. All categories of workers employed at private enterprises get higher wages than their counterparts in the public sector. In the private sector, the gap between the wages of skilled and unskilled workers is greater. This is due to the fact that the private sector is market-oriented, that is, it is guided by the correlation between the demand for and the supply of labour force. In contrast, the government wage policies which the state-owned enterprises adhere to are aimed at supporting the poorer workers and narrowing the wage gap.

The level of wages in developing countries is increasingly influenced by transnational corporations (TNCs). At TNC-controlled enterprises the wages are considerably lower than at similar enterprises in developed countries. By establishing meagre hourly wages at their enterprises, the TNCs force their workers to agree to a longer working day. For instance, at the Singapore and South Korean affiliates of U.S. corporations, the working day is longer than that at similar enterprises in the United States by 18 and 24 per cent, respectively. In the past, low wages in the developing countries were due to low labour productivity.

Nowadays, as production is increasingly automated, labour productivity in the newly-independent states has virtually reached that in the developed countries. Nonetheless, the difference in the wages of workers in the developing and developed countries persists.

In developing countries, the differentiation in wages is largely due to racial, sexual, caste, religious and other discrimination. Discrimination is often effected through a system of bans depriving certain categories of workers of access to prestigious, high-paying jobs. This tendency is especially evident in the employment of women: in developing countries they are mostly employed on non-prestigious, unskilled manual jobs in the least productive industries, trade and services. As a result, women's wages average from 50 to 65 per cent of men's wages. Whenever the employment situation changes for the worse, women are the first to lose jobs.

Unconcealed inequality dominates the picture of the migrant workers' employment opportunities, wages and social rights. Deprived of all rights, these workers are used as a cheap labour force on casual unskilled jobs. Their wages are 20 to 50 per cent lower than those of the regular workers. An intermediary position between the regular army of the industrial proletariat and the migrant workers is occupied by the indentured workers recruited in the

countryside or in the poorer urban quarters. The average wages of the indentured workers vary from 60 to 65 per cent of those of the regular workers.

In developing countries differentiation in the payment for work is largely determined by extra-economic factors. However, as the young states' economies develop, economic factors come to the fore and the wage differentiation picture comes to resemble that in the developed countries.

It should be noted that wages and salaries are not the only sources of the working people's income.

As the capitalist mode of production matured, small producers were increasingly deprived of the means of production, and a huge army of the proletariat emerged. Unemployment, production-related injuries, occupational diseases, premature disablement and ageing were the "benefits" granted to the working class by capitalism. For decades, the workers waged a class struggle to improve their position and working conditions and to contain runaway exploitation. The working class was growing stronger and better organised. Despite the capitalists' stubborn resistance, workers organised strikes, associated in trade unions and gradually succeeded in making their life more tolerable as their wages were raised and social insurance benefits insti-

tuted. The latter will be the subject of our further discussion.

As a rule, capitalist countries have one or more of the following *public social security systems*: social insurance, public assistance and what is known as "universal" social security. Social security, the most widespread system, is based on the obligatory deduction of insurance fees from the hired workers' wages. It grants the right to a pension and welfare payments (provided certain requirements – length of insurance, age, etc. – are satisfied) irrespective of the financial situation of the insured person's family.

Public assistance benefits are paid, in their entirety, from the state budget only to persons who have been officially recognised, after a check on the income of all the members of the family, as having no means of subsistence. The system does not cover, therefore, all the workers who have no earnings. Disablement or unemployment public assistance payments are granted by administrative bodies at their own discretion.

The universal system, which mainly involves pension benefits, is used in Sweden, Finland, Norway, Canada and Spain. All persons who have achieved the retirement age, become disabled or lost their breadwinner are entitled to a pension. The fixed pension rate is the same for all. The pension fund is raised through

a special taxation system covering all the citizens from the age of 16 to 18 and up to the retirement age.

Apart from the public social security system, protection against the potential loss of earnings is provided by private insurance. This system is founded on the principles of capitalist private enterprise which secure profit for the owners of insurance companies.

In the developing countries, the most widespread form of social security is what is known as the provident fund system. A provident fund is intended to ensure each worker's personal responsibility for his own welfare through making personal savings. This institution resembles a savings bank, the only difference being that contributions and payments are compulsory.

In the developing countries, the social security system covers an insignificant proportion of the population, including civil servants, servicemen (in some Asian and African countries, only these two groups enjoy social security) and some of the hired workers employed in the modern sector of the economy (with the eligibility of the latter group depending on the industry, the size of the labour force employed at the given enterprise and the size of wages). The inhabitants of rural areas, who make up the majority of the developing countries' population, and also artisans, small traders, servants and

workers in the non-organised sector of the economy are not entitled to social security.

Let us now consider the way social security funds are made up under capitalism. In the capitalist countries, factory and office workers are the main source of contributions to social insurance. The share of the working people's contributions in the total amount of all contributions to the social security funds is 29.5 per cent in the United States, 31.9 per cent in Austria, 35 per cent in Canada, 48.1 per cent in Holland and 63 per cent in Greece.

In some countries, the share of workers' contributions to the social insurance funds varies from 4 to 30 per cent of their wages. For instance, an Austrian worker has to contribute 8.75 per cent of his monthly wages for old age, disability and loss-of-breadwinner insurance, 3.65 per cent for sickness and maternity insurance, 1 per cent for unemployment insurance and 3 per cent for the family allowance tax. Altogether, the contributions to the social insurance funds add up to 16.4% of the worker's monthly wages.

As a result of periodical increases in the size of insurance contributions, the latter come to account for a growing share in the working people's average wages.

It might seem that the huge and constantly growing sums coming to the capitalist state budgets from the tax-payers and intended for social

security should create the material basis for improving the working masses' social security. However, the capitalists are unwilling to part with anything they lay their hands on. The bourgeois governments skilfully manipulate with the funds that actually belong to working people, using them in the interests of the exploitative classes. A considerable proportion of the funds made up of the working people's contributions for social insurance is never paid back to the workers. The workers' contributions to social security funds exceed benefits payable from the latter by 18.1 per cent in Canada, 10.6 per cent in Finland, 16.6 per cent in Iceland, 27.4 per cent in Japan, 15.6 per cent in the Netherlands, 27.4 per cent in Portugal, 18.2 per cent in Sweden, 13.9 per cent in Switzerland and 10.3 per cent in the United States.

In many capitalist countries, the system of compulsory social insurance is used as a form of additional taxation. That is why the fixed size of insurance contributions is from 1.5 to 5 times higher than is required to form a distributable fund. In Turkey, for instance, only 54 per cent of the money collected from the working people in the form of the social security tax is actually used for social security purposes. The rest goes to cover other expenditures made by the state.

In the capitalist countries, the working people's

participation in the formation of social security funds is not limited to their making obligatory contributions for social insurance in the amount established by the law. Some workers rely on various private insurance plans available at their enterprise or firm so as to become entitled to a pension which is larger or is granted on more convenient terms. As a rule, the methods of financing and spending private pension funds are not regulated by legislation. Therefore, the workers have no guaranteed right to a pension paid out of such funds. If a worker changes his place of employment, he forfeits both the right to a pension and the money already contributed to the fund.

In accordance with the international legal standards established by the International Labour Organisation, social security comprises the following nine kinds of insurance: medical aid, sickness benefits, unemployment benefits, old-age pensions, benefits payable in case of production-related injuries and occupational diseases, family benefits, maternity benefits, disability pensions, and loss-of-breadwinner pensions. None of the capitalist countries has introduced all of them. Only socialist societies have succeeded in doing so.

One hundred and eighteen capitalist countries have passed legislation on at least one kind of social security. Old-age, disability and

loss-of-breadwinner pensions are provided for by the legislation in 107 countries, temporary disablement and maternity allowances, in 59 countries, industrial accident and occupational disease compensations, in 108 countries.

At present, pensions constitute the most developed and large-scale type of social insurance. The capitalist state regulates the terms of granting a pension (such as age, length of insurance, service or citizenship), the pension rate (which can be fixed, minimal, or proportional to the wages), and the procedure for the formation of insurance funds.

In developing countries, too, pension schemes are now the best developed and most widespread form of social security. They cover all wage workers in most Latin American, Caribbean and African countries, and one out of every three Asian countries. The methods of calculating the size of a pension are basically similar in the developed and developing countries. In the latter, however, there are great differences in terms of importance attached to the pensionable length of service, the rate of the wages on the basis of which pensions are calculated, and the extent to which the overall length of service is taken into account. The minimum and maximum sizes of pensions are also different.

The pensionable age for men is 60 in Italy,

France, Japan and Turkey, 65 in Belgium, Great Britain, the USA, the FRG and Mexico, and 67 in Norway, Sweden and some other countries. In actual fact, intensification of production renders the workers aged between 40 and 45 (especially those who have assembly-line jobs) incapable of performing technical operations accurately and quickly enough. Elderly people are the first to be dismissed. Statistics show that the proportion of the elderly among the unemployed is always higher than that of other age groups. It should also be noted that preferential pension schemes for those employed on arduous or noxious jobs are limited in scope.

Most of the pension schemes now in effect in Latin America establish the legal pensionable age at 60 or 65 (with the exception of Uruguay, where the pensionable age is 70). In some countries women become eligible for a pension five years earlier than men. In most Asian and African countries, the pensionable age is 60. This is a rather high ceiling if one takes into account the fact that the average life expectancy in many developing countries – 50 years – is far below the life expectancy in the developed countries. Retirement at a younger age for those employed on arduous or noxious jobs is practiced in some Latin American countries (Argentina, Brazil,

Colombia, Nicaragua, Peru, Venezuela), Iran and Turkey. This measure, however, covers only persons who have made social security contributions for a sufficiently long time or worked at the given enterprise for an established period.

The size of the benefits paid out on the attainment of the pensionable age or the expiry of a required period of service or insurance is not large, normally amounting to 25-40 per cent of the earnings, which does not guarantee even the minimal means of subsistence. There are several reasons for this. First, the size of the pensions often depends on the length of service, which puts most of the labour force, mainly recruited relatively recently from among the village people, at a disadvantage. Second, the small size of pensions is due to the extremely low level of wages. In the Brazilian automotive industry, for instance, the workers' wages are equal to 6.9 per cent of the American automobile workers' wages; in Argentina, to 6.4 per cent; in the Philippines, to 4 per cent; in Mexico, to 23.7 per cent; in Venezuela, to 18.5 per cent; and in Peru, to 17.3 per cent. Moreover, because of the higher rates of inflation, the size of the pensions in real, money terms in the developing countries is considerably lower than that in the developed countries. Rises in the prices of

consumer goods virtually bring to naught both the value of the pensions and the governments' attempts to make adjustments for inflation by paying additional benefits. If one stops working before attaining the pensionable age, his pension is cut down.

In the capitalist countries, the provision of disability and loss-of-breadwinner pensions is also limited. In the United States, for instance, 12.3 per cent of the people between 20 and 64 years of age, that is, 14,300,000, are disabled invalids. However, only 7 per cent of them are disability pension recipients.

In the capitalist countries, disability and loss-of-breadwinner pensions, just as old-age pensions, are small in size. The number of people entitled to them is limited because of the stringent requirements as regards the cause of disability or death, and the period of insurance. In Austria, for instance, only those who have paid 260 weekly insurance fees are entitled to a disability pension (in the FRG, the required quota is 60 monthly fees, and in Italy, 5 yearly fees). In Switzerland, only workers who have been paying insurance fees from the age of 21 without a year's interruption are eligible for a disability pension.

When the provision of disability pensions is stipulated by the legislation, pensions are granted in the event of complete and perma-

nent disability, or in the event of the loss of at least two-thirds of one's ability to work. Another condition for the granting of a disability pension is a reduction in earnings by 66 to 80 per cent. In Denmark, disability pensions are granted to persons who have lost two-thirds of their ability to work. In Finland, a disability pension is granted to the completely disabled. As the fully disabled and those who have lost two-thirds of their ability to work account for only 35 to 40 per cent of the total number of invalids, the majority of the latter in the capitalist countries are left without a pension.

Allowances for children as a form of social security are the least widespread: they are granted in only 65 countries. No allowances for children have ever been introduced in the United States, for instance. Normally, the eligibility for such allowances depends on the size of the family and the family income. The legislation in West Germany, Japan and some other countries, for instance, provides for the payment of such allowances only to families which have three or more children. In most cases, this is a token allowance: in Australia, for instance, it amounts to $ 0.5 per child, and in Great Britain, £ 1 per child (per week). To make things worse, being in receipt of such a negligible sum deprives the working members

of the family of tax benefits.

A relatively new element in the system of social security for families with children is the payment of allowances to unmarried mothers. In capitalist society, however, such an allowance, if provided at all, is granted for a comparatively short period of time (in France, for instance, for only three years).

In capitalist society, the child's interests are neglected even before its birth. Take, for instance, the attitudes to maternity. In many Western countries, even those having special nationwide laws in this regard, not all working women are granted an adequately long maternity leave and an appropriate compensation for the loss of wages during the leave. The number of women entitled to a maternity allowance is usually limited by the requirement that they have an uninterrupted work record of at least two years. The school leavers, college graduates and those working women who have changed the place of work are thus deprived of the right to a maternity allowance.

In the developing countries, the provision of a paid maternity leave is regulated by the sum total of contributions for social insurance. There are many other limitations. In Singapore, for instance, women are entitled to a maternity leave not more than three times in their lifetime.

Both in the developed and the developing countries, the length of the maternity leave is inadequate. In some capitalist states, it is only six weeks long. In some developing countries, among them Nepal, Saudi Arabia and South Korea, maternity leaves are not granted at all. In Hong Kong, women are entitled to only ten days of unpaid leave. The size of the allowance is likewise limited: in Austria and Japan it equals 60 per cent of the woman's wages; in Spain, 75 per cent; in Italy, 80 per cent; and only in Denmark and France, it amounts to 90 per cent of the wages. In the developing countries of Asia, the size of the allowance varies from 33 to 80 per cent of the woman's wages. It should also be noted that in many countries maternity allowances do not constitute an independent type of social insurance. They are often substituted by sickness or unemployment allowances and that leads to a shorter term of payment because no benefits are paid during what is known as the waiting period.

The extreme degree of the working people's social insecurity in the capitalist countries manifests itself, among other things, in the health service. The bourgeois governments find it too burdensome to take care of the workers' health and make every effort to shift the burden of health-care expenditures on the working peo-

ple. The employers may display some interest in taking disease prevention measures only if such efforts yield profit, as preventive measures often help them avoid losses which are due to reduced labour productivity or workers' sickness.

In the capitalist countries, most workers cannot afford timely treatment or hospitalisation because they lack disability insurance. Meanwhile, the importance of medical expenses insurance is brought into sharp focus by the figures illustrating the loss of working days due to sickness. In the United States, the loss of working time caused by temporary disability is illustrated by the fact that 17 per cent of all industrial workers fail to report to work during the year. The workers in the capitalist countries cannot afford being sick. Only two of the latter – Great Britain and Italy – have public medical care systems. The rest of the countries have paid health services. In many instances, the so-called free public health service is state-sponsored only in form, while in essence it is similar to private health care.

In most capitalist countries, the insured workers have to reimburse part of the cost of their health care. In France, for instance, the insured person covers 20 per cent of all the expenses involved in his treatment, with the exception of the cost of certain medicines. In the United States, the patient is obliged

to pay a hospitalisation fee and reimburse all the expenses incurred during his stay in the hospital over and above the established time limit (usually, 70 to 90 days).

The working people find themselves in an extremely difficult position because of the lack of free medical aid which is often accompanied by the lack of sickness benefits. The average annual sum an American family is compelled to spend on medical services is roughly equal to the monthly earnings of the head of the family. The sum continuously increases because the cost of medical services grows uncontrollably. In the United States, for instance, the cost of medical services trebled between 1979 and 1981. Since 1965, it has grown by 700 per cent.

In the case of sickness or accident, a working person has to shoulder a double burden: throughout the period of disability, he does not receive any wages and has to pay for the treatment. Temporary disability cash payments or sickness benefits, as they are referred to in the international practice, are granted in a limited number of cases. In the capitalist countries, only part of workers are entitled to a temporary disability benefit. The latter is paid out only if the cause of disability is indicated in the very short list of disability causes eligible for compensation. In most

countries, benefits are paid out only in the event of an industrial accident or an occupational disease. In very few countries the benefit is granted in other cases as well.

Temporary disability benefits are granted only to those who have paid a certain amount of fees to the insurance fund by the time of disability. This puts young workers, as well as seasonal and casual workers, at a disadvantage.

A serious limitation is imposed by the system of waiting periods, widely applied in capitalist countries. Under this system, the worker who has fallen sick spends the first few days of his illness (seven days in the United States, three days in Great Britain, Austria and Belgium, and six days in Denmark) "waiting" for the sickness benefit. As the disability period does not normally last more than five days, this regulation leaves 80 per cent of the sick without a compensation.

The size of the temporary disability benefit is established as a percentage – usually no more than 50 per cent – of the minimum wages. Insurance benefits cover an average of 19 per cent of family medical care expenses.

In the developing countries, there is a whole set of limitations restricting the working people's right to sickness benefits. In Turkey, for instance, the worker is entitled to sickness benefits only in the event he has paid insurance fees

for at least 120 days within the twelve months preceding his illness. Similar limitations exist in many other countries. Still another limitation is the government-established minimum number of workers employed at each enterprise. For instance, employers in Saudi Arabia pay out sickness benefits only if they hire at least 20 wage workers.

Thus, in the capitalist countries the situation of the temporarily disabled workers is difficult indeed. The system of social insurance against temporary disability is either non-existent or fails to provide adequate benefits.

Unemployment insurance is a specific type of social security under capitalism. It has been growing in importance as the army of the unemployed has swelled. However, unemployment insurance is limited in scale: nowhere does it involve all the wage workers. In Canada, for instance, it covers 89 per cent, in France, 60 per cent, and in Italy, 51 per cent of the labour force. In 1981, according to the US Department of Labour statistics, unemployment insurance covered less than a third of the labour force in the USA. As a rule, the unemployment insurance legislation does not cover civil servants, low- and high-income workers, seasonal workers and some other categories of employees.

The worker must have a record of service

of a certain length (at least 48 weeks in the United States, for instance) to qualify for unemployment benefits. Another condition is being in receipt of a certain sum during the quarter preceding unemployment. Thus school leavers, college and university graduates and other people who start looking for a job for the first time are deprived of the right to the unemployment benefits for they do not have a previous record of unemployment insurance.

In contrast with the social insurance pensions, which are paid throughout the established term (for instance, old-age pensions are paid for life, and disability pensions – over the period of disability), the period during which workers are entitled to unemployment benefits does not coincide with the period of the applicant's search for a job. In all countries except Belgium, the period when the unemployment benefit is paid out is rigidly regulated. In the United States, for instance, it cannot last more than 20 weeks. As a result, the majority of the unemployed (as many as 67 per cent in the United States in 1983) do not get any social security benefits.

Let us consider the size of the unemployment benefits. Bourgeois propaganda presents a distorted picture of the social insurance legislation in capitalist countries. By concentrating on selected legal provisions and ignoring

others, it creates the impression that the unemployed are in receipt of a sum that equals the working person's wages. Indeed, in some countries, bourgeois legislation on social unemployment insurance does include standards that formally provide for such a possibility. However, the reservations accompanying the legislation in question actually bring the declared rights to naught. An analysis of the legislation currently in effect in some capitalist countries reveals that unemployment benefits are never equal to wages, amounting to 40 per cent of the latter in Austria, 44.8 per cent in West Germany, 60 per cent in Belgium and Switzerland, and about 50 per cent in the United States. Thus, the unemployment benefits doom the jobless and their families to a semi-beggarly existence. Such are the realities of the capitalist world.

In the majority of the developing countries, there is no unemployment insurance. In Iran and Turkey, for instance, the law obliges the employers to pay a lump sum to the workers they dismiss. However, the size of such benefits is ludicrous: they amount to 15-day wages per each year of work. Moreover, in Turkey such allowances are only paid if the dismissed worker has worked for at least three years by the day he is dismissed.

In all the capitalist countries, the social

security system is complemented by the public assistance system. The distinctive features of the latter are as follows: (a) public assistance covers only those workers whose income is below a certain level; (b) assistance is provided after a check on the potential beneficiary's financial situation; (c) assistance funds come from general tax revenue; (d) the management of public assistance funds rests with the local authorities.

Public assistance has two functions: (a) the provision of additional income to persons who are not entitled to benefits or to those whose benefits are not large enough for them to be considered living above the official "poverty line"; (b) assistance to the needy families with children. A person who qualifies for benefits under the latter programme also qualifies for assistance under two more programmes; (a) medical care and free food stamps, and (b) "general assistance" in the form of a money allowance to the working poor, persons with a long record of unemployment, and the like.

The people in the West suffer from continuous cuts in government allocations for public assistance purposes. In the United States, for instance, the allocations for food stamps for the poor and for benefits payable to poor families with children were cut as of 1982. In 1979, the food stamp and child-benefit programmes involved 6,000,000 families or 22 million people,

of whom 50 per cent were children under 17; 8 per cent, old people and the rest – persons living below the official poverty level or the disabled. After the 1982 public assistance cuts, nearly one million people in the above category were deprived of public assistance. That saved the government 1.9 billion dollars.

Thus, the entire capitalist social security system is essentially financed by the working people themselves.

The capitalists persistently seek to reduce workers' wages and social security benefits to a level which would be barely sufficient for the working man to acquire a minimum of basic necessities. This certainly secures greater profits for the capitalist class.

Unwilling to put up with the situation, the working class wages a struggle for higher incomes and a better life.

As to the bourgeoisie, in its fight against the working class it relies on all the elements in the bourgeois society's superstructure – the state, the law, the Church, the mass media, etc. Moreover, the capitalists set up employers' unions so as to oppose the workers in a united front.

In order to be able to repulse the capitalist onslaught, workers associate in trade unions. The latter organise the working people for a struggle to improve their economic position.

It is only in the bitter *class struggle* between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie that a certain level of wages and social benefits is attained. If the workers on strike show sufficient resolve and persistence, the capitalists may be compelled to accept their terms and raise their wages or improve social security. At present, the working class struggle for better living conditions is being waged on an especially large scale.

The struggle of the working class has brought about some improvements in social security systems. In a number of countries, codes and other legislative acts on social security were promulgated. In the developed capitalist countries, participation in the social insurance system is obligatory for the wage worker, and the system covers broad sections of the population.

The *economic struggle* waged by the proletariat is of great importance. However, while recognising the significance of the working class economic struggle, Marxists-Leninists maintain that in and of itself it cannot deliver the workers from exploitation. Only the elimination of the capitalist mode of production by way of *revolutionary political struggle* can eradicate the conditions for the economic and political oppression of the working class.

3. Capitalist Organisation of Labour

Adjustments in the wage system cannot resolve all the problems arising from the growing exploitation of hired labour. The capitalist is still faced with a situation when even higher wages fail to make the worker maintain a high level of labour productivity or prevent spoilage and absenteeism. That is why the capitalist seeks to overcome the limitations inherent in the wage adjustments by improving the organisation of labour. He makes efforts to reduce the number of monotonous, arduous, non-creative jobs. Advanced labour organisation at individual enterprises in an economy regulated by chaotic market fluctuations and subject to frequent crises and slumps is typical of capitalist society.

The organisation of labour at capitalist enterprises is called upon to bring the workers into contact with the means of production in the course of labour. This includes concrete work assignments to each worker; the selection of adequate forms of production relationships among the workers responsible for individual parts of production; setting up and servicing work stations; establishing work techniques; creating adequate working conditions; setting production norms; providing work incentives, and ensuring labour discipline.

Organisation of labour holds a special place in

the evolution of various forms of capitalist exploitation. One can distinguish between two stages in the capitalist organisation of labour. The first is associated with *Taylorism*, the widespread system of production management first introduced by the American engineer Frederick W. Taylor. The second was marked by the use of *group forms of labour organisation*.

The Taylor system is grounded on the assumption that man, when engaged in production, is incapable of creativity or self-organisation, is essentially lazy, and works only under coercion and supervision, or under the threat of being fined or sacked. Man is assumed to be a dumb element in an industrial system, a component adjusted to the latter by technology. Taylorism preached subordination of the worker to the machine, a process ushered in by the industrial revolution.

The undemanding and primitively educated wage worker suited the capitalists at the initial stage in the development of capitalism. According to Taylor, the worker was expected to automatically perform several thousand monotonous operations a day, rather than to display an ability for creative or professional thinking.

The introduction of the Taylor system involved a time study – to a fraction of a second – of all production operations. The norms were set on the basis of the production time expended on each

operation by specially selected skilled workers. Separate wage rates were established for those who fulfilled the norm and for those who failed to do so. The wages of the second group were much lower than those of the first. As a result, labour productivity increased while the wage fund remained practically the same; this led to a tremendous rise in the level of exploitation.

Taylorism, tenacious of life, has persisted throughout the scientific and technological revolution. In the context of automated production, capitalism continues to reproduce the worker as an appendage to the machine; it subordinates the working man to machinery, technology, and the mode, measurement and remuneration of work.

At the same time, as the scientific and technological revolution progressed, Taylorism began to show signs of its inherent limitations. The narrow specialisation and rigid setting of work impeded the development of workers' creative initiative and prevented them from improving their skills and professional knowledge. As new technology was introduced on a growing scale, the Taylor system proved increasingly incapable of ensuring higher labour efficiency and a lower rate of spoilage. Conveyorized assembly, the *alma mater* of Taylorism, became symbolical of the alienation of labour. The Taylor system, with its time study and norm-fixing, proved inadequate in

the epoch of the scientific and technological revolution. It had to be supplemented with many other work organisation methods–the analytical assessment of the production operations, the length of the working day, the time spent on individual operations, the degree of man's attachment to his work station, and the number of shifts. This has given rise to the advocacy of a "human relations" concept which regards man involved in production as a social being.

The efforts to overcome Taylorism included the following: workers were assigned to work stations on the basis of rotation, attempts were made to broaden and enrich the content of individual and group labour and to set up autonomous work teams. The most far-reaching change in the organisation of labour involved the introduction of the collective (team) organisation of labour based on human psychology and physiology and taking into account the worker's personal interest in work. This system was necessitated by the restructuring of technology in the older industries and innovations in the advanced sectors.

At its modern stage, the team method of organisation of labour (which in fact originated long ago) is characterised by a much greater independence of work teams. This system offers not only a new type of linkage between technology and the worker but also a means

of more effective regulation of the social labour relations. In its advanced form, a work team features technical, technological and organisational integrity. United by a common time-specific task it is responsible for its fulfilment. The team is also independent in solving some of the questions related to work organisation and incentives. Such teams are capable of functioning without foremen, supervisors or quality inspectors.

Consider the experience of team organisation of work at the Volvo automotive concern, one of the leaders in the automotive industry. At a number of Volvo enterprises, each worker is put in charge of a certain segment of the production process. Within the latter, he is entitled to make independent decisions. He is fully responsible for his own work. If the labour process comprises several operations, he may vary their sequence so as to avoid monotony. He may, independently and at his own discretion, contact the specialists whose services he needs. Under this system, between 5 and 30 workers, given one assignment, form a group within which most internal managerial problems are settled without any interference from the higher management levels.

The method of team organisation of work had a major impact on the effectiveness of production. Labour productivity and output increased in 18

per cent of the cases surveyed, the moral climate improved and workmen became more satisfied with their jobs in 40 per cent of the cases, production costs dropped in 36 per cent of the cases, the quality of production improved in 20 per cent of the cases, the absenteeism rate was brought down in 23 per cent of the cases, and fluctuations in the supply of manpower were reduced in 17 per cent of the cases.

On the whole, the method of team organisation of work promotes higher productivity (although in many instances a drop in productivity during the adaptation period was observed), improves the quality of output, and reduces the amount of waste and the number of defective products (sometimes, by 30 to 80 per cent).

The improvement of collective discipline reduces the losses of working time. True, the measures to reorganise labour sometimes result in reductions in the number of workers, including part-time employees.

The team quality-control system has an important role to play in the organisation of labour. One of the forms of such control has been established by Japanese companies. The "quality control groups" set up at the enterprises have noticeably promoted the development of the workers' professional skills and creative initiative.

One of the consequences of the introduction of work teams is that some workers become re-

dundant. At the enterprises belonging to the companies which practice the team method, production personnel has been reduced by 11 to 40 per cent, while the personnel responsible for output quality and technological supervision has been cut by 28 to 50, and even 75 per cent. Against the background of mass unemployment, this manner of rendering people redundant is strongly opposed by the workers and trade unions who feel that improvements in the organisation of labour cause increased physical and mental strain.

The 1970s were marked by the active development of a new trend in bourgeois management science. Reflected in this trend was a growing conflict between the developing productive forces, on the one hand, and the outdated capitalist relations of production, on the other. The forms and methods of management applied by the Japanese firms are noteworthy in this respect.

One of the highlights of the Japanese system of production management is reliance on "human potentialities" and social manoeuvring entrusted by the capitalists to hired managers. Among the most widespread forms of management are: the hire-for-life system; wage increases and promotion depending on the length of service (the principle of seniority); continuous improvement of workers' skills; and a system of moral, psychological and material incentives

which links the workers' position to the overall results of the firm's activity.

The hire-for-life system covers roughly 35 per cent of the Japanese labour force employed by major companies and establishments in the state sector; it covers only a limited stratum of the highly skilled workers. By ensuring long-term employment, it places permanently employed workers in a privileged position by guaranteeing them employment, a growing income, and social and cultural services. By contrast, casual workers contracted for a day or a year (never more than a year) enjoy no privileges at all and may be fired at any moment.

The method of changing jobs is widely applied, along with other methods, in training and promoting young managers. Under this system, employees are transferred from one job to another within one enterprise or, in the case of larger companies, to different enterprises or affiliates. The aim is to enable them to gain experience in various fields so that, when promoted, they could cope with any job.

Another method widely applied by the Japanese firms is that of collective decision-making. Various possible approaches to the solution of a problem are made known to the workers and units concerned. Possible solutions are set forth in special documents in which all those involved in the discussion express their agreement or

disagreement with the solution suggested and make remarks, amendments, additions and clarifications. This document is passed from one level of management to another until it reaches the executive responsible for making the final decision.

This form of management constitutes an attempt to smooth over class contradictions and promote "trust" between the capitalist and the wage workers.

In actual fact, it only creates an illusion of a collective approach to managerial decision-making. Industrial firms and companies, and institutions in the state sector have a rigid, carefully elaborated and strictly hierarchical structure of management where unconditional authority is glossed over by various forms of "participation" and an artificially created climate of collective action.

The atmosphere of mutual trust and collectiveness is basically alien to capitalist enterprises where relations based on domination and subordination persist as an instrument of gaining profit. As a result, the workers are increasingly alienated from the process of labour.

While taking note of the exploitation-oriented nature and goals of the above innovations, one should bear in mind that their economic and technological aspects display a number of progressive trends. Even under capitalism, the new

management methods allow for a more rational use of working time, machinery and equipment, and create the conditions which match the new level of the workers' requirements.

Nonetheless, none of the above systems, not even the hire-for-life system, can ease the effect of the cruel laws governing the capitalist economy, nor reduce the scale of unemployment.

4. Unemployment: The Tragedy of Millions

In many cities and towns in the capitalist countries, virtually anyone knows where the labour exchange is. Many people come there every day in search of a job – any job. In terms of their social status, some of the job seekers belong to the lowest strata of society. They are social rejects; unless they manage to find a job, they face poverty, the loss of qualification and skill, and moral degradation.

Unemployment has a destructive effect on the working people. It signals the collapse of all their illusions. It destroys families, leads to higher crime-, sickness- and death-rates. According to US medical findings, a one per cent growth in the unemployment rate leads to a two per cent growth in the death rate, a 3.4 per cent rise in the number of mental patients and a 4 per

cent rise in the number of suicides.

People are willing to work, but capitalist society is in no position to provide them with jobs. What are the reasons for that? Karl Marx analysed the causes of unemployment and found that the demand for labour power is determined, not by the whole of the capital earmarked for purchasing machinery, equipment, buildings and labour power, but rather by that part of the capital which is used for acquiring labour power.

Outwardly, there is no link between unemployment and the capitalist form of labour. Bourgeois economists attribute both the excess and shortages of labour force to natural population growth. In actual fact, however, unemployment is determined, not by the population growth rate but by the capitalists' demand for labour power. The causes of unemployment are associated with the peculiarities of labour under capitalism rather than with the laws of nature.

As capitalism develops, an increasing proportion of the accumulated capital is invested in technical innovation and the production of new kinds of equipment, stock, fuel and materials, and not in the efforts to create new jobs. This means that with the development of capitalism an increasing percentage of capital is spent on innovating the means of labour, and, accordingly, a reduced share is used for the purposes of satisfying the demand of labour power

for jobs. Thus, what causes unemployment is not technical progress as such but the capitalist forms of utilizing it.

The capitalists take advantage of unemployment to intensify the exploitation of the working people. The fear of losing their jobs compels the wage workers to labour more intensively. As in bourgeois society they are not guaranteed the right to work, they may lose their jobs at any time.

There are three main forms of unemployment: casual, concealed and long-term.

Casual unemployment implies the loss of work for a comparatively short period. The causes of this form of unemployment are many and varied, the most important of them being the fact that capital accumulation at individual enterprises and within individual industries in different periods is uneven. Casual unemployment involves workers who lose their jobs because of the introduction of new machinery or the curtailment of production during the economic slump. In the older industries, the curtailment of production entails reductions in the number of jobs and creates a demand for labour power at newly-commissioned enterprises. In the process, some workers are ousted from the sphere of relations of labour, while others become involved in such relations.

The application of female and child labour,

which reduces the number of jobs available to men, intensifies casual unemployment. On attaining their majority, young workers are fired and start hunting for jobs.

Concealed unemployment occurs primarily in rural areas. Most of those hit by it are peasants and artisans crushed by competition. While formally they are still regarded as independent small-property owners, they are actually on the verge of being transformed into proletarians. However, with the towns abounding in the unemployed, urban industry is in no position to absorb them. They are thus compelled to stay in the rural areas and drag out a miserable existence. Nonetheless, registered as small-property owners, they are not regarded as unemployed. The moment capitalist production develops a demand for an additional labour force, the mass of rural inhabitants surges into towns under the pressure of concealed overpopulation.

Concealed overpopulation is also observed in urban areas where it hits small artisans and traders ruined by capitalist competition.

Long-term unemployment involves those numerous categories of workers whose casual earnings come from doing intermittent work, mostly at home. Whenever they manage to get an odd job, their working day is the longest and their earnings, a mere pittance.

The employment problem faced by the developing countries has some specific features which are largely due to the persistence of colonialist forms of the division of labour, to the existence of backward, semi-feudal structures and modes, and to specific demographic trends. Applicable to these countries is Lenin's description of pre-revolutionary Russia as a country suffering not so much from capitalism as from its insufficient development.

Bourgeois sociologists argue that the peculiarities of the employment situation in the developing countries are all traceable to the irregular pace of scientific and technological progress. Some bourgeois scholars, the institutionalists, hold that technological progress will result in the disappearance of crises and unemployment. They claim that capitalist industrialisation offers a way to eliminate unemployment in the countries of Asia, Africa and Latin America. It is common knowledge, however, that the employment problem in developing countries becomes increasingly acute as capitalist production relations develop and agrarian overpopulation grows.

Western corporations, attracted by the abundance of cheap labour, tend to transfer their labour-intensive industries to developing countries. In recent years, that has not helped the latter to control unemployment. The "attraction" is still there, but it has started to

fade: cheap labour now faces stiff competition from robots and computers, dangerous rivals that deliver people not only of arduous work but of work in general.

Uncontrolled, exceptionally high rates of urbanisation are characteristic of developing countries. The vestiges of feudalism and the lack of land – the plagues of the developing world – force peasants to flock to cities and towns. However, the scarcity of capital investment caused by the low marketability of the developing countries' commodities and by the fact that these states' economic resources are siphoned off by transnational corporations has resulted in a shortage of jobs in towns where unemployment often involves from 25 to 30 per cent of the labour force.

According to the estimates of some economists, by the year 2000 urbanisation in the developing countries will uproot and send to towns another billion people. The influx of people from the countryside cannot be expected to be matched by the creation of an adequate number of jobs. This particularly concerns the decades of the anticipated upsurge in the scientific and technological revolution (discussed in more detail later), when the emphasis in industry will shift from cheap labour power to technology. Only a handful of people out of the billion newcomers will be able to find jobs in towns.

To be unemployed, to be deprived by an unjust social order of the opportunity to work and maintain oneself and one's family – what can be more tragic? To be an outcast vainly searching for a job, to be deprived of the basic condition for life, to be uprooted – this is the lot of millions of people in capitalist countries.

Under capitalism, even the scientific and technological revolution, supposed to be a blessing for mankind, causes the army of the unemployed to swell and blights the life of the working people.

5. Scientific and Technological Revolution: the Aggravation of Contradictions between Labour and Capital

The scientific and technological revolution started in the 1960s. Since then, it has caused far-reaching changes in the content and organisation of labour by bringing into existence a new element in the system of machinery – computerised control units, by making possible the large-scale use of new types of energy, including atomic energy, and by introducing fundamentally new technologies, such as laser technology.

The development and application of new electronic equipment (such as microprocessors

and robots) and biotechnology as well as new processes making it possible to produce raw materials and products possessing amazing properties (for instance, rolled metal ten times stronger than that now in use) build up the potential of labour and promise tremendous economies in intellectual, physical and psychological efforts.

Major changes in the content of labour have been brought about by modern information processing technologies. They provide for practically instantaneous access to the information (texts, reproductions of pictures and technical drawings) available in public libraries and museums, to the videotape recordings of films or performances, computerised instruction in foreign languages, typing skills and machine control. Scientific methods have been developed for organising effective, far more productive work, introducing new technologies and effecting automation of the most complicated industries.

In the setting of the scientific and technological revolution, the process of labour is based on an integrated and ramified system linking science, production and consumption. With priority in this system given to science, expenditures involved in scientific research are growing dramatically.

The scientific and technological revolution has developed the potentialities of labour, heightening the latter's role in the rise of man as

the main productive force, improving the social forms of the organisation of labour, promoting the specialisation and cooperation of labour, and stimulating the growth of the social productivity of labour. The importance of labour in accelerating scientific and technological progress and developing man's abilities has thus been amplified.

The scientific and technological revolution induces far-reaching changes in the character of labour as well.

It causes a profound qualitative change in the social division of labour. More priority is given to specialisation in the production of parts and the application of technologies. Such specialisation is widely practiced in the US automotive industry where major parent firms rely on a broad network of affiliated suppliers, that is, specialised factories which produce parts. Relations between the major monopolies and the allied suppliers are based on the former's full sway over the latter. The monopolies dictate the prices of the suppliers' products, determine the volume of their output, and regulate all other aspects of their production activity.

The scientific and technological revolution spreads the specialisation of production beyond the scope of individual enterprises and industries. Individual capitalist countries specialise in producing certain types of goods which they sub-

sequently exchange. This gives rise to the international division of labour, the highest stage in the development of social territorial division of labour.

At the same time, the developed capitalist states and transnational corporations use the international division of labour in the setting of the scientific and technological revolution to exploit the developing countries. Developing economies become dependent on the imports of modern machinery, technologies and scientific knowledge – which they apply on a growing scale – from advanced industrial countries. While consuming Western technological innovations, the newly-independent states become involved in the international capitalist division of labour. In the process, they are turned into advanced countries' technological and economic appendages rather than equal partners.

While expanding the possibilities for economic growth in developing countries, the scientific and technological revolution broadens the gap between them and the developed states. The attempts of economically underdeveloped countries to assimilate, as quickly as possible, the latest achievements of science and engineering are blocked by their lack of skilled labour, the absence of adequate production and social infrastructures, and the persistence of traditional, semi-artisan forms of production that coexist

with modern capitalist microelectronic, textile, garment and automotive industries. Notably, in these countries the development of industries involving a large volume of simple, labour-intensive operations is encouraged by the transnationals in every way.

Slumps and booms experienced by the world capitalist economy affect the division of labour between the developed and developing countries. Thus, in the late 1970s and early 1980s, the Latin American countries which had been in a better position than the rest of the Third World and were about to join the category of developed countries, found themselves confronted with a predicament caused, among other things, by their huge debt of 400 billion dollars to the developed capitalist states. When in 1980-1982 the latter experienced a slump in production, Latin American exports to them had to be cut. That touched off a severe economic crisis.

This example shows that the international capitalist division of labour fails to harmonise the interests of the developing and developed countries.

Capitalism faces the contradiction between labour as a means of securing a livelihood and labour as a means of satisfying social needs. This contradiction manifests itself in the fact that vast technological potentials are used to enslave people rather than to ensure their well-

eing. The way to resolving this contradiction s blocked by the unsurmountable barrier of rivate ownership of the means of production, nonopoly capital and the monopolies' drive for uperprofits.

The scientific and technological revolution nhances the exploitative nature of wage labour nder capitalism. Capitalism has a long record f using science and technology in an effort o enslave labour. The achievements of the scien- ific and technological revolution, which are ssentially levers for increasing labour productiv- ty and securing more spare time for the workers, re used to escalate the exploitation of the wage vorkers, to continuously boost the intensity of heir labour without raising their wages, and to ncrease unemployment.

The scientific and technological revolution ubjects ever new sections of working people o exploitation. Especially vulnerable in this espect are brain workers in various fields of cience and engineering. Among the wage la- ourers there is now a growing percentage of ighly skilled workers, engineers, technicians nd office employees. Well-educated and well- rained, they are capable of making creative, pontaneous, original decisions. Wage workers in his category possess high professional skills and re well-versed in new technologies. They hold restige jobs requiring advanced skills. In in-

dustrial capitalist countries the lion's share – four-fifths if not five-sixths – of all surplus value is created by highly skilled workers. It is for this reason that developed countries seek to entice highly skilled workers from the developing states.

Labour migration causes considerable damage to developing countries which lose large numbers of highly skilled workers in the process. Among the migrants are well-trained workers of the most productive working age (25 to 45). As a result of the "brain drain", the developing countries lose almost as much money as they receive from the West in the form of aid. According to the UNCTAD Secretariat, the developing countries' annual losses caused by the migration of specialists to the United States, Great Britain and Canada run to 3.8 billion dollars. In the early 1970s, the United States' net profit from enticing brain workers from other countries to come to America amounted to nearly 230,000 dollars per scholar, 235,000 dollars per natural scientist, 253,000 dollars per engineer and 646,000 dollars per physician.

Whole economic sectors in the developed capitalist states would not be able to function without migrant workers. This concerns both subsidiary and leading industries, e. g., the automotive industry in France, the operation of resorts in Switzerland, or gold-mining in South Africa.

Of more than 25 million foreign workers and members of their families, some four or five million have settled in the United States; nearly 15 million, in Western Europe; some three million in the oil-producing countries of the Middle East; nearly 1.5 million, in West Africa, and the rest, in South Africa, Latin America and Oceania. Most of them come from developing countries (Mexico, Pakistan, the Mediterranean region and the poorer countries of Africa).

Migration from developing countries is largely caused by the "ousting forces" generated by the relatively fast disintegration of traditional structures and the slow development of industries and infrastructures. The development of capitalism and the release of labour in agriculture and traditional industries cause a continuous migration flow from rural regions to urban areas and then abroad. The "forces of attraction" in industrial capitalist countries are generated by economic growth (within the limits imposed by the cyclical development of capitalism) and job vacancies for unskilled workers.

Even the meager wages offered abroad to a worker from an underdeveloped country can secure for him an escape from the grip of unemployment and abject poverty. For instance, if a Mexican worker employed in the United States sends a third of his wages to his home country, he can secure a livelihood for, on the

average, five members of his family.

In the developed capitalist states, foreign workers are predominantly employed in low-paying industries. They are mainly hired to work on construction projects, at hotels or at plastics, rubber or asbestos factories, where they usually account for one out of every three people employed.

The bourgeoisie subjects foreign workers to merciless exploitation, forcing the migrants to take the most arduous and tedious jobs. The newcomers from the developing world find themselves at the bottom of the social hierarchy and are treated as second-rate human beings.

Although many West European countries, acting under pressure from the trade unions, have passed legislation banning discrimination against foreign workers, the employers there always manage to find a loop-hole and pay the foreigners less than the local workers. Discrimination against foreigners as regards the payment of bonuses is an everyday occurrence. The migrants' working conditions are a crying manifestation of discrimination. Insanitary, overcrowded premises, and overseers keeping a close watch on the workers – all this brings to mind the gloomiest pictures of ages past.

The existence of a readily available foreign labour force permits the employers to bring pressure to bear on the local workers. It also

enables the politicians and the ruling class spokesmen to foment chauvinistic sentiments among certain sections of the population. The bourgeoisie in the developed capitalist countries seeks to fan out enmity among people of different nationalities and set local workers against foreign labourers by claiming that the latter take away the jobs and reduce the earnings of the local population. In this way, the bourgeoisie tries to conceal the genuine causes of unemployment and of the dramatic worsening of the working people's living standards. The genuine causes are rooted in the ever-exacerbating contradiction between the social character of production and the private capitalist mode of appropriation, as well as the contradiction between labour and capital, and many other antagonisms inherent in capitalism.

Under capitalism, the results of the scientific and technological revolution, which, if properly used, could actually improve labour productivity and secure more spare time for all the members of society, are used instead for enhancing the exploitation of workers and intensifying their labour.

In the setting of the scientific and technological revolution, there emerges a need for a constant improvement of workers' skills. While some professions and trades wither away, new

ones originate, modifying the requirements placed on the wage workers' qualifications. Before the revolution in science and technology began, occupations disappeared as soon as the machines they were associated with became worn out or obsolete. In the course of the scientific and technological revolution, the period of renovation has been reduced to 4-8 years. Occupations supersede one another 1.5 to 2 times faster than machines. All this compels workers to continuously improve their skills.

Under capitalism, however, the improvement of skills and knowledge is hindered by both socio-class and financial limitations that block the workers' access to the higher levels of education.

The scientific and technological revolution enables private monopoly capital to tighten its grip on the workers' labour, both at the monopoly-owned enterprises and in the non-monopolised sector. The monopoly, in all its manifestations, consolidates the domination of capital over labour. In doing so, it relies on the entire might of the bourgeois state machinery. This is manifested in the intensified exploitation of hired labour by the monopolies. But not only in that. The monopolies hold sway over a great number of non-monopolised enterprises, redistributing the surplus value created at such enterprises to the monopolies' advantage. The monopoly bourgeoi-

sie of a limited number of developed capitalist states plunders developing countries through the export of capital and by strengthening the positions of *transnational corporations* (TNC).

The TNCs are formed as a result of takeovers and mergers of companies based in different countries. In the early 1980s, the TNCs accounted for some 40 per cent of industrial production, 60 per cent of foreign trade and about 80 per cent of technology developed in the capitalist states; transnational banks controlled a substantial part of bank capital. The TNCs derive high profits from concentrating investment in capital- and science-intensive industries such as the computer industry. The overwhelming majority of licences issued in the capitalist countries wind up in the hands of the transnationals. The TNCs are bent on buying up the best enterprises and firms operating in various countries; they tend to hire only highly skilled workers and to entice the best workers and engineers from different parts of the world to work for them. In the early 1980s, 25 per cent of the labour force employed in the manufacturing industries in the capitalist countries worked at TNC-owned enterprises.

The TNCs promote scientific and technological progress through plundering developing countries, exploiting their resources and cheap labour power, and blocking these states' advance-

ment. The hopes that the scientific and technological revolution would radically change this situation by reducing the gap between the developed and developing capitalist countries have not materialised. Contrary to expectations, the rift between these two groups of states is broadening.

One of the reasons why this is happening is that the richer capitalist countries have greater opportunities to speed up research and development projects in every way, thereby continuously modernising the technical basis of production. Most developing countries have only minimal opportunities to act likewise.

The TNCs gain monopoly superprofit not only by exploiting cheaper labour force and plundering natural resources, but also through maintaining different wage levels at their enterprises in the developing states compared to those located in the developed countries. For instance, assembly workers employed in the electrical engineering industry in Malaysia and South Korea are paid the equivalent of 1.7 per cent, in Taiwan, 2.9 per cent, and in Singapore, 16 per cent of the hourly wage rate paid to the workers in the same industry in Spain, Italy, and the FRG.

By establishing extremely low hourly wage rates, the TNCs seek to prolong the working day. The length of the working day at the Singapore and South Korean branches of US transnationals exceeds that at similar enterprises

based in the United States by 18 and 24 per cent, respectively.

The TNCs are expanding their activities at a particularly fast rate in the developing countries where there exist automated enterprises relying on monotonous assembly-line work. Also built in the developing countries, which have a ready supply of cheap labour, are enterprises expected to use a considerable percentage of manual labour.

Under the conditions of the scientific and technological revolution, the need for state regulation of the economy and of the relations between labour and capital grows. As a result, the interests of the bourgeois state are merged with those of the monopolies.

The bourgeois state has an important role to play in the system of capitalist exploitation. First, the state provides its protection to capitalist exploitation as such. The constitutions in effect in capitalist countries proclaim private property inviolable. With the police, the courts, prisons and other means of coercion at its disposal, the bourgeois state suppresses all encroachments on capitalist property and maintains the capitalist order of things.

Second, the bourgeois state promotes exploitation in many different ways: by passing anti-labour legislation so as to limit trade union rights; by pursuing wage-freeze policies, and by subsidising monopolies with funds exacted from

the working people through taxation.

Third, the bourgeois state itself exploits wage labour. The surplus value created by the workers employed at state-owned enterprises replenishes the state budget. The regimen of labour at such enterprises is similar to that established at monopoly-owned plants. In some countries, among them the United States, strikes at government-owned factories are prohibited. In addition to exploiting the working people in the sphere of production, the bourgeois state – and the entire capitalist class, for that matter – subjects them to additional exploitation through taxation.

Under state-monopoly capitalism, as the monopolies and the state merge into a single mechanism, the bourgeois state is in a position to fully perform its main function, that of maintaining the kind of order best suited for the monopoly exploitation of wage labour.

Assisted by the bourgeois state, the monopolies knock together military-industrial complexes and inordinately boost expenditures involved in the militarisation of the very foundations of the economy. The *militarisation of the economy* aggravates the employment problem.

According to a Michigan public interest research group, the conversion to peaceful use of each billion of dollars now spent on the militarisation of the economy in the United States could create 70,000 jobs for teachers or

85,000 jobs for medium-level medical personnel. The aggregate loss which militarisation causes in the area of employment is formidable. In the early 1970s, militarisation reduced the annual labour market demand by more than 300,000 jobs. And that at a time when millions of jobless Americans milled at the labour exchange.

The fact that developing countries are drawn into the process of militarisation hampers their effort to overcome economic, social and cultural backwardness. At a time when trillions of dollars are allocated for gigantic military programmes, nearly two billion people are not provided with fresh drinking water and suffer from infectious diseases; 1.5 billion people are deprived of any access to medical aid; one billion people live in abject poverty; 800 million adults are illiterate; 200 million children have no opportunity to attend school; and 600 million people are jobless.

Another manifestation of the aggravation of the basic contradictions of capitalism against the background of the scientific and technological revolution is the *growing antithesis between mental and manual labour.*

Scientific and technological progress radically changes the role of labour in the development of man and his abilities. The technological revolution reduces the sphere of application of monotonous, low-prestige, manual labour while

broadening the sphere of application of intellectual, creative, diversified labour.

In the course of the scientific and technological revolution, there emerge problems related to the transition from a division of labour based on handling individual machines to one involving the use of automated systems. At the initial stages in the development of capitalism, the hired worker was attached to a certain type of social division of labour in terms of both time and space. He was the machine's appendage, a detail worker. What was required of him was to possess a certain set of skills; broad knowledge did not have a major role to play. Day by day, the worker performed exhausting, monotonous production operations. In a sense, he was the slave of the machine and of the division of labour which chained him to capital.

With the scientific and technological revolution beginning to play a role in production, and as the applications of machine systems broadened, there emerged a need for change in labour. The role of knowledge in labour was thus heightened, and a demand appeared for a greater expenditure of mental energy by workers who had predominantly manual jobs. The impact of technology and engineering on the process of labour brought about a fundamental transformation of labour. Thus eliminated was the need

for detail workers and their servile attachment to a certain type of the social division of labour. There emerged a new type of worker, a universally trained, educated and highly skilled one.

Under capitalism, however, all the structural shifts described above occur in the circumstances when in many industries the contingents of the workers who possess average and low-level skills continue to grow both in absolute and relative terms. The expansion of the area of application of creative labour does not reduce the antithesis between mental and manual labour.

In the course of the scientific and technological revolution, not only manual workers but also persons engaged in brain work (skilled workers, engineers, technicians, and office employees) become wage workers. At modern capitalist enterprises, especially the automated ones, there appeared a broad stratum of workers primarily engaged in brain work. The revolution in science and technology generates a demand for competent and cultured workers. Apart from that, the struggle of the working class for its rights leads to the establishment of a shorter working day and the emergence of conditions for better training and education. Nowadays, the distinction between the exploitative class and the exploited class does not coincide with the division of people into those mainly engaged in brain work and those mostly involved in manual labour.

Under capitalism, the scientific and technological revolution *enhances the difference between the town and the countryside*. The content of labour in the rural areas undergoes profound changes. The "green revolution" has brought about radical changes in agricultural technology, farming methods, and the organisation of farm labour. Agricultural labour becomes increasingly similar to industrial labour. The means of labour applied in agriculture today include highly productive machinery (tractors, combine harvesters, etc.), mixed feed, mineral fertilizers, and plant-protecting chemicals. Science (particularly microbiology and genetics) has a greater role to play in agricultural production. Land reclamation systems are being expanded. This heightens the role of knowledge in the process of agricultural labour. Labour requirements in the village are no longer limited to purely farm labour, as there appear agricultural machinery maintenance-and-repair enterprises, food-processing, mixed-feed and other factories, and as roads are laid and cultural and consumer service facilities are built.

Still, the rate of urbanisation remains high, and the migration from rural to urban areas continues unabated. The exploitation of the countryside by the town grows more intensive, while the gap between the living standards and cultural level of urban dwellers and those of the rural population is constantly broadened.

The town increasingly surpasses the countryside in terms of education, scientific and cultural development, services, living standards and way of life.

In the setting of the scientific and technological revolution, the difference between the town and the countryside manifests itself in the contradictions between the industrially developed central areas and the backward outlying districts, and between the developed and the developing countries. The difference is also manifest in the broadening gap between the prices of agricultural raw materials and the prices of manufactured goods; this has become a lasting tendency.

Characteristic of the developing countries is a lopsided, at times economically distorted and harmful, specialisation in the production of export crops. In a number of countries it has taken on extreme forms, manifesting itself in the one-crop system of farming. In the so-called "coffee republics", coffee accounts for more than fifty per cent of export revenues.

In the developing countries, the difference between the town and the countryside fosters the pre-capitalist forms of private landownership and the predominance of subsistence and semi-subsistence economies where labour is not socialised and goods are not produced for sale but for the producers' own consumption. In the mid-1970s, subsistence production in Africa

and South-East Asia accounted for roughly 20 to 25 per cent of their gross domestic product.

In the rural areas of some African countries, communal landownership and tribal relations still predominate. In these countries, there is no private ownership of land. The state is the supreme landowner. Within the communes, there is a differentiation among the peasants, which arises from their inequality in terms of their property status and the development of commodity production.

In the countries of Latin America, landlordism (*latifundismo*), or large landed proprietorship, predominates. A mere 1.5 per cent of the latifundias, whose area runs to more than 6,000 hectares, account for nearly 50 per cent of all the registered land; 3 to 8 per cent of the landowners hold between 60 and 80 per cent of the land, while 75 to 80 per cent of the farms take up only 5 to 10 per cent of all the cultivated land. In Latin America, 88 per cent of the able-bodied rural population are either entirely landless or own plots of land which are too small to provide a livelihood for a family.

Developing countries have a sizable surplus agrarian population, that is, vast masses of half-ruined peasants who are still bound to land and have not migrated to towns in search of work. This legacy of the colonial past accounts for the persistence – and in some countries even growth –

of underemployment in rural areas and for an increasing percentage of landless peasants. Rural-urban migration is growing in scale. However, the low level of industrial development prevents the labour market from expanding at a faster rate.

Peculiarities in the exploitation of the rural population in the developing world can also be traced to the existence there of traditional artisan forms of production. Even in relatively developed India, persons engaged in traditional industries account for 70 per cent of all industrial workers. Most enterprises are located in the countryside. As a rule, the artisan is in bondage to the usurers, raw material suppliers, and middlemen. His earnings are often lower than those of the unskilled wage worker.

With the existence of multiple modes of production in the developing countries, the expansion of agrarian capitalism broadens the gap between the town and the village. The developing countries' work towards national and social liberation includes, therefore, efforts to abolish the crippling terms of employment and carry out an agrarian reform.

The scientific and technological revolution, however, fails to resolve many of the problems involved in the application of female and child labour.

The application of *female and child labour* on

a mass scale is associated with the emergence of mechanised production which rendered muscle work redundant. The scientific and technological revolution offered numerous applications for female labour. The introduction of automatic and electronic production equipment has secured for women access to many occupations which, while calling for dexterity, accuracy and advanced skills, no longer require physical strength.

In the capitalist countries, female workers account for a growing percentage (at present, close to 40) of the hired labour force; two out of every three working women are employed in the newly free states which have taken the capitalist path of development.

Most women work in agriculture and retail trade. Besides, new technological processes permit a wide use of cheap unskilled female labour at enterprises producing electronic equipment. In Morocco, for instance, women under 24 years of age account for 80 to 90 per cent of all workers engaged in the assembly of computers, TV- and radio-sets. As a rule, on attaining the age of 30, female workers are discharged and replaced by younger women.

The managers of TNC subsidiaries make no secret of the fact that they obtain considerable economic benefits from employing women, as female workers are generally more submissive and patient and less inclined to associate in

trade unions than men.

However, the female workers' inadequate educational level prevents them from being employed at modern enterprises on a larger scale. According to UNESCO statistics, in 1980 there were 814 million illiterates in the developing states, women accounted for 500 million of them. It is not an easy matter for women in a developing country to obtain a primary education, to say nothing of vocational training. The illiteracy rate among women runs to 80 per cent.

The above explains why small-scale and artisan industries still account for a large percentage of the female labour force. According to the findings of a UNESCO survey conducted in 1978-1979, in just one country, Bangladesh, the jute-processing cottage industry and the manufacturing of jute articles provided employment for nearly 100,000 women – one of the highest female employment rates among the country's industries.

The labour skills acquired by women in the non-factory industrial sector find little or no application at factories. This keeps female workers at the bottom of the occupational hierarchy in industry. According to a survey conducted in Morocco, women account for 50, 55 and 80 per cent of the unskilled workers in the textile, paper manufacturing and pharmaceutical industries, respectively. In Tanzania,

only 4 per cent of all the female workers in the manufacturing industry have jobs requiring advanced skills. Even in India, where women have quite favourable educational opportunities, they are generally hired to do unskilled work.

By pursuing a policy of wage discrimination against working women, the capitalists gain additional profit. In capitalist countries, women get between 50 and 80 per cent of the wages paid to men for doing work equal to men's both in volume and skill. Female textile workers' hourly wages are lower than those of men by 14 per cent in Morocco and by 22 per cent in Singapore. In Bangladesh, female workers in the urban non-factory sector are paid 40 to 50 per cent less for doing the same work as men. In Tanzania, the average monthly wages in the manufacturing industry in 1980 ran to 379 shillings in the case of men and 276 shillings in the case of women. In Syria, the respective figures are 115 pounds and 79 pounds. In South Korea, the women's average wages are a mere 44.5 per cent of those paid to men's wages.

The proportion of child labour in the developing countries is also higher than that in the developed states. According to UNESCO statistics, among children in the 10-14 age group, working children account for 31 per cent in the developing countries and 5 per cent in the de-

veloped states. In 1979, there were at least 52,000,000 young workers under 15 years of age in the capitalist states. The age a child starts to work depends on tradition, on the size of the enterprise that employs him or her, and on whether or not the latter is owned by the child's relatives.

The reasons compelling children in the developing states to go to work differ from those that motivate young people to take a job in the developed countries. In the latter, the young worker's goal is to earn additional money for his or her own needs. Parents do not usually insist that their young children get a job.

In the developing countries, most children are compelled to work because their earnings often constitute the family's sole source of income. The need to start working at an early age often makes children drop out of school. In 1978, 1,500,000 Mexican children had no opportunity to go to primary school. The number of school graduates in 1975-1976 was only 40 per cent of those enrolled in 1970-1971. In Argentina, nearly 50 per cent of the children leave school without getting even a primary education.

In developing countries, child labour is widely used in agriculture and the services and, to a lesser extent, in the non-factory industrial sector. In recent years, growing urbanisation has caused a rise in the number of working children in

urban areas. So as not to be starved to death, the child who has come to town by himself takes up any work he is offered.

In Africa, Asia, Latin America and Southern Europe, parents often hire out their 8- or 9-year-old children, sometimes without the latter's consent, to work as shepherds or farm hands. In return, they get a payment in cash or in kind from their children's employer. In South Asia and South-East Asia, employers have been reported to force children to work, and subject the young workers to cruel exploitation. Children engaged in the making of watches, wooden articles or rugs work as many hours per day as adults. The length of the working day in that region exceeds the limit established by the law. At the unregistered small enterprises children are exploited even more brutally, as the owners are at liberty to establish any conditions and terms of work they wish. In small tea-shops children have a ten-hour working day.

The abuse of child labour has a negative effect on the rising generation's physical and moral health. A survey conducted among the plantation workers in the region in question showed that 25.6 per cent of the younger workers suffered from advanced avitaminosis. The children employed in the tobacco industry suffer from anemia and chronic bronchitis.

Children get much lower wages than adults

for doing the same kind of work. In Indonesia, for instance, children's wages are equal to 70-80 per cent of the wages received by adults for the same kind and volume of work.

Despite all the existing regulations, the problem of female and child labour remains a most acute social problem faced by capitalist society.

In the context of the scientific and technological revolution, the development of capitalist production becomes ever more spasmodic as periods of economic revival and boom alternate with recessions and slumps. Scientific and technological progress promotes faster renovation of fixed capital (machinery, equipment, etc.). Only the fittest, those who use better machinery and technologies and spend less for labour power, can survive the bitter competition. All this compels the capitalists to spend a growing part of their capital on the development of machinery and technology. In its turn, this enhances the predominance of past labour over live labour. Under capitalism, the process of labour is spontaneous: it is subordinated to the interests of private enterprise. The goal of the capitalist is to gain greater profit rather than to help satisfy society's requirements. The process of labour is linked to the satisfaction of social requirements through the market, which is expected to resolve the contradiction between private labour and social labour. Only when a commodity is sold on the market, private

labour is turned into social labour.

Thus, if the capitalist fails to sell his entire commodity output on the market, only part of the labour expended to produce it takes on the form of direct social labour. In the conditions of the scientific and technological revolution, the division of labour into private and social makes it impossible to overcome the fundamental contradiction of capitalism. The social link between private and social labour, effected through the market, blocks the way out of the impasse created by *economic and structural crises.*

The periods of economic crises are marked by a slump in production and a shrinking demand for the means of production and labour power. This is accompanied by a rise in the prices of consumer goods, and also by wage-freezes and cuts in social spending. Each crisis narrows still further the sphere of the application of labour and diminishes the demand for both unskilled and skilled labour. Foreign workers are among the hardest hit as they are always the first to be sacked. During a crisis, the victims of race discrimination find it practically impossible to get a job. During a crisis of overproduction, production capacities are underutilised, and tremendous material values created by the labour of workers are destroyed for the sole purpose of propping up prices. In the setting of the scientific and technolog-

ical revolution, the destructive impact of economic crises is enhanced by structural crises.

Structural crises manifest themselves in prolonged periods of decline in the rates of growth and in the stagnation or curtailment of production in the metallurgical, petrochemical, automotive, heavy engineering, shipbuilding and other traditional industries. All this is accompanied by the expansion of production in the newer industries brought into existence by accelerated scientific and technological progress – the manufacture of robots, electronic equipment and polymers, space engineering, etc. Unlike economic crises of overproduction, structural crises go on continuously. They have a major impact on labour under capitalism as they enhance the role of knowledge, education and vocational training. Modern industries call for advanced skills and a better education. To find employment in the new industries, wage workers must be better educated and have higher skills. That calls for time and money – which they lack. That is why structural crises aggravate the contradictions between labour and capital and, in the final analysis, give a greater impetus to the class struggle.

The class struggle involves the principal areas of society's life – the economic, political, and ideological spheres. The aims of the proletariat's economic struggle include higher wages,

a shorter working day, better working conditions, etc. Among the various methods of economic struggle are strikes, work stoppages, and picketing. The workers' political and ideological struggle, more complicated in form, is aimed at effecting fundamental political changes. While economic struggle results in the emergence of trade unions, political struggle leads to the founding of political parties as the highest form of the proletariat's class organisation.

Thus, in the context of the scientific and technological revolution, monopoly capital socialises labour and production on a gigantic scale. The financial oligarchy, though small in size, tightens its control over the social wealth and labour. The contradiction between labour and capital grows still more acute. The contradiction between the capitalist form of labour and the development of man, society's main productive force, thus becomes irreconcilable.

The scientific and technological revolution broadens the opportunities for the development of people's mental and physical abilities. But the capitalist organisation of labour prevents men from expressing themselves through their work.

Hence the need to eliminate the capitalist form of labour. It is superceded by the *socialist form of labour which is free from exploitation* and provides a basis for man's all-round development.

Chapter Three

LABOUR UNDER SOCIALISM

1. The Character of Labour under Socialism

The principal form of labour under socialism, is the social form of labour. Its essential features are as follows. Such *labour is free from all forms of exploitation. It benefits both the workers and the whole of society, and is based on the principles of collectivism, comradely mutual assistance and cooperation. Under socialism, labour is socialised, in a planned manner, in the course of production on the scale of entire society.* The economic foundation of the socialist character of labour is the socialist ownership of the means of production.

The socialisation of the means of production in socialist society eliminates all forms of the alienation of labour. At its initial stage,

such socialisation does not cause radical changes in the content of labour as at this stage the worker, still associated with a definite type of the social division of labour, is essentially a detail worker. The reason for this lies in the contradiction between the level of the development of productive forces, on the one hand, and the new, progressive social form of the organisation of such forces, on the other. A socialist revolution does not immediately eliminate the contradiction between the roles of one and the same person as a detail workman and as a co-owner of the means of production. The historical experience of the USSR and other socialist countries shows that the resolution of this contradiction takes a long time.

At its early stages, the construction of socialism involves the use of machinery and technologies inherited from capitalism. It is only in the course of the development of the social form of labour that the content of labour is transformed and the material and technical basis of socialism is created.

Socialist ownership of the means of production is the basis on which the social form of labour rests.

In the USSR and other socialist countries, social ownership of the means of production appears in two principal forms: state property (the property of the whole people) and coop-

erative (collective-farm) property.

State property plays the leading role in the economic system of socialism. In the USSR, for instance, it accounts for 90 per cent of the fixed production assets in industry and for 60 per cent of the fixed production assets in agriculture. State property holds key positions in other socialist countries as well.

All the principal facilities in both the productive and non-productive spheres constitute state property.

Speaking about state property (belonging to all the people), one should point out two important things. First, the state owns the key means of production on the scale of the entire country. Second, state property belongs to the entire socialist society. It is the property of the producers who are associated on the scale of the entire society and are jointly engaged in planned production based on the principles of collectivism, mutual assistance and cooperation.

Cooperative (collective farm) property emerged as a result of the peasants' voluntarily uniting their private holdings. At present, the peasants' collective property has gained strong positions in the socialist countries. The backbone of the peasants' collective property is formed by the nondistributable assets that have been created in the course of many years with the labour of the cooperated peasants.

In 1983, the collective farms' contribution to the overall capital investment in agriculture amounted to 32.5 per cent of the fixed agricultural production assets in the USSR. In the same year, the collective farms produced 48 per cent of the gross agricultural output and 39 per cent of the agricultural commodity output. The collective farms cultivate 46 per cent of the crop area and employ 12,900,000 people, that is, 52 per cent of the number of people engaged in agriculture.

Both the common features and the differences displayed by the two forms of property are reflected in the *character of labour* under socialism. The common elements include the absence of the exploitation of others' labour and the fact that labour is based on principles of collectivism, comradely cooperation and mutual assistance. The differences manifest themselves in the degree of the systematic socialisation of labour and its product. At state-owned enterprises, the workers' labour is supervised by society itself, and the necessary and surplus products are therefore the property of all the people. On the collective farms, part of labour is expended at the collective farmers' personal subsidiary holdings. The product of collective labour belongs to individual collective farms or groups thereof. The necessary and surplus products belong to the collective rather than to the entire society.

The two forms of socialist social ownership of the means of production reflect the distinctions between the classes. While in the process of social labour the workers are directly linked to the means of production owned by the state (by all the people), the collective farmers use the means of production which belong to cooperatives. Hence the different roles of the two classes in the social production system and the differences in the amounts and forms of their income.

The consumer cooperatives' property is a special form of the collective-farm-cooperative property. Unlike the collective farms, consumer cooperatives function both in rural and in urban areas, offering their services not only to the collective farmers but also to other members of socialist society.

Consumer cooperatives play a major role in promoting trade, public catering, the procurement of agricultural produce for the population and the industry, etc. The diversified activity of consumer cooperatives expands the economic and civic activity in the countryside. In terms of their social role, the members of consumer cooperatives are closer to industrial and office workers than to the collective farmers.

The consumer cooperatives' funds are allocated for social development in the countryside. These assets are used to finance the improve-

ment of communal, cultural and medical services in rural areas, to send young people to higher and specialised secondary educational establishments, to build pre-school child-care centres, Young Pioneer camps, sanatoriums, holiday homes, and dwelling houses.

The unity of the two forms of property—state property and collective-farm-cooperative property—eliminates antagonisms, which existed under capitalism, in the socio-class foundations of the division of labour. Let us consider the *division of labour under socialism.*

Socialist ownership of the means of production eradicates exploitation as the basis for the division of labour. The latter takes on the form of cooperation and mutual assistance among people free of exploitation. Under socialism, the division of labour throughout society and within individual enterprises persists. What is implied by the social division of labour is the division of labour among the various branches of the national economy (for instance, between mechanical engineering and the food processing industry) and among the different regions of the country. Socialist ownership of the means of production creates conditions for the comprehensive development of labour in each region. This is confirmed by the successes scored by the peoples of the Soviet Union in their economic and social development. Within a short histor-

ical period, in the formerly backward outlying districts illiteracy was fought down and free public education was introduced. Industrialisation induced profound changes in the distribution of labour between industry and agriculture. There emerged new branches of the economy which employ highly skilled production workers, engineers, technicians, and other employees.

Under socialism, the division of labour is effected on a planned basis. This secures tremendous advantages and provides for a rational use of capital investments and society's material, manpower and financial resources. In the USSR and other socialist countries, the division of labour is based on five-year and long-term economic and social development plans. A systematic, planned character has been imparted to the structural changes in the economy. The number of jobs is reduced in the older industries and increased in the new industries (the ones that use sophisticated machinery and advanced technology) according to plan. Vast territories are also developed in a planned manner. Relying on the advantages of the social form of labour, the state is in a position to allocate considerable sums for increasing the number of jobs in the regions under development.

The social form of labour induces changes in the division of labour within enterprises and in the division of labour among people of

various trades and professions.

The division of labour conduces to people's development, enriches their knowledge and improves their skills. At the same time, if people are attached to one and the same type of the social division of labour, this tends to inhibit the development of their abilities. As the workers' attachment to one type of labour is eliminated, the area of their labour activity broadens and their work becomes more diversified, interesting and pleasant.

Under socialism, all have an opportunity to enlarge their knowledge, improve their skills and broaden their education. In the course of the all-round development of socialism, there will emerge a new type of worker, one who is free from a lasting attachment to one and the same type of the social division of labour. The man of labour will cease to be a detail worker. This will create a most important prerequisite for *overcoming the socio-economic distinctions between the town and the countryside, and between mental and manual labour.*

Let us consider the process of overcoming these distinctions under socialism.

The socialist approach to socialising the means of production eliminates the antithesis between the town and the countryside. However, under socialism the socio-economic distinctions between the division of labour in the town and the

division of labour in the countryside still persist.

These distinctions stem from the essential difference between industrial and agricultural labour. The results of labour in agriculture are largely influenced by the weather and other natural factors. There is also a considerable difference in the scope of the application of machinery in industrial labour as compared to agricultural labour.

Another socio-economic distinction lies in the predominance of manual labour in the rural areas. In the village, people are attached to one and the same type of the social division of labour to a greater extent than in the town. The applications of their labour are limited to the various branches of agriculture.

When socialist production relations were still in the making, the effort to overcome these socio-economic distinctions was associated with the establishment of the socialist ownership of the means of production.

While creating the prerequisites for the elimination of the old forms of the social division of labour between the town and the village and for the industrialisation of agriculture, capitalism does not eliminate private ownership of the means of production as the economic factor that perpetuates the antithesis between urban areas and the countryside. The significant dis-

tinctions between the town and the village that continue into socialism are obliterated as the traces of the former division of labour between the town and the countryside, the class distinctions between the workers and the collective farmers, and the gap between the cultural development levels and lifestyles of the rural and the urban population, are all overcome.

When socialism is built, the social and economic distinctions between the workers' labour and the collective farmers' labour mirror the different stages in the socialist socialisation of the means of production. The means of production used by the workers are owned by the state (i.e., by all the people), whereas those applied by the collective farmers constitute part of their collective property. Nonetheless, the labour of urban and rural dwellers has much in common as it is based on collectivism, comradely assistance and cooperation.

The socialist mode of socialising the means of production removes the opposition between mental and manual labour.

In capitalist society, all human energy and ingenuity were applied, in the final analysis, to securing all the cultural and technological benefits for the few and leaving the masses without such basics as education and development opportunities. Socialism has placed the gains of culture and technology at the disposal

of all the people.

Socialism does not immediately remove the socio-economic distinctions between persons engaged in mental labour and those performing manual labour. Socially, the distinction between the workers by brain and the workers by hand stems from the different functions they perform and the different places they hold in the system of social production. Industrial workers and state-farm peasants are predominantly employed in the sphere of material production and are engaged in manual labour. Theirs is the "doer" work. The intellectuals are engaged in mental labour. They work in various fields of science, the arts, literature, etc. The content of their labour is determined by organisational and creative functions they perform.

Distinctions between the workers engaged in predominantly mental labour and those involved in mostly manual work are directly linked to the content of their labour.

The elimination of the differences between the town and the countryside and between mental and manual labour creates prerequisites for the evolution of new traits in the social form of labour. Socialist ownership of the means of production creates conditions for the division of labour into labour for oneself and labour for society.

Labour for oneself is part of social labour

expended to produce the material wealth and services which are then distributed among the workers in proportion to the personal contribution of each to the work process. In other words, labour for oneself becomes embodied in all that the workers' wages can buy.

Labour for the benefit of society creates the boons used to satisfy the needs of society as a whole. Its results can be divided into three parts. The first goes to form social consumption funds used by the workers either free of charge or on preferential terms (schools, polyclinics, hospitals, social security benefits, etc.). The second part goes to expand production, that is, to build new factories or roads, modernise equipment and machinery, etc. The third makes up society's reserve funds which include the means of production and the articles of consumption which are used only in emergency cases (natural calamities and other unforeseen circumstances).

Since, in the final analysis, all labour benefits the members of society, there are no antagonistic contradictions between labour for oneself and labour for society. Personal, collective and the entire people's interests are not opposed to one another.

In the totality of economic interests, the predominant role is played by those stemming from the public ownership of the means of

production. Society, acting as the state, organises production. Therefore, that which is in universal interest is also in the best interest of the entire people and of the state as a whole, of the social groups, strata, classes and each member of socialist society. All other interests take shape under the determinative influence of the interests of the entire people.

The socialist mode of socialising the means of production does not immediately create the conditions that are necessary for all these interests to coincide spontaneously and automatically. The experience of building socialism in the Soviet Union and other socialist countries shows that this calls for a long historical period and for the application of a set of measures and means matching each step in society's maturation. The transformation of the formal coincidence of interests into an actual agreement is a complicated process tied up with the emergence of a communist attitude to labour as a prime vital need, and with the strict observance of administrative and labour discipline, and adherence to state plans.

The unity of the economic interests of society and those of all its members should not be taken to mean that under socialism there is room only for the interests of the entire country which allegedly erode or inhibit collective (group) interests or personal interests.

What is implied by *collective interests* is, above all, the interests of work collectives. Collective interests arise from the relative economic isolation of the different enterprises or production associations. The isolation is accounted for by the fact that the means of production, although owned by the whole people, are disposed of by individual enterprises.

Personal interests stem from personal ownership of articles of consumption and some means of production, and from the specific needs of the individual. There exists an inseparable link between personal economic interests and the way of life. Thus, the problem of personal interests must not be reduced to the problem of distribution of material wealth. Personal interests stem from the special role played by labour under socialism, i.e. from the work-oriented socialist way of life. They are linked to the socialist system of distribution, the living conditions, rest and recreation opportunities, etc. Socialism extends personal interests beyond the limits of the reproduction of labour power, and focuses them on the creation of conditions for the all-round development of the individual.

The community of the interests of work collectives' members and those of society as a whole is largely determined by those relations among the members of society which arise from the division of labour into necessary and surplus

labour. Socialism does not eliminate this division. But it gives a new meaning to both necessary and surplus labour. Let us consider the new content of *necessary and surplus labour under socialism.*

Under capitalism, the division of labour into necessary and surplus labour is linked to the exploitation of wage labour and to the purchase and sale of labour power.

In contrast, under socialism there is no antagonism between necessary and surplus labour (i.e. between labour for oneself and labour for society) even though the two forms of labour play different roles in man's development.

The working people obtain the greater part of the necessary product through wages. They get the rest in the form of payments and other benefits from the social consumption funds (free education and health care, student grants, the subsidised maintenance of children in child-care centres, etc.).

Surplus labour is labour that creates the surplus product which makes up a considerable part of the product intended for society (used to ensure the continuous growth and improvement of socialist production, replenish the reserve assets, build up the country's defence capability, maintain administrative bodies and keep law and order). The surplus product is used in the interests of all the members of society.

Under socialism, necessary labour and surplus labour are closely interconnected. Surplus labour ensures the development of socialist production and therefore provides for the growth of the necessary product and, consequently, for the satisfaction, on a greater scale, of people's needs. For its part, necessary labour is a prerequisite for the expansion of the surplus product. With the heightening of the level of education, skills and creative initiative as factors inherent in labour, workers create a greater volume of surplus product per unit of time.

Under socialism, the interrelationship between the necessary and surplus product leads to the elimination of the antagonistic contradiction between productive and individual consumption.

Under capitalism, individual consumption is seen as a condition for the productive consumption of labour power by capital only to the extent that the worker maintains and reproduces himself as labour power through his individual consumption. The capitalist leaves this problem to the workers. His only concern is *to limit, as far as possible, the workers' individual consumption to what is essential to the* continued reproduction of labour power. *In contrast, in socialist society, where the working* man is free, productive consumption is a means for increasing personal consumption.

Under socialism, labour time is determined

by the social form of necessary and surplus labour. Let us consider the problem of *labour time under socialism* and the factors that influence the length of the working day in socialist society.

Under socialism, labour does not yet turn into people's prime, vital need. That is why the people's right to work is combined with a universal obligation to work. Under capitalism, the length of the working day is established in the process of a bitter class struggle between the workers and the capitalists. In contrast, the length of the working day under socialism is provided for by the legislation enacted by the state with the active participation of work collectives. Thus, in the USSR, in accordance with the Law on Work Collectives, the latter endorse internal work regulations submitted for their consideration by the management and the trade union committee. The work collectives also carry out measures to ensure the observance of these regulations, and take steps towards tightening labour discipline.

In a similar manner, socialist society regulates the length of the working week and the duration of leaves at state-owned enterprises and institutions. Thus ensured is the application of state labour norms in all the economic sectors and in all regions of the country. Any violation of such norms is inadmissible even though it

may have been agreed upon by the workers and the management. For instance, overtime is allowed only in exceptional cases provided for by the legislation on labour.

The management is entitled to regulate labour time within the framework of the working day, that is, to decide on the beginning and the end of the working day, the time and duration of the lunch break and of the shifts. All these issues are decided upon by the management in consultation with the trade union.

Most socialist countries have an eight-hour working day and a 5-day working week (the USSR has a 41-hour working week).

In establishing the length of the working day, working conditions are taken into account. In the case of noxious and arduous jobs, the working day is shorter.

Under socialism, the division of the working day into necessary and surplus time is sustained. This is accounted for by the level of development of society's productive forces which preconditions the division of labour into labour expended to satisfy personal needs and labour expended to satisfy social needs.

What is meant by *personal needs* is each worker's need for the means of subsistence.

Social needs are the needs of the worker as a member of society (the need for building production and non-production installations,

launching social and cultural programmes, ensuring administration and management, etc.). The division of the working day into necessary and surplus working time does not involve any irreconcilable contradiction, because throughout the working day people work both for themselves and for the benefit of the society they live in.

Both society as a whole and every individual worker have a stake in making rational use of working time and establishing an appropriate correlation between the duration, productivity and intensity of work, on the one hand, and remuneration for work, on the other. In socialist countries, measures are taken to tighten labour discipline. A rational use of working time is largely ensured through reducing the losses of working time and improving the work rhythm during each shift. The scientific organisation of labour, strict technological discipline, and uninterrupted supplies of requisite materials and equipment are an effective means of ensuring a rational use of working time.

The correlation between working and non-working time influences the development of the personality. As socialist society reduces the number of arduous jobs and creates conditions for the all-round development of the individual, the prevalence of non-working time over working time acquires increasing importance in

establishing the length of the working day.

The out-of-work time is divided into the time required to satisfy natural, physiological needs (sleeping, eating, etc.), the time required to run the household and bring up children, and spare time. Spare time is the time used by people to develop their abilities not only as workers but as personalities. Therefore, spare time is the supreme measure of public wealth in socialist society.

Under socialism, the rational use of spare time is an urgent problem considered from the point of view of man's growing importance as society's main productive force. Society's interests in the rational use of spare time are ensured by the socialist countries' Constitutions. The spiritual and physical development of the working people, just as people's adequate rest and recreation opportunities, are ensured by society through establishing a working week of a certain duration, shortening the working day for the people employed on certain jobs and in certain industries (for instance, working time in the chemical industry is shorter than in food processing), through granting annual paid leaves, broadening the network of cultural, educational and health-building facilities, developing mass sports, physical culture and tourism, and providing favourable conditions for a rational use of spare time.

In the socialist countries, working people devote a considerable part of their spare time to studies and improving their skills.

Under socialism, society has a stake in shortening the working day and ensuring more spare time. However, it can only afford this if it expands production and elevates the people's living standards.

The shortening of the working day (the social labour norm) and securing more spare time for the working people is a hallmark of social labour under socialism.

An important feature of the social form of labour is the latter's division into productive and non-productive labour. What is the essence, economically speaking, of *productive and non-productive labour under socialism?*

The distinction between productive and non-productive labour is based on the social form of labour organisation and on the supreme goal of socialist production – elevating the working people's living standards.

Due to the social form of labour under socialism common labour provides a basis for the growing well-being and all-round development of all the working people. Under socialism, therefore, the labour which creates conditions – the material wealth and services – for attaining this supreme goal is productive. Non-productive labour is the labour whose product has no

social use value and is not in demand.

From the point of view of the social form of labour, direct social labour (that is, work at state-owned and cooperative enterprises) is productive.

Characteristically, direct social labour is incorporated, on a planned basis, in social labour with a view to satisfying social requirements. Before the process of labour begins, the planning authorities work out a plan fixing the range and variety of goods to be produced and bring it to the notice of the enterprise. The enterprise must fully implement this plan. If it does, and the customers obtain in time the goods they have ordered, and if their demands as regards the quality and variety of goods are met, the direct social labour expended to produce such goods has been productive. If the supplier fails to fulfil the plan or to ensure the appropriate quality of goods, the labour expended is referred to as non-productive.

In socialist society, part of the labour is not direct social labour. The labour of the peasants working on personal subsidiary holdings, and the labour of the artisans who are not members of cooperatives, is private labour.

The labour expended on personal subsidiary holdings is not fully socialised. That is why not all the labour expended on such holdings is productive.

Under socialism, the farmers who work on personal subsidiary holdings are assisted by state farms and other state-owned enterprises, as well as by collective farms, in farming land, acquiring cattle and procuring fodder and pasture land. They are also ensured the services of agronomists and livestock specialists. Farmers who work on personal subsidiary holdings may make contractual arrangements with collective and state farms about fattening cattle or raising poultry.

As a result of the expansion of such contractual relations among collective farms, state farms, consumer cooperatives and farmers working on personal subsidiary holdings, such holdings become less and less isolated as both the work done on them and the produce which they turn out are increasingly subjected to planned regulation.

Productive labour as direct social labour is work aimed at ensuring the people's full well-being and high living standards and the harmonious development of the personality.

The new content of *direct social labour under socialism* manifests itself in the following: the surplus product is used in the interests of all the members of society; there is a division of labour into work done for oneself and work done for the benefit of society; relations are based on comradely cooperation and mutual

assistance; planned labour is organised on the scale of all society and in the interests of all the members of society; and labour acquires a direct social character in the process of production and not at the market.

Labour for the benefit of society is a most important prerequisite for the integrated development of the national economy as a whole.

Under socialism, the economic ties involved in the process of production grow ever more complex. Isolated production processes in different industries merge into a single social production process calling for collective efforts on the scale of all society. As new territorial-production complexes (TPCs) come into being, the economic ties involved in the planned production system grow stronger. The term "territorial-production complex" stands for the aggregate of enterprises (production associations) and organisations which function within different sectors of the economy, are located in the same area and are interlinked by common natural and economic resources.

The TPCs are generally formed within the boundaries of the existing administrative-territorial units. Sometimes they are set up to carry out target programmes aimed at attaining some concrete goal. In that case, they are designed to ensure a comprehensive solution of major socio-economic problems essential to the economy.

The planning and organisation of labour at the level of individual economic units of society is based on the physical and value indicators established by the plan.

The system of indicators brought to the notice of each enterprise includes physical indicators, i.e., the range and variety of goods required to satisfy social needs. The Soviet industry, for instance, turns out 24 million items of goods. Each product turned out ensures the cooperation of labour on a nationwide scale. In their functioning, individual enterprises rely on dozens and even hundreds of economic ties.

Every enterprise is both a producer and a consumer. Through observing the plan, which specifies the amount of goods to be supplied to other enterprises, each enterprise, in its capacity of a producer, creates conditions for the functioning of other enterprises in their capacity of consumers. On the other hand, in its capacity of a consumer, it is linked to other enterprises in their capacity of producers. For instance, in its capacity of a producer, a motor-car factory turns out motor-cars; in its capacity of a consumer, it uses the parts (engines, etc.) produced by other enterprises. As is known, Diesel engines are more economical than carburetor engines. Therefore, in order to produce competitive motor-cars, an enterprise may find it more advantageous to use Diesel

engines in the motor-cars it produces.

The range and variety of the goods produced are important plan indicators which mirror the production relations that are established in the process of labour.

So long as commodity-money relations persist under socialism, the plan of each enterprise specifies a set of value indicators (profit or reduction in production costs, the value of the products sold, etc.). Under socialism, reliance on both physical and value indicators may bring about a contradiction between the interests of cost-accounting enterprises and those of society (an immediate example is an enterprise fulfilling the plan in terms of profit without fulfilling it in terms of the variety of the goods produced).

This destabilizes relations between the producer and the consumer, as the interests of the enterprise (the producer) are thus placed above those of society. The reason for this kind of contradictions lies, in the final analysis, in the persistence of the two-fold character of labour under socialism.

The changing correlation between the importance of the plan and the relevance of market-related factors for the process of labour imparts a new content to the two-fold character of labour. The plan is essential to the functioning of each enterprise as an element in the integrated

economic complex. The market has a subsidiary role to play. The market makes it possible for enterprises to display initiative and broaden the range of consumer or other goods which they produce.

Value indicators (such as production costs, prices, profit and profitability) are instrumental in comparing the individual and the socially necessary expenditures of labour and in measuring the effectiveness of the various forms of concrete labour. These indicators cannot be considered as playing a determining role in the character of labour. At an enterprise, labour is expended in order to meet social requirements rather than to gain profit.

Under socialism, the organisation of labour according to plan in society as a whole and at individual enterprises is an important prerequisite for ensuring full employment.

2. Universal Employment. The Right to Work and to Choose One's Trade or Profession

Socialism puts labour on a new social basis. Unemployment, the plague of capitalism, becomes a thing of the past. Socialist society ensures conditions for the *full employment* of the entire able-bodied population. This is a mani-

festation of the indisputable advantages of socialism over capitalism. Guaranteed employment, which delivers people from the feeling of uncertainty as to the future, is a source of social optimism. Under socialism, no one can afford shunning work as there are no other sources of income. There are no private owners of capital, private factories or shops. No one lives off one's dividends as there are no private joint-stock companies.

At the same time, the working people are co-owners of the key means of production. Under socialism, the means of production do not belong to economic units or individuals. The working man, being a member of a work collective, is a joint owner of the means of production. All the members of society are equal in relation to the means of production; this guarantees employment to each member of society.

The *universality of labour* under socialism manifests itself in the fact that society secures for all its members an opportunity to work (in the socialist countries, the right to work is guaranteed by their Constitutions), and that all able-bodied members of society are obliged to work both for themselves and for the benefit of society.

Under socialism, employment in each branch of the economy and each region is ensured

according to plan. Society plans the opening of new workplaces by taking into consideration the demand for labour in each industry and region and proceeding from the local demographic situation. The state regulates relations among enterprises, as well as the regimen, norms and conditions of work. The expenditure of labour on manufacturing various goods is also determined by society.

The members of socialist society may work at state-owned, collective-farm or cooperative enterprises, as well as in their homes or on personal subsidiary holdings. There are also possibilities for individual labour, for instance, in agriculture, crafts, and services. The socialist state regulates individual labour activity so as to ensure its serving the interests of society (this is done through the system of financing and crediting, the purchase of the goods produced, and through other economic measures, as well as by legislation).

The universality of labour promotes its creative character. In socialist society, there is every opportunity for turning labour into a creative process. Any kind of constructive work contains elements of creativity. However, labour is truly creative only in the conditions of public ownership of the means of production, that is, where the latter belong to the workers.

It is conscientious work and its outcome that determine a person's status in socialist society.

The general attitude towards working people is that of profound respect. The universality of labour, which is free of exploitation and is growing ever more creative, accounts for the fact that work is the key factor determining the way of life under socialism. The right to work and to choose one's profession or trade has an important role to play in imparting a work-oriented character to the socialist way of life.

In the socialist countries, every able-bodied person is guaranteed an opportunity to get a job and to receive remuneration for the work done in accordance with its quantity and quality, and never below the state-established minimum level of wages. *The right to work* is not merely proclaimed by the Constitution, as is the case in capitalist countries, but it is actually ensured "by the socialist economic system, steady growth of the productive forces, free vocational and professional training, improvement of skills, training in new trades and professions" (Art. 40 of the Constitution of the USSR).

As the members of socialist society enjoy equal rights in relation to the means of production owned by entire society, they exercise equal rights as regards participating in social production and obtaining, in accordance with the quality and quantity of work they have put in, part of the product created through

the use of these means of production. This is what is meant by the socio-economic equality of the working people under socialism. The right to work is one of the more important social implications of the public ownership of the means of production.

In the process of building socialism, unemployment is eliminated, and full employment is ensured. Full employment means that the able-bodied citizens' requirements for work in the area of social production are satisfied to the maximum extent. It is objectively inevitable, of course, that part of the able-bodied population is engaged in running their homes (these are mainly women), working on personal subsidiary holdings or studying. In socialist society, the provision of all the able-bodied people with jobs constitutes an important element in the process of the planned development of social production.

In socialist society, employment performs both economic and social functions. The economic function manifests itself in the fact that each able-bodied person, being a co-owner of the means of production, is obliged to work in order to procure the means of subsistence both for himself and for the benefit of society. The social function of employment stems from work being the main form of people's participation in the life of society.

In the socialist countries, the employment policy is called upon to ensure full, rational and effective employment. The latter implies optimal and productive application of manpower resources, their rational distribution among the various economic sectors, and the full use of the skills and abilities of the employed population.

The right of the members of socialist society to work is inseparably linked to their obligation to work. The elimination of exploitation does away with the opportunity to live parasitically, i.e., at others' expense. "He who does not work, neither shall he eat" is a principle of socialism. The fundamental difference in the condition of the working people under socialism and under capitalism is accounted for, not by the absence of the need to work but by the differences in the socio-economic conditions of work. Socialism eliminates the antithesis between mental and manual labour, between agrarian and industrial work, between the work of the managers and of people who follow their instructions.

In socialist society, the obligation to work implies not only participation in social production, but also conscientious and skillful work. It is inseparably linked with the need for each worker to improve his professional skills, strive for better results in his work and see to it that production resources and working time are used rationally and sparingly. The reliance on the

achievements of scientific and technological revolution, the growing interdependence between various industries and production sectors, as well as the vast dimensions of the national economy, call for the working people's better organisation, improved discipline and higher quality of work.

As conscientious work turns into a norm of everyday life, there is no place for idleness and parasitism in socialist society. Nonetheless, there are still people who violate labour discipline or seek to avoid work, thus violating social standards. That people should feel obliged to work is ensured by material and moral incentives, and through legislation.

On reaching the working age, that is, the age of 16, all the members of society are obliged to work (those in the 16 to 18 age group, during a shorter working day). Under socialism, child labour is banned. Involving the rising generation in labour activity at secondary and vocational-training schools, and thereby training young people in various labour skills, is an important means of cultivating respect and love for work.

In ensuring full employment, the socialist state uses a variety of methods. First, all economic and social development plans, both short-term and long-term ones, provide for such volumes and areas of capital investments as to

create new jobs; an allowance is made for the growth in manpower resources. This guarantees full employment. Second, socialist society makes every effort towards creating employment opportunities for those people who would like to work but are unable to do so because they are busy running their homes, raising children, working on personal subsidiary holdings, etc.

The opportunity to involve people working on personal subsidiary holdings in social production depends, first of all, on the development of the agro-industrial complex and the expansion of the purchases of agricultural produce by the state and cooperatives from the owners of personal subsidiary holdings.

Universal, guaranteed employment in social production cultivates in all the members of society a desire to work, and guarantees them the means of subsistence. This creates a socio-psychological atmosphere which could never emerge under capitalism. Capitalism's class antagonisms and the struggle for survival are replaced, in socialist society, by social optimism and relations based on mutual assistance, cooperation and collectivism.

Bourgeois economists tend to misinterpret the notions of full employment, the right to work and the obligation to work under socialism. They picture employment in socialist countries as being either a result of the spontaneous

action of the labour market, which is deformed by state planning[1], or as an outcome of the libertarian policy of the state which institutes universal compulsory labour.[2] Both interpretations are groundless and have nothing to do with socialist practices. Rendering people free of work and making them join the huge army of the unemployed – that is how capitalism reveals its exploitative nature. In socialist society, labour is the decisive prerequisite for the uninhibited, all-round development of the personality of each and all. That is why the socialist economy has no room either for a relatively free labour market (i.e. unemployment) or for compulsory employment. This is confirmed, among other things, by the fact that in the socialist countries the working people have the *right to choose a trade or a profession.*

Enshrined in the Constitution of the USSR is the right of Soviet citizens to choose a trade or profession, type of job and work in accordance with their inclinations, abilities, training and education, with due account of the needs of society. More and more people are involved in social production in accordance with their incli-

[1] See, for example, *The Soviet Economy: Continuity and Change.* Ed. by M. Borstein. Boulder, Colo., 1981, p. 97.

[2] See, for example, *Employment: Outlook and Insights.* Ed. by D. Freedman, I.L.O., Geneva, 1979, pp. 111–15.

nations, knowledge and experience. An opportunity to make full use of all one's abilities is an important feature characterising labour under socialism. That is why socialist society sees to it that workers are satisfied not only with the size of the remuneration for their work but also with the content of their labour, that they have an opportunity to develop their creative potential, mix with other people, and fulfil themselves through their work.

The degree of a job's attractiveness is determined by a number of factors, among them material and moral incentives, work intensity or arduousness, working conditions, the content of work and whether or not it matches the workers' temperament, physical and mental abilities, skills, historical and national traditions, age, sex, marital status, etc.

The right to choose an occupation is ensured by free education and the expansion of the opportunities to apply labour in rural and newly-developed areas. Of great importance is the effort to facilitate and protect labour and to improve working conditions. Many trades and professions associated with health-hazardous or arduous working conditions have become a thing of the past (for instance, the job of a hammersmith).

The effort to ensure a free choice of occupation in accordance with one's abilities encounters

difficulties arising from the present development level of the productive forces. One is free to choose a profession or trade within the existing employment structure. Alongside mechanised and skilled labour, whose applications are constantly multiplying, there still exist manual, low-skilled, and low-prestige jobs. Additional material incentives and efforts to cultivate respect for any kind of work, regardless of its content, are essential in encouraging people to take up such work.

Vocational guidance is of growing importance in guaranteeing that people exercise their right to work in accordance with their abilities. The state, regional authorities and enterprises make a purposeful effort to identify and develop people's abilities to work, taking into account their inclinations, psychology, physiology and social interests. Vocational guidance includes the provision of information and consultative services, as well as job selection. At the first stage of the vocational guidance process, the content of a trade or profession is described in general terms; at the second, more detailed information is provided; and at the third, it is determined whether or not a concrete person is fit for the given profession or trade. Vocational guidance involves various measures to provide vocational training and general education to the rising generation, setting up voca-

tional guidance centres at schools and enterprises, and inviting sociologists, psychologists, economists, and other specialists to participate in consulting and selecting people fit for the given profession or trade.

In the context of the scientific and technological revolution, vocational guidance grows in importance as higher demands are made on the education, skills, and psycho-physiological traits of the worker aspiring for a certain job, and as the structure of employment broadens and becomes more complicated.

The employment structure evolves under the influence of two aspects in the social division of labour, the production-technological one and the socio-economic one. The production-technological aspect is linked to efforts to improve the means of production, to the methods of their application, and to the upgrading of workers' skills. The socio-economic aspect is linked to the orientation of socialist production towards ensuring the well-being and all-round development of all the members of society. This presupposes, among other things, the creation of favourable conditions for the voluntary involvement of all the contingents of the able-bodied population in social production, as well as the rational use of manpower in the process of labour.

The scientific and technological revolution

leads to quantitative and qualitative changes in the employment structure. Quantitative changes are caused by the following factors: the emergence of new jobs due to the modernization of existing enterprises or the construction of new ones; reductions in the number of existing jobs due to the phasing out of obsolete equipment; and the increases in the coefficient of machine working-time. Qualitative changes are brought about by the production innovations based on the introduction of new equipment and technologies (i.e. due to the development of flexible production systems, a higher technical level and better quality of the manufactured machinery and equipment, the mechanization of materials-handling work and warehousing, and an ever broader use of microprocessors and robots). In the USSR, for instance, the production and transportation of coal in the stopes as well as the haulage and loading operations have been fully mechanised. The mechanisation effort has almost fully covered the removal of ore and rock in underground mining, and lumber felling and transportation. Fifty per cent of all cattle, 66 per cent of all pigs, and 78 per cent of all poultry are raised at mechanised farms.

The scientific and technological revolution induces changes in such overall ratios in the structure of jobs as the ratio between employ-

ment in the public sector and individual labour activity, between employment in material production and that in the non-production sphere, within the branches of the production and non-production spheres, between employment in industry and work in agriculture, between the number of male and female workers, and between predominantly mental and predominantly manual labour. Labour processes become more attractive aesthetically, and more and more monotonous, unskilled, manual jobs cease to exist.

However, there is a "reverse side" to the scientific and technological revolution. Factors emerge that have an adverse impact on the human organism. These include, among other things, the higher speeds of production processes, the use of new flammable materials, and the broader application of radioactive substances and lasers. That is why, as the scientific and technological progress accelerates, socialist society pays greater attention to creating not only technological-and-economic, but also social models of the technologies and production processes yet to be introduced. It also takes into account the potential impact of such processes on the health and personality of the worker.

In the USSR and other socialist countries, the scientific and technological revolution brings about progressive changes in the employment

structure. There is a growth in the employment rate in the public sector of the economy, in the manufacturing industry, in science-intensive sectors and in science itself, and in the non-production sphere and retail trade. Meanwhile, in agriculture and in the labour-intensive industries, the number of people who have low-prestige, monotonous jobs tends to drop. The range of the workers' professional skills is expanding. As the workers master several related skills each, as they learn to handle a number of machine-tools at a time, and as the range of their functions and duties broadens, there emerges a new category of multi-skilled workers. The socialist state stimulates this process by paying additional allowances to those who do several related jobs.

At the early stages of its development, socialist economies usually feature an expansion of the production sphere at the cost of the non-production sphere. This is due to the need to create the material and technical base of socialism. At later stages, the use of machinery and the increases in labour productivity make it possible to channel more and more resources to the non-production sphere. In the process, emphasis is laid on those sectors of the non-production sphere which exert a key influence on the advancement of the economy as a whole. Over the last decades, the number of people employed

in the health service, education, culture and science has been growing at a faster rate than the number of those employed in material production. Between 1950 and 1980, in Bulgaria, for instance, the number of industrial workers grew 3.7 times, in the health service and social security, 8.5 times, in education, science and culture, 5.2 times. In Poland, the number of people employed in industry grew 2.2 times, in the municipal services, utilities, and consumer services, 5.6 times, in the health service and social security, 5 times, and in education, science, and culture, 3.9 times over the same period.

The level of workers' education and skills has been growing correspondingly. Between 1970 and 1982, in Bulgaria the percentage of specialists with a complete higher or secondary specialised education grew from 19 to 22 per cent of the total number of the employed; in the GDR, from 12 to 20 per cent; in Poland, from 18 to 29 per cent; and in the USSR, from 19 to 27 per cent. Education is provided to the working people free of charge. Those who study while continuing on their jobs are granted various benefits. They are entitled to additional paid leaves for doing practical work in laboratories, taking exams and tests, and preparing their graduation projects. They are also entitled to a favourable work regimen. For

instance, in the USSR, night-school students are entitled, beginning with the third year of study, to an additional day off each week at 50 per cent of their regular wages. In Hungary, the night-school students may have up to 40 days off work for their studies each year with their average wages reserved for them.

The scientific and technological revolution causes an intensive redistribution of workers between enterprises, within and among industries, and within enterprises. It also leads to population migrations and increases the professional and social mobility of the working people. Redistribution of the work force is typical of socialist production. Labour mobility within and among socialist enterprises is effected on a planned basis; the workers' wishes and preferences are taken into account.

In the USSR, for instance, the redistribution of the labour force may take on such organisational forms as enrolment through voluntary organisations, organised recruitment, transfer of workers from one job to another, or organised job placement. Workers may also change their place of work on their own initiative, or change their trade or profession altogether.

Each of these forms corresponds to a definite goal. For instance, the territorial redistribution of the labour force with a view to attracting workers to construction projects of higher na-

tional-economic importance involves voluntary organisations (the Young Communist League and others) issuing special calls to the population. What is referred to as organised recruitment serves the purpose of redistributing the labour force to the more labour-intensive and seasonal industries located in regions which are not easily accessible or lack manpower. The rural redistribution of the labour force is aimed at supplying labour power to collective farms and state farms which, while holding large areas of land, lack manpower. The transfer of workers from one enterprise to another serves the purpose of organising an intra-industry redistribution of manpower and supplying labour to major industrial installations about to be put into operation. This method is also used in the job placement of workers released from other production spheres due to modernisation.

Organised job placement is applied at the urban or regional levels with a view to effecting the intra-industry and inter-industry redistribution of labour resources. The individual form of enrollment is used in all cases of redistribution for personal reasons. This form makes it possible to harmonize the interests of society and personal interests, and to ensure the workers' right to a free choice of a job and trade or profession, as well as the enterprises' right to employ personnel in accordance with their own

needs. In the USSR, the ratio between the organised and individual forms of job placement is 1 to 4.

As its economy develops on a planned basis, the socialist state forms "attraction" and "repulsion" zones for manpower, thereby exerting an indirect influence on the size and direction of individual migration of the able-bodied population. In the USSR, for instance, the effort to develop Siberia and the Far East fosters the territorial mobility of the population. Regional allowances and bonuses are the main incentives used to attract population to the regions under development. The large-scale construction of social and cultural facilities and the priority supply of these regions with high-grade goods are also important. All this is achieved on the basis of a programme for the development and distribution of the productive forces of Siberia and the Far East.

The methods used to encourage the resettlement of agricultural workers from one region to another include the payment of a lump-sum non-refundable allowance and the granting of privilege loans to workers wishing to build houses and outbuildings, buy cattle and durables.

In the USSR, it is important to encourage the planned redistribution of the labour force because in all the regions of the RSFSR and the Republics situated in the European part

of the country, the labour resources virtually ceased to expand, while in the Republics located in Central Asia, as well as in Kazakhstan, Azerbaijan, and Armenia, the rates of the able-bodied population growth have greatly overtaken the production requirements. The regions which have a shortage of labour resources dramatically differ from those having an abundance of them, both in natural conditions and in ethnic composition. This hinders the population flow. In this context, the creation of additional jobs in regions having an excess of manpower is essential to ensuring the correspondence of the labour resources to the production requirements.

Some of the changes in the structure of employment under socialism are due to the active involvement of women in the economy.

Socialism does away with job discrimination against women and creates conditions ensuring their full equality in society. The large-scale involvement of women in social production is promoted by the character of labour in socialist society: labour is free of exploitation and is the sole source of the working people's growing well-being. The Constitutions of the socialist countries not only secure for women equal rights with men, but they also guarantee women an opportunity to actually exercise these rights.

The socialist countries feature high rates of

women's involvement in social production. In the CMEA member-countries, women account for 40 to 50 per cent of the factory and office workers in the 1980s. In the GDR and the USSR, women account for more than half of all workers and employees. In Bulgaria and the GDR, more than 80 per cent, and in the Soviet Union, more than 90 per cent of all women of the working age are either employed in the economy or study full time.

In 1982, the proportion of women employed in the public and cooperative sectors of the economy was 51.1 per cent in the USSR, 50.3 per cent in the GDR, 49.2 per cent in Bulgaria, 48 per cent in Mongolia, 46.6 per cent in Czechoslovakia, 44.9 per cent in Hungary, 43.3 per cent in Poland, 38.2 per cent in Romania, and 35.1 per cent in Cuba.

In the socialist countries, women are guaranteed a proper role in social production. Characteristically, an increasing number of women are employed in the best-equipped industries, such as mechanical engineering and metal working. In Hungary, for instance, women currently account for nearly 45 per cent of the factory and office workers employed in industry; in Bulgaria and Mongolia, they account for about 49 per cent and more than 55 per cent, respectively.

An increasing number of women hold impor-

tant management jobs (shift attendants, team leaders, shop super-intendants, engineers, economists, agronomists, and heads of institutions and enterprises).

The scientific and technological revolution causes profound qualitative changes in the labour of women employed in agriculture. The work of peasant women becomes increasingly similar to industrial labour. In socialist countries, there are many women among tractor-drivers, combine-operators, agronomists, livestock specialists and farm managers.

Women's contribution to the development of science, public health services, education, culture and the arts is invaluable.

In the CMEA countries, four of every five workers in public health and social security are women. In the public health services of the GDR, the Soviet Union, Poland and Czechoslovakia women predominate. Women account for 60 to 75 per cent of all cultural workers and educators in the socialist countries. In Bulgaria and the GDR, women account for more than 50 per cent of all scientific workers.

The accelerated development of education and the continuous improvement of women's professional skills have largely contributed to their mass involvement in social production. Socialist society has done away with the wage discrimination against women. Women have the

same rights as men as regards access to education, vocational training and improvement of skills.

In the USSR, for instance, 29.5 per cent of the women employed in the national economy in 1980 had a higher or secondary specialised education. In 1940, only 6.5 per cent of all the working women had this kind of training and educational background.

Women account for 60 per cent of all the mental workers, 59 per cent of the specialists with a higher and secondary education, and for 40 per cent of all scientists and research workers.

The level of skills of female manual workers has considerably risen. Every year, nearly 30 per cent of all the workers in the USSR upgrade their skills. The gap between men's and women's levels of skill is narrowing. While in the 1920s the average skill level of female manual workers in the USSR was 2 or 3 grades below that of male workers, nowadays the gap has narrowed to 1-1.5 grades.

Similar processes are observed in other socialist countries, as well.

In the socialist countries measures aimed at protecting women's, and especially mothers', labour and health are provided for by the legislation. This is an important guarantee of the exercise by women of their right to work.

The international covenants concerned with female labour are fully observed in the socialist states: it is forbidden to employ women on underground, health-hazardous, arduous or noxious jobs. (Note that in the United States, for instance, there is a certain percentage of women among the coal miners.)

Among the economic guarantees of the women's right to work is the wide network of child care facilities (créches, kindergartens, all-day school groups) which enable women to combine their participation in social production with bringing up children.

In Bulgaria, for instance, 75.5 per cent of the children aged between 3 and 7 go to kindergartens. In Hungary, 85 per cent of all children between three and six years of age, and 15 per cent of the children under three years of age, attend kindergartens. In 1978, 60 per cent of the children under three years of age in the GDR were taken care of in créches, while more than 90 per cent of the children between three years old and the school enrollment age attended kindergartens, and more than 75 per cent of the school children in the first to fourth forms were covered by the all-day-school system.

The socialist countries are carrying out efforts to ensure women's broader involvement in production through turning consumer services into a

major, mechanised industry and by widening the availability of the services and goods that are designed to facilitate domestic work. A great deal has already been done in this respect. The demand for household appliances is satisfied at a fast rate. In the USSR, for instance, the families' demand for refrigerators, washing machines, vacuum cleaners and similar items is satisfied on an ever broader scale. Whereas in 1965 only 11 per cent of the families owned refrigerators, in 1980 more than four fifths of the families owned one. Nowadays, 70 per cent of the Soviet families have washing machines. This is four times more than in 1965. The quality of household goods is constantly improved and their range widened.

The socialist countries' successes in guaranteeing women the right to work have been made possible by the socialist planned economic system, as well as their governments' socio-economic policies aimed at ensuring the right to work for all the citizens and at satisfying, to the maximum degree, the people's material and intellectual needs.

In the socialist countries, child labour (that is, the work of children and teenagers under 16 or 17 years of age) is prohibited by the legislation. Children may only become involved in labour education programmes, working on special farming lots within school grounds and

participating in other vocational guidance programmes at school.

The issues considered above – the universality of labour, the right to work and choose a profession or trade, and the changes in the structure of employment brought about by the scientific and technological revolution – reveal the advantages of socialist public ownership of the means of production over capitalist private ownership. Socialist public ownership of the means of production accounts for the ever growing role of labour in the rise of man as the main productive force and participant in the socialist relations of production. That labour grows ever more homogeneous socially, turning into the principal factor in the all-round development of man is an indisputable advantage of socialism.

Under socialism, labour is not only a means of the all-round development of the personality, but also a source of income. The next chapter will deal with the formation of people's income under socialism.

3. The Working People's Income under Socialism

Under socialism, the working person's income consists of two parts. One of them comes from distribution according to work done and the

other, from the social consumption funds. The first part is the result of work done for oneself and the second, of the work done for the benefit of society. Under socialism, the distribution of material wealth and cultural boons is based on the principle of "From each according to his ability, to each according to his work". *Distribution according to work done* is necessary because socialism does not immediately create an abundance of material wealth, and labour does not immediately become the prime, vital need. Predominantly mental and predominantly manual labour, agrarian and industrial labour, skilled and unskilled labour, the labour of managers and the labour of those who carry out their instructions, are still different both socially and economically. Therefore, labour under socialism cannot immediately ensure people's equality in terms of consumption. Distribution according to work done establishes a link between the measure of labour and the measure of consumption. More complicated, higher-skill labour is better remunerated.

Distribution according to work done takes on the form of the shopfloor and office workers' wages or salaries at the state-owned enterprises, and of remuneration for work in cooperatives.

Wages are the fund of the means of subsistence essential for the normal reproduction of the

labour force. The money paid to the worker by way of remuneration for his work is spent by the worker directly on articles of consumption and services.

The two main forms of wages are time payment and piece rates. In the case of piece-rate wages, the size of the workers' pay is determined by the fixed rates of pay for a definite output or for a definite volume of work done. The main advantage of the piece-rate wages is that they provide a direct incentive for the worker to raise his labour productivity. However, this form of remuneration is limited to the production sectors where each worker's output can be measured. In the case of time payment there is no direct link between the results of work and the amount of earnings. The payment depends on the actual length of time worked. Also taken into account are the worker's skills, the importance of the work he does, and his working conditions. Time payment is used when it is difficult to measure the output produced by an individual worker and when it is particularly important to ensure high quality.

As production automation is introduced on an increasing scale, and as higher demands are set on the quality of output, time wages gain priority over all other forms of pay.

Distribution according to work done is based

on the quantity and quality of labour expended by workers in the course of social production. The quantity of labour is measured by the working time required to produce an item or to perform a given production operation with the given kind of equipment, technology and organisation of production.

Of decisive importance for determining the amount of work done is norm-setting (the establishment of the norms of work time, output, servicing, personnel, etc.). Labour norms are substantiated scientifically, technologically, physiologically, economically, and with due regard to the social aspects of labour.

Under socialism, norm-setting is based on the premise that there exist social limits to the intensification of labour as the supreme goal of production is to create conditions for the all-round development of the personality. The labour norms are set with due regard for the experience of the front-ranking enterprises (associations) and aimed at mobilizing the existing potentialities; at the same time, they are realistic, that is, they can be fulfilled by workers possessing the requisite skills. Labour norms are relatively stable. They are revised as new machinery and equipment are installed, advanced technologies are introduced, the organisation of labour is improved, and so on.

What is meant by the quality of labour

is the level of skills that enable the worker to cope with a job or production operation.

In the case of a socialist economy, society distinguishes between the various levels of skills and complexity of work and, on that basis, establishes, purposefully and in a planned manner, wage differentials.

In determining the skill level requirements, it proceeds from the amount of socially necessary time expended by the worker in acquiring the necessary skills. It takes into account the fact that the other expenditures involved in mastering skills are material expenditures which are, on the one hand, roughly proportional to the time expended, and, on the other hand, that many of these expenditures are met by society which provides free education, student grants, and other benefits. Also taken into account is the urgency of the economy's need for training highly-skilled workers. The problem which arises in this regard is whether the wage differentials should be identical to the differentiation in the complexity of labour (i.e. in the levels of the workers' skills) or whether the rate (grades) of such differentiation should be such that society's expenditures on teaching skills to the worker could be repaid by the latter over the years of his work.

As can be seen from the actual economic conditions and the practice of providing ma-

terial incentives, if the wage differentiation on the basis of output quality is to be effective, it is essential that the differentials be sufficient – both in relative and in absolute terms – to ensure the attainment of requisite skill levels, and that all job vacancies (both those available today and the ones to be created in the future) that call for complicated labour be filled with workers having appropriate skills.

In the course of building socialism in the USSR, the wage system evolved as a form of distribution according to work done, ensuring equal pay for equal work. This presupposes wage differentiation according to the amount and quality of work done, and with due regard for the working conditions, the workers' skills, the importance of the given industry for the national economy, etc.

While ensuring equal pay for equal work, the wage system has the main task of promoting labour productivity thereby improving the working people's well-being. Between the mid-1970s and mid-1980s, the Soviet industrial workers' monthly earnings rose from 161 to 210 roubles.

The tariff system (wage rating) is the main method of assessing performance quality. The wages consist of the base pay (tariff) and a bonus. The tariff accounts for the bulk of the payment. It reflects the quality of performance, and the complexity and importance of work.

The tariff system reflects the workers' skills, the time required to fully master a job, the health-hazardous or dangerous working conditions, and the arduousness of work.

There is no direct link between the base pay and the final results of work. The link can only be established through bonuses. Bonuses are paid for: various economies (of time, materials, fuel, energy, etc.); higher output quality; technical improvements and innovations; better organisation of work (including staff reductions). Thus, bonuses are of great importance in enhancing the effectiveness of work done by individual workers and whole collectives.

Distribution according to work done is used at public (state-owned) enterprises and organisations, and on collective farms. In the latter case, distribution according to work done matches the cooperative form of production. On the collective farms, the forms of distribution are closely approaching those used at state-owned enterprises. Each member of a cooperative enterprise receives a share of the enterprise's gross income in exchange for his labour.

During the period immediately following the Great October Socialist Revolution of 1917 in Russia, the cooperatives in this country distributed their income on the principle of equalization. The most widespread form of distribution in the early cooperatives was distribu-

tion according to the number of "mouths to feed", that is, the number of its members. A combined system of distribution based on the size of the plot farmed and the number of workers, was also used.

On the collective farms in the Soviet Union, distribution according to work done, as the main source of income of the collective farmers, was preceded by other forms of distribution. For instance, in 1928, 11 per cent of the Soviet collective farms distributed their income in proportion to the farmers' membership fees; 16.3 per cent, in proportion to the area of the socialised land; 5.7 per cent, according to the size of the socialised livestock population; and 20.4 per cent, according to the amount of the peasants' means of production used by the collective farms.

As land was socialised on a growing scale, and as remuneration of labour in proportion to the area of land handed over to the collective farm was gradually abolished, the principle of distribution according to work done came to be applied on a broader scale. The workday unit was introduced as a unit of payment on collective farms.

The workday was a measure of labour expended by the peasants on a collective farm and a measure of distribution according to work done. The workday unit as the measure of la-

bour and consumption reflected the peculiarities of the cooperative enterprise at a certain stage in the latter's development. As socialist production was further socialised, the workday unit came to feature some of the traits typical of wages. Initially, this was manifested in the growth of the percentage of cash payments in the workday unit. Subsequently, there occurred qualitative changes, as well. The state started to exert more influence on fixing the rate of payment for work on collective farms.

The transition to guaranteed monthly cash payments reduced the socio-economic distinctions between the shopfloor and office workers, on the one hand, and the collective farmers, on the other, as far as distribution according to work done was concerned. It also reduced the differences in pay rates on different collective farms.

The establishment of the principle of guaranteed regular payment for work provides a radically new basis for the formation of the wages fund which, at present, constitutes an integral part of the collective farms' production expenditures, rather than a remainder left after the distribution of the farm's income in cash and in kind.

Since the collective farmers' pay grows at a higher rate than the wages and salaries in the economy as a whole, the gap between the

farmers' earnings and the emoluments of factory and office workers is narrowing.

As the two forms of public ownership of the means of production are drawn closer together, and as agrarian labour develops into a variety of industrial labour, the difference in the pay of the collective farmers and that of the factory and office workers employed at state-owned enterprises will be obliterated altogether. This, however, will take a long time. Distribution according to work done will predominate as a source of the working people's income until the construction of communism is fully completed.

Distribution according to work done influences the development of people's abilities and talents. It stimulates their desire to engage in creative labour, to upgrade their skills and to raise their educational and cultural level. The principal distinctive features of the socialist way of life – collectivism, comradely cooperation and mutual assistance – become ever more pronounced.

Under socialism, distribution according to work done is supplemented with *distribution through the social consumption funds* (SCFs). The latter constitute one of the most remarkable hallmarks of socialist society.

Social consumption funds are intended to satisfy the population's *socially* important needs (for health services, culture, education, social security

for the disabled, etc.) at the socially necessary level determined by the stage of economic development achieved. The needs listed above have particular socio-economic importance, and this explains why it is impossible to satisfy them solely at the cost of people's income gained according to work done. If this were possible, there would appear considerable distinctions in people's levels of consumption due to the different sizes of their wages and salaries, different cultural levels, different sizes of families, etc. If under socialism the entire consumption fund were distributed solely as remuneration for work, society would be unable to make planned provision for, and to exercise control over the formation of a whole number of citizens' priority personal requirements which are of great importance for the all-round development of people's abilities.

That is why society disposes of part of the consumption fund by setting up special social consumption funds. These are used to provide the population with various material goods and services free of charge or at a discount, and also to make cash payments other than remuneration for work.

These funds ensure only those benefits which are used to satisfy the citizens' personal wants. They do not include the funds spent for administration and management, defence, science or

for other purposes which are not directly related to the population's consumption.

The social consumption funds have two closely interrelated functions: (a) the promotion of the social homogeneity of labour (*i.e.* they are used to satisfy common, socially relevant needs), and (b) smoothing out or eliminating those differences in people's living standards which are due to the different number of children or elderly people in their families, or to other factors. Distribution effected through the social consumption funds provides all the citizens with equal opportunities for improving their material and intellectual well-being.

In the Soviet Union, other payments and benefits from the social consumption funds account for a large share of the factory and office workers' overall income. Their proportion is nearly 40 per cent in the case of the lower-income group among the factory and office workers; 15 to 30 per cent in the case of the average-income workers, and 10 to 15 per cent in the case of high-paid factory and office workers.

The centralised social consumption funds (which belong to the entire people) provide a material basis for the system of providing free services to the population. This portion of the social consumption funds goes to maintain hospitals, clinics and other health centres, secondary

schools, technical colleges, higher educational establishments and other schools, créches and kindergartens, and many of the cultural facilities. In the 1983-1984 school year, 75 per cent of the day students at the specialised secondary educational establishments and 77 per cent of the day students at the higher educational establishments received grants or scholarships. The state covers 80 per cent of the cost of the children's upkeep at the créches. It also pays more than 10 roubles daily towards the cost of the hospital stay and treatment of each patient.

Apart from the centralised social consumption funds (which are the property of the entire people), there are also decentralised public consumption funds owned by enterprises, collective farms and social organisations.

The bulk of the social consumption funds belonging to the state-owned enterprises and organisations is used to pay for the workers' leaves and sanatorium accommodation vouchers, to maintain the housing, child-care centres and Young Pioneer camps owned by these enterprises or organisations, pay the workers lump-sum bonuses over and above the payments from the wages fund, carry out cultural and educational work, provide health protection, develop physical culture and sports and provide meals at reduced prices at cafeterias at the workers'

places of employment.

From the point of view of the distinctions in the forms of distribution and consumption, the social consumption funds can be divided into the funds used to provide material goods and services free of charge or on preferential terms, and the funds from which cash payments are made. Material goods and services are provided to the population by the public health service, and by educational, cultural, physical-culture and sports centres and organisations financed out of the social consumption funds. These material goods and services are granted free of charge, and thus the possibility of using the social funds for any purpose other than that for which they are intended, is ruled out. The socially necessary level of satisfying the more important social requirements is thereby guaranteed.

Among the cash benefits payable to the population from the social consumption funds are old age and disability pensions, allowances payable to families with children and to unmarried mothers, students' grants, temporary disability benefits, maternity leaves, etc. Cash payments from the social consumption funds constitute part of the individual income and personal property of the people who receive them. The beneficiaries are free to dispose of them as and when they deem it necessary.

A considerable part of the cash benefits reaches the population through the *system of social security and social insurance*. Under socialism, social security implies the maintenance by society (i.e. directly at society's expense) of people who are unable to work, either permanently or temporarily, for reasons which society deems valid. Among such reasons are: sickness, disablement, the attainment of pensionable age and the required length of service, interruption of one's work in order to obtain an education or training, being on a regular leave, etc.

4. Organisation of Labour in Socialist Society

Under socialism, the role of labour in the rise of man as the main productive force and participant in the socialist production relations largely depends on the organisation of labour on the scale of the entire national economy and of the individual production units.

The organisation of labour on the scale of the entire economy implies the cooperation, on a planned basis, of the labour of all the citizens. The social organisation of labour under socialism ensures that people work both for themselves and for the benefit of the entire society, while society undertakes to regulate the economic and

social conditions of such work. Society maps out plans for economic and social development, distributes the principal material resources, and exercises control over prices and over the measure of labour and the measure of consumption. Socialist society works out and applies new forms of production and work organisation, applies its own methods of involving people in labour, ensuring discipline and raising labour productivity.

The organisation of labour under socialism serves both as a means for expanding production and as a basic condition for the rise of man. The purpose of the organisation of labour is to completely eliminate the workers' life-long bondage to any one production operation. Socialist work organisation develops the workers' functions in the area of labour and turns them into workers of a new type – multi-skilled, better educated and more capable of taking a creative approach to their work than the detail workers in the past. The worker of the new type has broader functions both in terms of his labour and as regards society as a whole. The indispensable requirement for the new kind of work organisation is the working people's participation in the management of production. This resolves the contradiction between the working man being a partial worker and his being a co-owner of the means of production.

Socialism brings to life some fundamentally

new forms of labour organisation. In socialist society, the organisation of labour is planned on the scale of the entire national economy. The plan provides for the combination of labour as the source of the means of subsistence and labour as a means of satisfying social requirements. The plan is a most important instrument used for well-balanced economic development. As social ties that emerge in the process of production grow ever more complicated, the organisation of labour comes to be grounded on a thorough knowledge of the laws governing the functioning of the socialist system. Socialist work organisation must never be based on libertarian decision-making. The organisation of labour depends, on the one hand, on the changes in the material basis of the worker's labour functions, his working conditions, the arrangement of his work station, etc., and, on the other hand, on the creation of conditions essential to the development of collectivism, comradely cooperation and mutual assistance among the members of work collectives. Under socialism, conditions for the harmonious development of the personality largely depend on the organisation of social labour. The matters related to the organisation of labour should be considered not only at the level of the entire national economy, but also at the level of individual industries, enterprises, sections and work stations.

In the USSR, the organisation of labour at individual enterprises is based on the principle of *cost-accounting*. The latter sets the stage for the organisation of labour at an individual enterprise on a planned basis. It presupposes reliance on material incentives in carrying out the enterprise's plan. The entire work collective of a cost-accounting enterprise would thus make every effort to increase output for each rouble expended. Cost-accounting reflects the connection between work done for oneself and work done for the benefit of society. It also links the size of the work remuneration to the worker's labour input and the amount of goods produced for society's use.

Operation on the basis of cost-accounting is different from operation on the commercial basis. While the essence of the former lies in comradely cooperation and fraternal mutual assistance, the latter is based on private ownership of the means of production and is used as a weapon in competition.

The organisation of labour at individual enterprises implies a rational placement of the workers with a view to making most effective use of the means of production. It provides for the division of labour within the given enterprise in conformity with the specific character and technical level of production, and the skill of the workers involved; the rational arrangement and

servicing of work stations; designing rational work procedures and creating conditions for their application; measures to improve working conditions and ensure labour protection and safety; measures designed to promote labour discipline; organised upgrading of the workers' skills, and raising their cultural level; regulation of the periods of work and rest and the work schedule; providing increased material and moral incentives for both individual and collective labour; organising socialist emulation and propagating advanced production experience, etc.

The organisation of labour promotes the all-round development of the personality through the *social development plans* adopted and implemented at enterprises.

The work collective is not only a determining factor in production activity; it is also a proponent of social values and norms. It influences the socio-political, ideological, recreational, cultural, educational, and communicative aspects of man's vital activity, exerting its effect on people's way of life, their mentality, world outlook and behaviour patterns. It is within the work collective that the basic patterns and norms of people's societal behaviour are formed and become rooted, and it is here that human beings become actively involved in the system of social relations. It is on the basis of and in connection with its economic functions in produc-

tion that the work collective takes shape as a social unit that concerns itself about the character, content, conditions and protection of labour; raising production standards; improving the system and organisation of remuneration for the work done; continuously improving the social and psychological atmosphere and relations within the collective; upgrading the collective's social structure, etc.

At an industrial enterprise, the social infrastructure emerges in response to the need to satisfy a certain set of the work collective's requirements in various fields. These requirements include: in the labour sphere, a need for meaningful, creative work, for appropriate working conditions and adequate production and rest-and-recreation facilities; in the socio-political sphere, the workers' need, shaped by the system of social relations, to act in accordance with their vigorous attitude to life; in the intellectual sphere, people's need to obtain or improve general education or vocational training, for developing and applying their creative abilities and satisfying other requirements associated with the development of their personality. In the area of everyday life, people may develop a wide range of needs and requirements determined by the quality of life (the availability and quality of housing, utilities, consumer services, retail trade outlets and public transportation), by the quali-

ty and variety of services; in the area of rest and recreation, people may feel a need for individual or collective rest and recreation, for engaging in physical training and sports, building up their health while on leave, etc.

Under socialism, a major role is played by collectivist relations. *Collectivist relations*, that is, relations based on comradely mutual assistance and cooperation, are characteristic of all the forms of work organisation. The primary unit of the hierarchy of the work organisation forms is the work team. The work team operates on principles of cost-accounting; it functions on the basis of a single work-order and gets paid in accordance with the results of the work done by all its members. *A team contract* is a contract concluded between a work collective and the management. Under this contract, the team undertakes to perform a certain task, turn out a certain amount of finished products, technological units or complete sets of equipment, or build an installation or a part thereof. The team is provided with the necessary equipment, gear, raw materials and supplies. Its pay rates and the consumption of materials are usually planned on a long-term basis.

Work collectives which operate on the basis of a team contract are granted extensive rights in organising labour and production, deciding on their own professional composition and size, and

distributing their overall earnings among the individual members. The team undertakes to fulfil a production assignment and to make rational use of the socialist property entrusted to it. The team method of labour organisation creates the necessary conditions for a harmonious combination of personal and collective interests in terms of the quality of output, and promotes labour discipline. This improves the productivity of labour and the quality of output.

The team method of labour organisation, as well as the collectivist principles inherent in it, have been developed on a broad scale both in the town and in the countryside.

The team method of labour organisation extends the working people's rights as regards the management of production. It presupposes the team's greater independence and greater responsibility. It also fosters the atmosphere of mutual aid and reciprocity, enhances each member's responsibility for the results of collective work, makes each member more exigent vis-à-vis the work done by himself and by his colleagues, fosters an attitude of intolerance towards carelessness, indifference or violations of technological and work discipline. All this serves to ensure good results of the team's work and increases the earnings of its members.

The advantages of the socialist organisation of labour manifest themselves, in the final ana-

lysis, at each work station. The latter holds a special place in the organisation of labour. The work station is the place where machinery and labour, technology and human skills come into direct contact. The cost of setting up a work station, and the number of new work stations to be created in each industry and region is determined by the planning authorities. The plan takes into account the availability of manpower, housing, cultural facilities and utilities. Before commissioning new work stations, social expenditures to be involved are planned. The work station is indicative of production standards; its state reflects the workers' attitude to labour and their performance standards.

Under socialism, work stations are reviewed, certified and rearranged as needed. This helps to improve working conditions and make better use of the labour resources. Systematic reviews help identify those work stations which fail to meet current technological and social requirements.

An important role among the measures designed to improve work organisation and efficiency is played by socialist emulation.

Socialist emulation is a form of the working people's active participation in the management of production at the level of individual enterprises. This form provides for the workers' most active involvement in the management of pro-

duction and secures for them an opportunity to solve certain production tasks, usually the most important ones, by themselves, through their own work. Socialist emulation is the masses' school of management, an effective means of educating a new kind of worker and cultivating in him the qualities of a co-owner of the means of production.

Emulation as a specific manifestation of man's ability to work has been known since the time people started to work collectively. Emulation rests on the cooperation of labour, which, by uniting people, promotes collectivism, competition and the striving to display one's energy, ability, and skill, as well as to correlate one's own achievements with those of other participants in the production process. Social contact stimulates emulation, stirs up vital energy and increases individual productivity. This is characteristic of collective labour under any mode of production.

As for the purport of emulation as a form of social labour, it depends on the form of ownership of the means of production. In the case of capitalist ownership of the means of production, relations among people are relations of competition. Workers are compelled to compete for better terms of the sale of their labour power and for jobs, while the capitalists compete for the market and the maximum profit. The capi-

talists wage a bitter struggle with one another lest they be defeated by the rivals. In production, this alienates people from one another ruling out constructive cooperation and healthy emulation. Capitalist competition reveals the lack of humanism inherent in the capitalist system.

Socialist ownership of the means of production rules out this kind of strife among people and the possibility for the strong to crush the weak. It eliminates the exploitation of man by man and promotes comradely cooperation among the workers involved in emulation. Under socialism, working people have a stake not only in their personal success but also in that of all society because the growth in the public wealth benefits each and all.

Since the early days of the Soviet state's existence, bourgeois scholars have repeatedly forecasted socialism's stagnation and demise. Socialist society, they claimed, lacked a motive force which would promote production growth as competition did under capitalism. They made socialism out as a realm of mediocrity and uniformity, and as a system which, by subordinating people to universal discipline, inhibited individual talent, prevented competition and smothered initiative. Lenin disproved these allegations: "Far from extinguishing competition, socialism, on the contrary, for the first time creates the opportunity for employing it on a really

wide and on a really *mass* scale, for actually drawing the majority of working people into a field of labour in which they can display their abilities, develop the capacities, and reveal these talents, so abundant among the people whom capitalism crushed, suppressed and strangled in thousands and millions."[1] Socialist emulation is an important aspect of the social organisation of labour based on collectivism, comradely competition, cooperation, and mutual assistance. It serves to improve the overall results of work. Success in social emulation is achieved not through defeating and destroying the rival, but through pooling efforts for reaching a common goal. Socialism has put an end to the tendency towards working in isolation and keeping secret advanced methods of organising labour and production. Under socialism, quality work gains universal recognition and is emulated by thousands. This is achieved through publicity and the practice of comparing the results of emulation. Socialist emulation has given rise to a wide range of methods of propagating advanced experience gained in various sectors of the economy.

Socialist emulation has economic, socio-political and educational functions.

Its economic function consists in increasing la-

[1] V. I. Lenin. "How to Organise Competition?", *Collected Works*, Vol. 26, Progress Publishers, Moscow, 1972, p. 404.

bour productivity and enhancing the effectiveness of production. At all stages of socialist society's development, socialist emulation serves to boost material production.

The socio-political function of socialist emulation consists in consolidating and furthering socialist democracy. By involving the broad working masses in production management and the effort to improve efficiency, it helps improve organisation and do away with shortcomings.

Socialist emulation is also an important educational factor. It brings to the fore the workers' creative potential as they work both for themselves and for the benefit of society.

The functions of socialist emulation complement and enhance one another.

The goals of socialist emulation are determined by concrete, topical economic, social and political tasks. In the USSR, for instance, socialist emulation pursues three main objectives: to improve the quality of people's work; to channel their efforts towards achieving the desired economic results; to involve all the participants in social production into the scientific and technological revolution.

Today, the principal objective of socialist emulation is to accelerate the rates of labour productivity growth. The higher the productivity of labour, the greater is the output produced

by each worker per unit of time; the less live labour, fuel raw materials and other resources are consumed per unit of output, the greater the output and the broader the possibility to satisfy society's requirements.

The campaign to promote the communist attitude to work is an important form of socialist emulation. This form is linked to a wide range of questions related to the development of collectivist relations, that is, relations based on comradely cooperation and mutual assistance.

The most important historical mission of socialism is to cultivate a new attitude to labour as man's prime, vital need. This kind of attitude to one's work was first manifested already in the early *communist subbotniks* (days of voluntary, unpaid work performed collectively – *Ed.*). Characteristically, *subbotniks* were born out of the revolutionary, labour enthusiasm of the masses and the advanced workers' lofty political and moral convictions. The first *subbotniks* – a manifestation of a new, communist attitude to work – were usually organised by the most politically conscious workers and lacked the mass scale and systematic character they were later to acquire. Still, Lenin assessed them as a phenomenon of world-wide historic importance, "the *actual* beginning of *communism*"[1], as the source of a new, more developed type of organisation of labour.

[1] V. I. Lenin. "A Great Beginning", *Collected Works*, Vol. 29, 1977, p. 427.

Today, *subbotniks* are a living and trustworthy tradition. The funds raised through the voluntary, unpaid work done at *subbotniks* are channelled to top-priority social areas, such as cancer research and combatting cardiac diseases, building hospitals for disabled war veterans or disabled workers, homes for the aged, cultural centres for young people, etc.

Participants in the socialist emulation aimed at fostering a communist attitude to labour systematically overfulfil output quotas, introduce production innovations and inventions and spearhead the campaign for the thrifty use of fuel, raw materials and other resources.

The campaign to promote a communist attitude to labour inspires a creative approach to work, stimulates the drive for better performance, and enhances people's awareness of the importance of their work for society. Organisationally, the currently practised forms of socialist emulation can be divided into three main groups – emulation among individual workers or teams within an enterprise; emulation among allied enterprises within an industry; emulation among allied enterprises in different industries.

Emulation within a factory involves workers' socialist pledges, counter-plans (upwardly adjusted plans) and inter-team agreements. The assessment of the results of socialist emulation among individual workers is based on such indicators

as the size and quality of output, the economies of raw materials and other resources, rational use of equipment and tools, improvement of workers' skills and education, achievements in mastering allied trades, and reductions in idle time within a shift.

Among the principal factors taken into account in assessing the results of socialist emulation at the level of work collectives are the amount, range and quality of output, labour productivity, economies in the wage fund and in raw materials and other resources, a steady rhythm of works, improvements in the output-to-capital ratio, savings in machine working time per shift, labour discipline, product unit cost, labour safety, production standards, and the number of workers who have made personal output pledges or adopted advanced methods and practices suggested by front-rankers.

Emulation indices chosen by an enterprise reflect the tasks it has to cope with.

The system of material and moral incentives for intra-factory socialist emulation may include cash bonuses, free rest-home or sanatorium accommodation vouchers, leaves granted out of turn, valuable presents, pennants, badges, honorary diplomas, official citation, the registering of the front-rankers' names in the Book of Honour or in the Roll of Honour, conferring on them the titles of Best Worker, Exemplary Work Team.

The most widespread type of intra-factory socialist emulation is emulation among individual workers or teams of workers in allied trades. Individual workers and teams may compete for such honorary titles as the Communist Work Team, the Exemplary Worker, etc.

Today, the socialist emulation movement has acquired a new dimension as more and more teams have adopted the method of working on the basis of a team contract. This method makes the team's entire effort dependent on the outcome of its work and thereby simplifies the organisation of emulation among teams, makes emulation more effective and heightens its educational role.

The team method of work organisation has brought into being a new, highly effective form of socialist emulation, known as emulation "all along the technological chain", that is, covering all the shops of an enterprise, from the blanking room to the shipping department. This form of emulation, aimed at ensuring an uninterrupted product flow at each stage of the technological process, features effective mutual aid, insistence on higher performance standards as regards each operation, and interchangeability of workers.

As socialist emulation campaigns transcend the boundaries of individual enterprises, they evolve into emulation among enterprises. The basic form

of this is emulation among the collectives of allied enterprises, the ones which turn out the same kind of products. Organisationally, such emulation is basically similar to emulation involving work teams in allied trades within a single enterprise.

Socialist emulation among allied enterprises involves socialist pledges and emulation agreements based on the terms fixed by the higher-ranking bodies of economic and voluntary organisations. Socialist pledges made by the enterprises participating in such emulation cover both the production sphere (the attainment of the basic plan targets, the amount of products to be turned out over and above the plan, the amount of the resources to be saved, the savings resulting from the introduction of innovation proposals, etc.) and improvements in the workers' living and working conditions (i. e. measures to be taken to ensure labour protection, improve living conditions, expand the network of health-building centres, encourage workers to take correspondence college-level courses or attend evening secondary schools, etc.).

Today, it is especially important to promote cooperation and competition among allied enterprises, other production facilities, and institutions (including research centres) in various economic sectors. By strengthening the direct links among the allied enterprises and institutions, which

emerge in the course of their operation on the basis of cost accounting and which are grounded on specially concluded agreements, emulation organised among their work collectives helps co-ordinate their efforts towards fulfilling the plans for mutual deliveries. Moreover, emulation involves people of various trades and professions – factory and office workers, engineers, technicians, scientists, and agricultural workers – in a single production process.

Thus, the distinctive features of the emulation campaigns that involve allied enterprises can be summed up as follows. First, the participants' mutual assistance is aimed, in the final analysis, at meeting social requirements. The goal of emulation is formulated in terms of the final, rather than intermediate, outcome of the production processes in which the participants in emulation are involved. Second, emulation transcends the boundaries of individual economic sectors. This corresponds to the social form of labour organisation under socialism. Third, such emulation focuses the participants' attention on the observance of delivery deadlines and plans.

When the results of emulation among allied work collectives are summed up, the collective which has secured the most favourable conditions for the rest of the participants, thus helping them meet their socialist pledges, is

recognized the winner.

Today, socialist emulation campaigns aimed at accelerating scientific and technological progress acquire increasing importance.

The feature that all the forms of socialist emulation share is their orientation towards enhancing the efficiencies and quality of work. This makes it possible to organise such emulation both within a country and on an international scale.

Among the highlights of *socialist emulation* today is its development as an *international phenomenon*, one that involves all the socialist countries. Such emulation is an objective manifestation of the extension of socialist economic integration, the international socialist division of labour, the international specialization and cooperation of production, the community of political and economic goals of the socialist countries, and, lastly, of the greater political awareness of millions of workers in these countries.

The most widespread form of international emulation is one which involves the work collectives of allied enterprises and organisations. For instance, each of the CMEA countries involved in the Soyuz gas pipeline project used its own resources and manpower in building a section of the pipeline. The builders' teams from the participating countries concluded socialist emulation agreements under which they pooled efforts

in improving the quality of work and fulfilling or overfulfilling the agreed plan assignments. The overall results of the work done by each of the international teams were thus considerably improved.

International socialist emulation yields the best results in the case of the work collectives of the CMEA countries' industrial enterprises involved in carrying out long-term cooperation plans for joint deliveries. Among other widespread forms of international emulation are machine-operators' or ploughmen's contests and exchanges of specialists among teams engaged in joint construction projects.

All the forms of international emulation promote collectivism and comradely cooperation.

In the *socialist-oriented developing countries*, emulation is gradually gaining ground as well. The far-reaching socio-economic transformations effected in these countries create objective prerequisites for the development of emulation.

Comradely emulation evolves, first and foremost, in the public (state) sector which plays a considerable role in the developing economies. Workers in major industrial centres are the most active participants in the emulation campaigns. An active role in emulation is played by people employed on key jobs – mechanics, electricians, oilmen, etc. To cite an example,

thousands of Syrian workers competed to fulfil the plan ahead of time at the Euphrates hydroelectric project. The campaign, launched on the initiative of the Soviet specialists employed on the project, resulted in a sharp increase in the rate of work.

Emulation also plays a major role in boosting the developing states' agricultural sector where most of the population of these countries is employed. In most cases, the emulation drives begin at public works projects where people work collectively and where the early forms of the cooperation of labour emerged. In many countries in Africa, Asia, and Latin America, people participate, without pay, in public works projects such as the laying of canals and roads, digging of wells, and building of dams, schools or hospitals.

In Algeria, for instance, there is a movement for voluntary work referred to as voluntaryism, which emerged in 1972. The agrarian reform launched that year involved a great number of university student volunteers who, during their vacations, helped peasants with working the land and harvesting crops. Subsequently, the movement involved dozens of thousands of other people, including high school pupils and, on weekends, factory workers.

Similar forms of comradely cooperation have emerged in other countries, as well. For instance,

at the state-owned enterprises in Syria what is known as the shock-work team movement has become widespread. The participating teams have set themselves the goal of tightening labour discipline, improving work quality and upgrading their skills.

Emulation helps to increase labour productivity and ensure economies of materials and manpower. For instance, workers at a building-materials factory in the town of Tiaret, Algeria, launched a campaign to contribute, on a monthly basis, the money earned during one day to the "Battle for Production" fund. At many other state-owned enterprises in Algeria, the workers draw up production plans, fix output norms and launch campaigns to fulfil and overfulfil the plan. As a result, the losses of working time are reduced, and the quality of output, improved.

In some countries, efforts have been made to work out the organisational principles and procedures of emulation. In Burma, for instance, the Ministry of Labour has drawn up emulation rules under which emulation results are to be summed up every three months on the basis of such indicators as labour productivity, work organisation, the scale of the rationalisation campaign, the introduction of advanced technologies, labour discipline and the effort to improve workers' skills.

In these developing countries which have opted for the socialist way of development, emulation has only started to gain ground. Its organisers face many problems which can only be addressed with due regard to various local factors. Nonetheless, emulation in these countries certainly has good prospects. In many countries in Asia, Africa, and Latin America it is developing into a mass international movement.

5. The Scientific and Technological Revolution and Labour under Socialism

The changes in the content of labour are largely due to the *scientific and technological revolution* (STR). The nature of the STR under socialism can be accounted for by the latter's advantages as an economic system. Socialism creates new socio-economic conditions and offers unique incentives for the acceleration of scientific and technological progress. These include socialist ownership of the means of production, cooperation of labour on a planned basis and on the scale of entire society, the universality of labour, the distribution of material wealth and cultural boons according to the quantity and quality of work done, the indivisibility of labour as a vital requirement and

a means of satisfying society's needs. Under socialism, the goal of the STR is to ensure the citizens' well-being and free, harmonious development.

Under socialism, the STR heightens the role of labour in the development of man as society's main productive force and as a vehicle of the new kind of production relations. The STR plays a major role in the enrichment of the content of labour as it develops from machine production through comprehensive mechanisation to the automation of production processes.

In order to facilitate the work people do, to make it more diversified and interesting, it is necessary to rely on mechanisation in all the sectors of the national economy. Socialist society transforms the productive forces it has inherited from capitalism and creates the material and technical base of socialism.

Socialism's material and technical base is socialised large-scale mechanised production based on the wide use of the latest achievements of science and technology, on the reliance on the plan in distributing material, labour and financial resources on the scale of entire society, and on making production more science-intensive.

The creation of the material and technical base of socialism implies the introduction of the machine system in all production sectors and a

transition from manual, artisan work to mechanised factory work.

In these countries, where prior to the socialist revolution large-scale industry was not sufficiently strong, the creation of socialism's material and technical base can only be ensured through industrialisation.

Socialist industrialisation envisages priority development of industry, above all heavy industry, and its key section – mechanical engineering. Industrialisation leads to the growth in the numerical strength of the working class and enables the workers to attain a higher level of skills and education.

Socialist industrialisation radically differs from capitalist industrialisation. Under capitalism, industrialisation enhances the difference in the content of work done by people employed in different industries and different regions, and intensifies the exploitation of the working class. Over the years of its existence, capitalism has effected industrialisation in only a handful of countries whose population accounts for a mere 15 per cent of the world's total.

Under socialism, industrialisation evens up the levels of mechanisation of the various industries in both developed and formerly backward regions and makes it possible to increase allocations for social needs. It also consolidates the working class's leading position in society.

As distinct from capitalist industrialisation, socialist industrialisation starts with changing the content of the labour of the workers employed in heavy industry. At the major enterprises built in this production sector, labour is mechanised, and the latest achievements of science and technology are used on a wide scale. Whole new industries are developed. The industrialisation period in the USSR, for instance, was marked by the development of the tractor, automotive, chemical, machine-tool, aircraft, and other industries. A higher level of mechanisation in these industries called for a higher level of the workers' education and vocational training.

The accelerated development of heavy industry made it possible to modify the content of labour in the light industry as well. The large-scale production of machine tools and equipment in heavy industry led to the mechanisation of labour in the light industry and made the work of the people employed here more attractive.

Industrialisation also made it possible to change the content of agricultural labour. Formerly, it was impossible to apply advanced agricultural practices and machinery on disunited and dispersed small farms. The plots of land used by the farmers were usually too small for them to employ machines or apply advanced

farming methods. Few peasant families could afford buying machinery. Thus, an objective necessity arose for transition to *socialist collectivisation*, that is, for a transition from small-commodity farm production to *agricultural cooperation* and to large-scale mechanised production within farmers' cooperatives.

In the USSR, the organisation of farmers' cooperatives made possible the transition from manual labour and the use of draught animals to the use of machinery.

In agriculture, just like in industry, there appeared new kinds of jobs and occupations. On small peasant farms, the same people cultivated fields, orchards and kitchen-gardens and raised cattle. In cooperatives, people found that they were able to make better use of their skills, knowledge and experience if they specialised, with some engaging in growing crops–wheat, flax, buckwheat, apples, etc.–and others, in raising cattle or poultry. As more and more machines were introduced, there appeared new jobs, those of the tractor-driver, combine-operator, milking-machine operator, etc. There emerged new fields of knowledge, such as agricultural technology and veterinary science. Rural workers now had broader opportunities to apply their labour in various fields and to find jobs corresponding to their abilities.

The large-scale introduction of machinery in

industry and agriculture called for a large number of skilled workers. In order to till land with a primitive plough one needs to be strong and possess skills which are usually passed from generation to generation. The ploughman's work can be done even by an illiterate person. In order to operate a combine harvester, drive a tractor or a car, or to apply chemical fertilizers, one needs knowledge and skills, that is, special education and training. The problem of workforce training is solved through a cultural revolution.

The cultural revolution entails the transformation of society's entire cultural and intellectual life and the creation of conditions conducive to the development and satisfaction of the working people's cultural needs. The cultural revolution moulds competent, high-skilled workers capable of managing production and state affairs and building socialism.

Socialism has secured an access to knowledge and the wealth of mankind's culture for all the people. For the working people to be able to master and assimilate the achievements of science, culture and the arts – the heritage of many generations – society has to start with eradicating illiteracy. Under the tsarist regime, 70 per cent of Russia's population could neither read nor write. The illiteracy rate reached almost 100 per cent

in the country's outlying districts predominantly inhabited by non-Russian nationalities. The measures taken by the socialist state to combat illiteracy yielded impressive results: in 1939, 87.4 per cent of the Soviet Union's population could read and write, and written alphabets were elaborated for the nationalities who had not previously had a written language of their own.

The cultural revolution creates prerequisites for a transition from unskilled manual labour to skilled labour. It sets the stage for developing a system of vocational and technical training. In the course of the cultural revolution, numerous technical, vocational and factory schools are set up, and higher educational establishments and technical colleges train large numbers of engineers and technicians.

The number of mental workers employed in industry and agriculture grows. The cultural revolution creates a new type of intellectual workers, the people's intelligentsia closely tied up with the working class and the collective farmers.

The cultural revolution enhances the role of knowledge in the process of labour. This can be seen from the fact that general education and professional training are as essential to the workers operating machines as dexterity or strength. The cultural revolution turns the semi-

literate worker prepared to accept any manual job offered into a skilled, competent worker versed in all the intricacies of his job and capable of handling machines and equipment.

Thus, the introduction of machinery accounts for the fact that the content of people's labour in various sectors of the economy becomes similar. Most jobs call for mechanised, skilled labour. However, the introduction of the machine system does not of itself eliminate the need for detail workers or people's attachment to concrete types of the division of labour. This can only be done in the course of the scientific and technological revolution.

The scientific and technological revolution first changes the content of manual labour in the sphere of material production. Comprehensive mechanisation and automation are essential to this change.

At the initial stage of automation, when it covers individual operations or a set of key operations, it is still the workers' responsibility to install parts and remove the finished product. The worker is also responsible for repairing and adjusting machinery for transporting products and parts, and for supervising production processes.

At the second stage of automation, when the entire set of production operations at a work station is performed by automatic ma-

chines, the worker is no longer responsible for loading and unloading the machine and is only in charge of the transportation of products and parts, quality control, observance of production procedures, and the repair, maintenance, and adjustment of the automatic machine.

The third stage of automation is associated with the introduction of electronic equipment and flexible automated production. The entire automated system can now be readjusted without the worker's participation. Flexible automated production is a system involving the designing and automatic manufacturing of parts. The elaboration of the system is the responsibility of the design and technological departments of the enterprise. All the components in the system are linked to one another through local-area computers. This allows to raise the productivity of labour many times, to reduce by half or even by two thirds the time spent on designing and manufacturing the parts, and to release a large number of workers. At the same time, this calls for better skills and an appropriate organisation of labour and production. The transfer of an increasing number of functions formerly performed by the manual worker to the computers leaves to the worker only the function of supervising and regulating the production process, increases the intellectual content of his work and makes it more creative.

The changes in the content and structure of labour in material production caused by technological changes modify the character of direct socialised labour as a whole. If the productive forces are not developed enough, labour predominantly appears as a means of producing material wealth. When social production enters the stage of comprehensive automation, the production of material and spiritual wealth will grow. However, the gradual changes in the functional role of social labour will take a long time. This process will lead to the intellectualisation of both manual and non-manual labour.

An indirect indication of the intellectualisation of manual labour can be found in the data illustrating the rise in the working people's educational level. In the USSR, for instance, the picture is as follows. While in 1959, people with higher, incomplete higher, secondary and incomplete secondary education accounted for 33 per cent of the workers engaged in predominantly manual labour and for 90 per cent of the workers engaged in predominantly mental labour, in 1970 the corresponding figures were 54 per cent and 95 per cent, and in 1983, 82 per cent and 98 per cent, respectively.

The intellectualisation of social labour also manifests itself in the growth of the number of specialists with a higher or secondary

specialised education employed in the national economy. Thus, in the USSR, in those shops of machine-building factories where simple labour predominates, there are 4 or 5 engineers and technicians per 100 manual workers; in the shops with mixed equipment, there are 9 or 10 engineers and technicians, in the shops where most of the equipment is automatic, there are 14 or 15 engineers and technicians, while at the fully automated enterprises, such as the modern thermal power stations, the entire personnel consists of engineers and technicians.

In the GDR, between 1969 and 1982, the number of specialists with a higher or secondary education grew by a factor of 5.1, the number of specialists with a higher education by a factor of 4.9 and the number of specialists with a secondary specialised education, by a factor of 5.2. In Bulgaria, between 1960 and 1982, the growth factors were 3.5, 3.1, and 3.5, respectively, and in Poland, between 1958 and 1982, they amounted to 5.4, and 5.6, respectively. A growth in the number of specialists with a higher or secondary education was observed in all socialist countries.

The introduction of computers, the improvement and mechanisation of clerical work, and the centralisation of data collection and storage set the stage for the gradual liberation of mental workers from monotonous, mechanical

functions and for a reduction in the number of unskilled and semi-skilled jobs. The introduction of automatic control systems and computers, as well as the implementation of organisational measures designed to raise the level of socialisation of production, induce considerable changes in mental labour in the area of management and set higher demands on the skills of the managerial personnel.

As the scientific and technological revolution progresses, the content of work done by production managers and specialists becomes increasingly complicated. This is due both to the introduction of new managerial technique and to a greater emphasis on socio-psychological factors. That is why, apart from being educated in engineering, economics and production management, they also need to be versed in pedagogics, social psychology, human engineering, sociology, etc.

Considerable changes occur in the content of labour in the non-production sphere. In science, education and the health service, machines and special equipment are used on a growing scale. The introduction of new equipment in consumer services allows for the application of more progressive methods such as self-service, sale by preliminary order, and mail-order service.

Comprehensive mechanisation (computerisa-

tion) will make it possible to release a considerable number of workers currently engaged in unskilled and semi-skilled manual labour, as well as a certain number of skilled workers who are now directly involved in the production process, by transferring their functions of controlling and supervising the operation of machines and mechanisms to computers.

The release of a considerable number of workers from the production sphere will make it possible to rechannel a major part of the labour force to the non-production sphere, reduce working time and streamline the structure of out-of-work time. The greater part of the labour expended in the production of material goods will be concentrated in the area of research and development. The latter will constitute the preparatory stage in the production process. An integration of science and production will take place. Thus, the production process will cover the entire concept-to-product cycle, rather than the traditional raw-material-to-product cycle. This factor, essential to overcoming the socio-economic distinctions between mental workers and manual workers, is closely connected with the development of the scientific and technological revolution.

The process of material production will increasingly depend on the degree of maturity of the collective reason. Correspondingly, the cont-

ent of labour in the production sphere will be largely determined by the creative element inherent in scientific and engineering work.

As a transition takes place from the predominantly extensive to the predominantly intensive type of production, it is increasingly imperative to reduce the number of manual, low-prestige jobs. At present, the USSR is developing a comprehensive long-term programme for reducing the volume of manual operations. It will be a costly programme. (In the developed capitalist countries, the average cost of comprehensive mechanisation of a work station is estimated at 14,000 dollars). In calculating the cost of mechanisation, the following factors are taken into account: structural changes in the national economy, a higher degree of specialisation of production, the extension of inter-sectoral ties, the rate of renewal of fixed productive assets, and the expenditures on personnel training and improvement of skills. Also taken into account is a whole system of social factors, including spendings involved in building dwelling houses, pre-school establishments, health-care centres, etc.

The introduction of the achievements of the scientific and technological revolution in production makes it possible to eliminate the division of labour whereby each worker specialised in narrow field and was attached to one type

of concrete labour. Today, many trades can be applied in different industries (for instance, that of the adjuster of equipment and automated production lines).

The elimination of jobs associated with health-hazardous working conditions is an important element of the effort to overcome socio-economic dissimilarities in labour. Lenin believed that under socialism the radical improvement of working conditions would rely on technological progress, especially on electrification, which "will make working conditions more hygienic, will free millions of workers from smoke, dust and dirt, and accelerate the transformation of dirty, repulsive workshops into clean, bright laboratories worthy of human beings".[1] As the Soviet Union's economic potential was gradually built up and the technological level of production was raised, ever more suitable solutions were found to the problems involved in the mechanisation of labour, first and foremost, in those industries which had especially harsh working conditions – coal mining, ferrous and non-ferrous metallurgy, lumbering, construction and some others. At the stage of developed socialism, the improvement of the working conditions of the working masses is an objective necessity born out of the

[1] V. I. Lenin. "A Great Technical Achievement", *Collected Works*, Vol. 19, 1977, p. 62.

basic economic law of socialism being applied on a growing scale. Both the effectiveness of the utilisation of technology and production assets, and efforts to boost labour productivity depend, to an increasing extent, on the workers' health and capacity for work.

Today, the Soviet Union's heightened economic potential ensures the material prerequisites for major improvements in working conditions. Each year, considerable sums are allocated for the purposes of providing workers with overalls, protective footwear and other protective gear. Success in the effort to improve working conditions is guaranteed if hygienic, physiological, psychological and aesthetic factors are taken into account already at the stage of research and development and in designing new and retooling or modernising old enterprises.

The scientific and technological revolution under socialism conduces to the elimination of distinctions not only between mental and manual labour, but also between agricultural and industrial labour.

The scientific and technological revolution unfolding under socialism also causes profound changes in the content of labour in rural areas. As agricultural labour acquires certain features of industrial labour, new jobs and trades appear while the older, traditional trades involve an ever greater use of machinery and equipment.

For instance, the introduction of industrial methods of processing grain after harvesting brought into being the job of the grain-dryer operator. The broad application of machinery in land reclamation and the construction of irrigation systems – where increasing priority is given to automation – have turned the job of the ameliorator into an industrial job. Mechanisation and automation of labour have attained a large scale at modern broiler factories. The content of labour of machine-operators has been enriched. The job of the tractor driver has been replaced by that of the multi-skilled machine-operator capable of handling tractors, combine harvesters, and other farm machines.

The range of jobs in rural areas is narrower than that in urban areas. Under socialism, agricultural and industrial labour still differ not only in sectoral, technico-economic and technological terms, but also in socio-economic terms.

The elimination of socio-economic distinctions between the town and the countryside is accelerated as people acquire better education and training. Between 1970 and 1984 the percentage of collective farmers with a higher or secondary (complete or incomplete) education grew from 39 per cent to almost 70 per cent.

Skilled urban and rural workers are trained in urban and rural vocational training schools. These educational establishments provide free

general secondary education and vocational training.

Rural vocational training schools graduate feeding- and milking-machine-operators, tractor drivers, combine-operators, mechanics, machine-servicers and car-drivers. On-the-job improvement of skills is also practiced on a large scale. The priority rates of training specialists with a higher or secondary specialised education for agriculture is an important indicator of progress in overcoming the socio-economic distinctions between industrial and agricultural labour.

As has already been pointed out, the scientific and technological revolution changes not only the content of labour of agricultural workers, but also the conditions of rural life. Under socialism, capital investment in the development of the social infrastructure in the countryside is constantly growing. This reduces the migration of labour force from village to town.

Construction projects launched in rural areas usually envisage simultaneous construction of dwelling houses, and cultural and service facilities (a trade centre, a consumer services centre, a canteen, etc.).

A great deal is done to improve medical services in the countryside. There are medical stations in all major rural settlements. Each regional administrative centre has a hospital,

mobile outpatient clinics, dispensaries, and an ambulance service. Emergency medical aid is available to all rural residents. Practically all village people can receive medical aid and treatment in their own region.

The construction of cultural facilities plays an increasingly important role in the social transformation of the village. In the USSR, for instance, one out of every two citizens borrows books from a public library. People in rural areas subscribe to newspapers and magazines, study at people's universities and join amateur art societies and groups.

Cultural services to the rural population are rendered through centralised library, club and sports centre systems established through pooling the funds and efforts of local Soviets, clubs, farms and trade union organisations.

Socialism's advantages in terms of labour are utilised not only on the national but also on the international level. Socialist economic integration opens up broad possibilities for accelerating scientific and technological progress through the *international cooperation of labour*. Joint implementation of major projects enhances the socialist countries' collective interest in their success.

Socialist economic integration promotes the unity of science and production on the scale of the entire world socialist system. This stimulates a continuous quest for the new, fosters

creative initiative and prompts flexible approaches both in the productive and non-productive spheres.

The international socialist division of labour evolves on a planned basis. Cooperation in planning, especially the coordination of national economic and social development plans, fosters the international socialist division of labour.

International specialisation is a most important form of the international division of labour. This can be illustrated by the example of the TMM-360 loom designed by engineers in the USSR and the GDR. The automatic shuttle-loading device is manufactured in the GDR, while the main, fabric-forming part is produced in the Soviet Union. The Soviet design is covered by 52 patents in virtually all industrially-developed countries. The TMM-360 loom has changed the content of weavers' labour and made it more productive. Thread rupture occurs less frequently than in other models; all parts of the loom are easy to service. The loom has another important advantage: it brings the noise level in the shops down to the sanitary norm. (The noise produced by weavers' looms is comparable to that of a rushing train and the noise-abatement measures previously used in the weaving shops did not always yield the desired result.)

Integrated programmes such as the Integrated Programme for Scientific and Technological Progress in the CMEA Member-Countries for the Period Ending in the Year 2000 are instrumental in combining the effects of the STR with the advantages of the world socialist system. They make it possible to carry on a well-coordinated scientific and technological policy over a long period.

The extension of specialisation and cooperation among the CMEA countries will enhance their joint effort aimed at promoting economic development, accelerating the development and introduction of fundamentally new machinery and technologies, making a better use of the production, scientific and technological potentials of the world socialist system in general and of each socialist country in particular and increasing the productivity of labour.

The introduction of new machinery and technologies boosts social labour productivity. For instance, the above-mentioned TMM-360 loom is twice as productive as a shuttleless loom and many times more productive than the older shuttle looms. For a single-phase loom to attain the same productivity, the shuttle would have to move at a speed of 240 km per hour, which is impossible. The speed of the TMM-360 shuttles is only 4 km per hour.

The 48-shuttle looms installed in one of the

shops of a textile factory in the GDR were operated by 4 weavers. The shop produced 250,000 square meters of fabric per year. The eighteen TMM-360s installed in the same shop after retooling are operated by 2 weavers who produce 1 million square meters of fabric per year. The rise in their labour productivity is obvious: while with the old looms each weaver accounted for 52,500 square km of fabric, with new looms installed each worker produces 500,000 square km of fabric, i.e. 40 times more than formerly was the case.

There will come a time when the TMM-360 will be replaced by another, more productive loom or automatic line operated and serviced by a robot.

Transition to fundamentally new, more effective technological systems and state-of-the-art machinery is a prerequisite for higher labour productivity. As the scientific and technological revolution continues, machinery is renewed at shorter intervals. That is why in the USSR and other socialist countries a great deal of attention is paid to the accelerated development of machine-tool building, computer manufacturing, instrument-making, electrical engineering and electronic equipment making – industries which serve as catalysts of scientific and technological progress.

The STR offers ways to reduce the con-

sumption of fuel, raw and other materials per unit of output. Each year, social production involves formidable material and technical resources whose rational utilisation is a prerequisite for enhancing the effectiveness of production. In Soviet mechanical engineering, metallurgy, construction, mining, agriculture and in the non-production sphere, there exists a potential for cutting the rates of consumption of raw materials, energy and other resources per unit of national income.

The acceleration of scientific and technological progress and the growth in labour productivity are closely linked to the radical improvement of the quality of output. The manufacturing of defective or low-quality products which fail to meet current technical, economic and aesthetic standards (in other words, which are substandard in terms of their consumption) is tantamount to the embezzlement of material resources and a waste of labour. The problem of quantity can be solved through solving the problem of quality. This is the only sure way towards a fuller satisfaction of a socialist country's requirements for modern technology.

The STR heightens the effectiveness of not only past and objectified labour, but also that of live labour. The less the expenditure of live labour, the higher the productivity of labour.

Let us take up the example of the TMM-360 loom again. Eighteen looms of this kind, operated by two weavers produced one million square km of fabric per year. Before the new looms were installed, 48 shuttle looms were operated by four weavers. The economies of live labour are obvious.

The scientific-technological renovation of production and the attainment of the highest level of labour productivity in the world implies, first and foremost, the improvement of economic relations within society. It also implies profound changes in labour and in the material and spiritual conditions of people's life. It implies the invigoration of the entire system of political and social institutions, and the furtherance of socialist democracy and self-government.

The development of socialism will largely depend on the qualitative advancement of the economy and on success in ensuring the latter's intensive growth. The *intensification* of production is aimed at accelerating scientific and technological progress and ensuring a fuller use of material, labour, financial and natural resources. It also involves the priority development of science-intensive industries (such as electronics, instrument making, robotics) and those which ensure reductions in the consumption of energy and materials per unit of output (high-yield

metallurgy, the production of modern plastic materials and chemicals). Priority is also given to manufacturing high-output equipment and machine systems making possible considerable economies of live labour.

Intensification has two aspects to it – economic and social. The main economic result of intensification is increased output per unit of investment. Moreover, intensification helps to overcome the contradiction between productive and personal consumption because, by reducing material expenditures for the means of production, it makes resources available for personal consumption.

The social aspect of intensification manifests itself in the elimination of the contradiction between man as a detail worker and man as a co-owner of the means of production, in the socialisation of labour on a planned basis, in distribution according to labour and in the growing involvement of the working people in administration and management.

The intensification of production is accompanied by the modernisation of jobs: obsolete jobs are eliminated, the number of those involving manual, monotonous, low-prestige labour is reduced and the number of those requiring the expenditure of predominantly mental labour increases.

The tightening of socialist labour discipline

is an important factor in accelerating the intensification of production. Socialist labour discipline hinges, above all, on changes in the attitude to socialist ownership of the means of production, on the less pronounced division of labour into work done for oneself and work done for the benefit of society and on the gradual disappearance of the distinction between one's own and common interests. Labour discipline is linked to production discipline and to the effective use of fixed production assets and society's labour and financial potentials.

Socialist labour discipline implies not only a strict observance of the internal labour regulations, but also a conscientious, creative attitude to work, a drive for top performance and for the most productive use of the working time.

In socialist society, special efforts are made to combat laxity, absenteeism, alcoholism and all that runs counter to the socialist way of life.

Reliance on the achievements of the STR and on the advantages of the socialist organisation of labour creates the necessary conditions for the attainment of the world's highest rate of social labour productivity.

The effectiveness of social labour can be raised not only through the introduction of new machinery and technology, but also by encouraging people to take a creative attitude to-

wards their work. The drive to accelerate scientific and technological progress implies giving more priority to creative labour. The transformation of labour into a creative process plays a major role in the development of people's abilities. It is through creative labour that the underlying principle of communism – "From each according to his abilities" – interacts with other economic laws. The furtherance of the creative character of labour resolves the contradiction between people's equality in respect of the means of production, on the one hand, and the social heterogeneity of labour, on the other. (This contradiction manifests itself in the division of labour into predominantly creative and predominantly non-creative labour, into prestigious and low-prestige labour.)

The creative character of labour means that the relations among people in the labour process are such that workers are encouraged to mobilise and make the best possible use of their physical and mental abilities, to realise the importance of their labour as part of social labour, to be receptive to the new, to display a sense of responsibility and the ability to quickly cope with new tasks, and to learn to make non-trivial, spontaneous decisions. If this is the case, any kind of work may turn into a creative process.

The scientific and technological revolution brought into being fundamentally new technolo-

gies that changed the workers' position with respect to production. The STR signalled a transition from traditional machine systems to automated machinery. Automated production systems, flexible technologies, robots and computers deliver people from the need to perform monotonous, non-creative production operations. Workers are increasingly involved in creative endeavours in various fields of science and engineering. The workers who perform individual operations are replaced by well-educated workers, versed in the fundamentals of modern science and technology and capable of quickly mastering new skills and effectively applying them when handling newly-installed machinery or progressive technologies. These qualities come to be indispensable in the course of the scientific and technological revolution.

As socialism eliminates the antithesis between mental and manual labour, it also eliminates the distinctions between creative and non-creative labour. The percentage of creative functions involved in various jobs grows. However, socialism does not immediately eliminate arduous, low-prestige or health-hazardous jobs. Socio-economic dissimilarities in people's work have not yet been overcome. Socio-economic differences between creative labour and non-creative labour will wither away only when communism is fully established.

Under socialism, the development of the creative content of labour is one of the conditions for cultivating in man the need to work. Under communism, this need will develop into man's prime, vital need.

In the new context the development of human personality also acquires greater importance. In order to be able to adopt a creative attitude to one's work one has to mature as a creative personality. A creative personality features outstanding mental abilities, a striving for experimentation and for gaining new experience. Such a personality is characterised by aesthetic sensitivity, flexibility and independence in thinking and acting, an ability to concentrate efforts on matters of primary importance, readiness to take up any challenge, and emotional responsiveness. The STR has consolidated the rational element in human beings and made their psychology more stable. At the same time, it has had negative effects: while the physical strains have diminished, mental stresses have noticeably grown; superficial contacts with many people have come to predominate over stable, lasting contacts affording relief from emotional and nervous stress in communication; people's fields of specialisation in various areas of knowledge have narrowed, etc. The desire to overcome these negative effects manifests itself in the tendency to maintain more active relations

within informal groups and to develop such interests as sports, travel, sightseeing, tourism. Man's requirements have become more subtle and complex. In order to be able to reproduce oneself as a creative personality, one has to have appropriate rest, recreation and leisure facilities and opportunities.

That labour under socialism becomes ever more creative can be seen from the workers' expanding involvement in the inventors' and innovators' movement.

Moral and material incentives have an important part to play in cultivating a creative attitude to labour. In determining such incentives, the specific character of creative work should be taken into account. It is also important to establish standards ensuring an objective, flexible and precise assessment of creative labour. As labour becomes more creative and people display a greater interest in more meaningful labour, intellectual incentives acquire greater importance.

The overcoming of the socio-economic distinctions between creative and non-creative labour is an important element in the further strengthening of the work-oriented socialist way of life.

The increasingly creative character of labour will play a primary role in socialist labour's evolution into communist labour.

CONCLUSION

The Transformation of Socialist Labour into Communist Labour

The development of the productive forces of socialist society, the abundance of material and spiritual boons, the opportunity to distribute them according to people's needs, the elimination of the socio-economic distinctions in labour, the effort to cultivate a greater sense of duty create prerequisites for the transformation of socialist labour into communist labour. What are the new features acquired by labour under communism?

Communist labour is labour performed gratis for the benefit of society, labour performed not as a definite duty, not for the purpose of obtaining a right to certain products, not according to prev-

iously established and legally set quotas, but voluntary labour, irrespective of quotas, it is labour performed without expectation of reward, without reward as a condition, labour performed because it has become a habit to work for the common good, labour as a requirement of a healthy organism.

The advance towards communist labour calls for far-reaching structural changes in all the sectors of the national economy. These transformations will involve fundamentally new, truly revolutionary technological solutions which will ensure multiple increases in labour productivity.

This necessitates a transition from the machine system to the automated production system. The latter, plus science-intensive technologies and equipment, will serve as the material and technical basis of communism.

Under communism, labour will turn into man's highest moral value and prime, vital need. The distinctions between predominantly manual and predominantly mental labour, and between the town and the countryside will fade away and all work will become creative and appealing.

Under communism, profound changes will occur in the content and character of labour. The worker's association with one type of the social division of labour, as well as man's occupational limitations, will become a thing

of the past. Qualitative changes will occur in general education and vocational training. The enrichment and timely augmentation of people's knowledge, necessitated by accelerated scientific and technological progress, will play a primary role in man's development as society's main productive force.

The development of the communist attitude to work will imply a gradual transition to a fundamentally new type of economic relations among people, one that arises in connection with their involvement in labour, and in creating material and spiritual values. People's views and assessment of work, approach to their participation in social production and their sense of responsibility and self-discipline will change greatly. They will regard their work not as their own, personal business, but as a matter of social relevance, as an important and necessary element of all social labour. They will be guided by the firm conviction that it is labour, and nothing but labour, that is the source of the growing social wealth and of the well-being of each and all, and that conscientious work in the sphere one chooses of one's own accord is a matter of honour for every able-bodied citizen.

With the transition to communism, people's active and creative approach to labour will become fully developed, as will the drive for

innovation, initiative, collective action, comradely mutual assistance, respect for any work, the taste for working according to one's abilities, improving one's skills, augmenting one's knowledge, and achieving optimal results in one's work. People will increasingly tend to regard labour not only as a means of securing one's livelihood, but also as a most important condition for the all-round development of the personality.

Thus, the essential conditions for the moulding of the communist attitude to labour are as follows: first, fundamental changes in working conditions (including comprehensive automation and scientific organisation of labour, and changes in work standards and the morale of and psychological atmosphere in the collective); second, a considerable rise in the level of workers' skills, general education and culture; third, the working people's increasingly active involvement in the management of production and the administration of society, and a transition to communist self-government.

The moulding of the communist attitude to labour calls for harmonising the interests of each person with those of work collectives and society as a whole. This can only be achieved by strengthening labour and production discipline, combatting absenteeism, irresponsibility, and other violations of labour discipline.

The change in the character and content of labour inherent in the transition to communism and the development of a communist attitude to work will gradually turn labour into people's prime, vital need. In communist society, where people will be ensured every opportunity to comprehensively develop their abilities and talents, all labour will be creative. This will change people's motivations for work. The duty to work will be matched by every individual's own need for work. Labour will turn into a most important form of self-expression and everybody's supreme calling. People's need for work will rank first in the system of human needs.

However, this does not mean that, under communism, labour will turn into an easy pastime, an amusement or a game. It will call for a large-scale expenditure of one's labour power, energies and will.

The transformation of labour into man's prime, vital need is grounded on the far-reaching changes in the material and technical basis of labour, in socio-economic relations and people's psychology and conscience. The shortening of the working day, accompanied by increases in spare time, and the establishment of a rational balance between work and leisure periods will make it possible to identify schedules and methods of work which would match the biolog-

ical rhythm and temperament of each person. With more spare time at their disposal, people will have a greater opportunity for their all-round development.

In order to transform labour into man's prime, vital need, it is essential to raise the level of people's qualification, skills, knowledge of scientific and production methods, and promote man's intellectual and cultural development. General education and vocational training will become a continuous process. This will intellectualise man's vital activity and build up his creative potential. Labour and education will grow more and more interwoven, interrelated and interdependent. People versed in science will be the main productive force of communist society.

Thus, communism will contribute to the development of world civilisation by turning labour into every citizen's prime, vital need.

GLOSSARY

Abilities to Work, individual characteristics of the personality which constitute subjective conditions for the successful performance by the latter of a specific type of labour activity.

Abstract Labour, expenditure of the labour of commodity producers which stands for the overall expenditure of human labour power, regarded independently of the latter's concrete form. A. L. creates the value of the commodity.

Agricultural Labour, labour characterised by an insufficient development of the division of labour and intersectoral ties, by a limited application of machine systems, by a strong dependence on natural conditions, the weather and the season, and by a lack of work load uniformity.

Alienation of Labour, the worker's relation to the means of production, the product of labour and labour itself as something alien, something which does not belong to him. A. of L. is rooted in private ownership of the means of production.

Automation of Production, development of mechanised production to a degree when automatic equipment performs the functions of control and supervision formerly performed by workers.

Bourgeoisie, the dominant class in capitalist society. The B. owns the most important, key means of production and exploits wage labour.

Character of Labour, characteristics of labour in terms of the form of ownership of the means of production, the working people's position in society, the purpose of production, and the interconnections between the labour of an individual worker and that of society.

Comprehensive Mechanisation, the replacement of manual labour with machines. Man's production functions are thus reduced to the supervising the operation of self-regulating, programmable machines.

Concrete Labour, labour used purposefully to produce the use value of a commodity.

Content of Labour, definition of labour in terms of the means of production and raw materials used and operations performed by the worker, and the type of the product turned out.

Cooperation of Labour, a form of organising labour under which a significant number of people jointly participate in one labour process, or in inter-related processes.

Creative Labour, labour which, due to its specific nature, encourages people to mobilise all their mental and spiritual abilities, make maximum use of such abilities in the labour process, and learn to take non-trivial, spontaneous decisions.

Detail Worker, the worker who specialises in a narrow field of labour activity, and is in bondage for life to a certain type of job.

Direct Social Labour under Socialism, labour organised on the scale of entire society in a planned manner and based on socialist ownership of the means of production; thereby, the individual labour of each commodity producer is directly incorporated in aggregate social labour as the latter's component.

Division of Labour, qualitative differentiation of labour activity; as a result of the D. of L., distinctions appear

between professions and trades.

Economic Interests, the objective direction of the economic activity of society, classes, groups or individuals, determined by the needs thereof. There are societal, collective and personal interests.

Education, the process of mastering systematised knowledge, skills, and work habits; a necessary condition for getting prepared for work; the principal means of assimilating and mastering culture.

Factory, a large-scale industrial enterprise relying on the use of machinery system.

Fixed Capital, part of the capital embodied in the means of production (buildings, structures, equipment, fuel, raw and auxiliary materials).

Individual Working Time, time expended by an individual commodity producer (enterprise) per unit of output.

Industrial Labour, labour based on the use of a system of machines, mechanised and automated labour.

Job Skill, the ability to perform one's production task smoothly and efficiently.

Job Tariffing, assigning to a job a certain wage category depending on the job's complexity and character, the working conditions, peculiarities of the production process, and the worker's requisite skills.

Labour, man's purposeful activity aimed at producing material and spiritual wealth.

Labour Discipline, strict observance of the necessary work order which regulates the volume and content of work operations, establishes schedules and deadlines for performing certain work, specifies the regimen of work and the subordination structure in production. L. D. may be enforced or voluntarily maintained.

Labour for Oneself, under socialism, part of social labour distributed among the workers according to the work done by them.

Labour for the Benefit of Society, under socialism, the part of social labour expended to produce the material

and spiritual wealth required for expanding production, maintaining the non-production sphere and forming social consumption funds.

Labour Intensity, intensity of labour determined by the expenditure of labour per unit of time. Labour intensity changes with the change in the expenditure of labour power per unit of time due to the growth of or reduction in the speed of production operations. More intensive labour, other things being equal, creates more value per unit of time than less intensive labour.

Labour Power, the individual's ability to work; the totality of the individual's physical and spiritual abilities used in material production.

Labour Productivity, the effectiveness of people's production activity. L. P. is measured by the time spent to produce a unit of output or by the amount of output created per unit of time.

Live Labour, man's purposeful activity aimed at producing material goods and services.

Manual Labour, the labour which primarily requires the expenditure of the worker's physical energy.

Manufactory, a stage in the development of capitalist industry which preceded large-scale machine production; a capitalist enterprise based on the division of labour and on handicraft technology.

Means of Labour, the things which man uses to act upon nature and to make natural objects suitable for his consumption.

Mental Labour, labour which primarily requires the expenditure of the worker's mental energy.

Migration of the Labour Power, movement of the able-bodied population within a country (internal migration) or from one country to another (international migration) caused by changes in the location of production or in living conditions.

Monopoly, a big private or state-owned capitalist amalgamation which holds dominant positions in an industry,

region or national economy and obtains monopoly superprofit.

Necessary Labour, under capitalism, labour in the course of which the worker reproduces the value of his labour power. Under socialism, the worker engaged in N. L. in the course of socialist production creates the value of the part of the social product which he obtains in the form of income (wages, bonuses, payments from social consumption funds, or income in cash and kind).

Non-Productive Labour, labour which fails to satisfy social requirements; labour expended in a social form different from the one inherent in the given social system.

Norm-Setting of Labour, the establishment of norms for the expenditure of labour by specifying the amount of time allocated for the performance of certain operations or setting output norms providing for the production of a certain amount of articles per unit of time.

Object of Labour, a thing acted upon by man in the process of labour.

Occupation, official designation for a job or type of labour activity of a person possessing substantial knowledge and practical skills acquired through training and labour experience.

Past Labour, labour embodied in the means of production and articles of consumptions.

Private Labour, labour based on private property in the means of production and on the isolation of commodity producers from one another.

Process of Labour, the action of man on nature with a view to transforming objects of nature in order to satisfy human requirements. P. of L. comprises labour *per se*, the object of labour and the means of labour.

Production Relations, the totality of relations which people enter irrespective of their conscious will in the process of the production, distribution, exchange and consumption of material goods. P. R. constitute an indispensable aspect of any mode of production. The character

of P. R. is determined by the form of ownership of the means of production and by the way latter come in contact with workers in the process of production.

Productive Forces, the aggregate of the means of production and the people who set them in motion. The material part of the productive forces, above all the means of labour, constitutes the material and technical base of society. The working people, with their production experience, knowledge and labour skills, are the main productive force.

Productive Labour, useful labour which satisfies social requirements and takes on a form characteristic of the given social system.

Relative Surplus Population, under capitalism, the relative excess of working population over the capitalists' demand for labour power.

Right to Choose a Profession or Trade, the right of the members of socialist society to choose an occupation or a job in accordance with their abilities, inclinations, training and education, and with due account of the needs of society.

Right to Work, under socialism, stands for guaranteed employment for every able-bodied person and pay in accordance with the quantity and quality of the work done, and not below the state-established minimum.

Scientific and Technological Progress, the process of developing and improving machinery and technology and of introducing scientific and technical discoveries and inventions that raise the productivity of social labour and improve the quality of output in various branches of production.

Scientific and Technological Revolution, a qualitative transformation in the development of the productive forces; in the course of the S.T.R., science is fused with production.

Scientific Organisation of Labour, under socialism, a set of organisational, technological, economic, sanitary-hygienic and psycho-physiological measures based on the achieve-

ments of science and on advanced production methods which ensure the most effective utilisation of material and labour resources and a continuous rise in labour productivity without impairing the worker's health.

Skilled Labour, labour requiring special training and/or skills; complicated labour.

Skill Level, is determined by the degree and type of vocational training received by a worker and by whether or not he possesses the theoretical and practical knowledge and knowhow required for a certain job.

Social Character of Labour, the interdependence of the labour of individual people which manifests itself as they exchange their activities or the results thereof in the process of common labour or its social division.

Social Consumption Funds, part of national income – the consumption funds – used, over and above the work remuneration fund, to satisfy the requirements of the members of socialist society. S.C.F. provide for pensions, and other benefits, free education, medical care, etc.

Social Insurance, a system for ensuring the working people's material security in case of sickness or disability. In the socialist countries, it is financed through social-insurance contributions paid by enterprises, institutions and organisations, and through allocations from the state budget. In the capitalist countries, it is financed through the insurance fees paid by the workers and by their employers.

Social Labour, a form of labour expressed in the inseparable link between man's labour activity and the social form of his existence.

Social Organisation of Labour, a system of the social relations pertaining to the use of live labour in social production. S.O.L. is rooted in the economic system. S.O.L. stands for the social form of labour, or the character of labour.

Social Security, a state-established system of measures which ensures material security for the elderly, for per-

sons disabled from childhood, and for unmarried mothers and their children.

Socialisation of Production, the fusion of production processes in the various sectors of economy and at different enterprises into a single process through the development of production, financial, trade and other ties.

Socialist Emulation, a method of raising labour productivity, developing and improving the productive forces and productive relations, ensuring the communist education of the working people and involving them in the management of production. S. E. is based on the workers' large-scale creative involvement in production and on their initiative. S.E. involves competition in work, aimed at raising the efficiency of production. Its characteristic features are comradely cooperation and mutual assistance. The underlying principles of S.E. are publicity, comparability of results and propagation of advanced experience.

Socially Necessary Working Time, the time required to manufacture a commodity under the median social conditions of production. It determines the value of the commodity.

Spare Time, the part of out-of-work time that the working people use for recreation, education, improving skills, satisfying cultural and spiritual requirements, and bringing up children.

Surplus Labour, under capitalism, the labour expended by the worker to create surplus value which is appropriated by the capitalist.

Surplus Value, value created by the wage worker's unpaid labour over and above the value of his labour power and appropriated by the capitalist without remuneration.

Transnational Corporations (TNCs), the biggest capitalist concerns which establish and exercise control over a certain branch of the world capitalist economy by investing capital within a country or outside it in such a way as to make maximum profit. The activity of the TNCs

leads to the exacerbation of all the contradictions inherent in capitalism, often runs counter to the national interests of the countries where they operate, and enhances the exploitation of the working people.

Two-fold Nature of Labour, the duality of the content of labour that creates the commodity: the use value of the commodity is created by concrete labour and its value, by abstract labour.

Unemployment, a phenomenon inherent in the capitalist system under which part of the working people cannot find a job and form the reserve army of labour.

Universality of Labour, in socialist society, the unity of the right and the obligation to work. U. of L. manifests itself in the elimination of unemployment and the full employment of the able-bodied population.

Unskilled labour, labour which does not call for special vocational training; simple labour.

Variable Capital, part of the capital that the entrepreneur spends to purchase labour power.

Wage Labour, the labour of persons employed at capitalist enterprises. Such workers are juridically free but do not possess any means of production. W. L. creates value and surplus value.

Wages Under Capitalism, a monetary expression of the cost of the labour power sold by the wage worker to the capitalist.

Wages Under Socialism, a form of payment according to work done. This form is used in the public sector of the socialist national economy. It covers the value of the bulk of the necessary labour expended by the workers engaged in the sphere of material production, of the bulk of the value of the socially useful labour expended by the workers engaged in the non-production sphere.

Way of Life, the mode of vital activity of people (of a community, class, social group and individual persons) in society. W. of L. encompasses work, everyday life,

family life, morals, the manner of spending spare time, etc.

Working Conditions, characteristics of labour in terms of the level of mechanisation and automation of production, humidity, temperature, noise, vibration, air pollution, the effect of chemicals on the worker, etc.

Working Day, the time of day during which the worker is engaged at the enterprise or establishment he is employed by.

REQUEST TO READERS

Progress Publishers would be glad to have your opinion of this book, its translation and design and any suggestions you may have for future publications.

Please send all your comments to 17, Zubovsky Boulevard, Moscow, USSR.

What Is Labour?

abc OF SOCIAL AND POLITICAL KNOWLEDGE

Books of the Series ABC of Social and Political Knowledge

1. A Reader on Social Sciences
2. What Is Marxism-Leninism?
3. What Is Political Economy?
4. What Is Philosophy?
5. What Is Scientific Communism?
6. What Is Dialectical Materialism?
7. What Is Historical Materialism?
8. What Is Capitalism?
9. What Is Socialism?
10. What Is Communism?
11. What Is Labour?
12. What Is Surplus Value?
13. What Is Property?
14. What Are Classes and the Class Struggle?
15. What Is the Party?
16. What Is the State?
17. What Is Revolution?
18. What [illegible] Transition Period?
19. What [illegible] Power
20. What [illegible] Syste[illegible]