

TRANSACTIONS  
OF THE SEVENTH  
WORLD CONGRESS  
OF SOCIOLOGY

---

ACTES  
DU SEPTIEME  
CONGRES MONDIAL  
DE SOCIOLOGIE



TRANSACTIONS OF THE SEVENTH  
WORLD CONGRESS OF SOCIOLOGY  
ACTES DU SEPTIEME  
CONGRES MONDIAL DE SOCIOLOGIE



VOLUME V

LENINISM AND THEORETICAL PROBLEMS  
OF MODERN SOCIAL DEVELOPMENT  
LENINISME ET LES PROBLEMES THEORIQUES  
DU DEVELOPPEMENT SOCIAL MODERNE

LIST OF PAPERS  
LISTE DES RAPPORTS

LIST OF PARTICIPANTS  
LISTE DES PARTICIPANTS

Coedited by

INTERNATIONAL SOCIOLOGICAL  
ASSOCIATION 1973

INTERNATIONAL SOCIOLOGICAL ASSOCIATION  
FOUNDED BY THE BULGARIAN ACADEMY  
OF SCIENCES

IMPRIMERIE LA MAISON D'EDITION  
DE L'ACADEMIE BULGARE DES SCIENCES

SOFIA - 1973



TRANSACTIONS OF THE SEVENTH  
WORLD CONGRESS OF SOCIOLOGY  
ACTES DU SEPTIEME  
CONGRES MONDIAL DE SOCIOLOGIE



Copyright

INTERNATIONAL SOCIOLOGICAL  
ASSOCIATION 1973

PRINTED BY THE BULGARIAN ACADEMY  
OF SCIENCES PUBLISHING HOUSE

IMPRIME PAR LA MAISON D'EDITION  
DE L'ACADEMIE BULGARE DES SCIENCES

SOFIA • 1973

# TRANSACTIONS OF THE SEVENTH WORLD CONGRESS OF SOCIOLOGY

## ACTES DU SEPTIEME CONGRES MONDIAL DE SOCIOLOGIE

Varna, September 14-19, 1970

### VOLUME V

#### LENINISM AND THEORETICAL PROBLEMS OF MODERN SOCIAL DEVELOPMENT LENINISME ET LES PROBLEMES THEORIQUES DU DEVELOPPEMENT SOCIAL MODERNE

#### LIST OF PAPERS LISTE DES RAPPORTS

#### LIST OF PARTICIPANTS LISTE DES PARTICIPANTS

#### INTERNATIONAL SOCIOLOGICAL ASSOCIATION ASSOCIATION INTERNATIONALE DE SOCIOLOGIE

1973



CONTENTS  
TABLE DES MATIERES

Preface . . . . .	9
Avant-propos . . . . .	9

LENINISM AND THEORETICAL PROBLEMS OF MODERN SOCIAL DEVELOPMENT

LENINISME ET LES PROBLEMES THEORIQUES DU DEVELOPPEMENT  
SOCIAL MODERNE

P. N. Fedoseiev (USSR) — Introduction. The Grandeur of Lenin's Previsions . . . . .	13
P. Banlaky (Hungary) — Lenin and Sociology: Some Theoretical Problems . . . . .	17
J. Filipec (Tchécoslovaquie) — Certaines bases théoriques de la recherche du développement des sociétés contemporaines . . . . .	24
P. Boccara (France) — Les aspects sociologiques de l'analyse de Lénine de l'évolution du capitalisme . . . . .	38
P. Crosser (USA) — Lenin's Political Sociology, What it is and What it is not . . . . .	51
H. L. Parsons (USA) — Lenin's Theory of Personality . . . . .	59
H. Aptheker (USA) — Lenin, Science and Revolution . . . . .	65
G. E. Glezerman (USSR) — Lenin and Problems of Scientific Prevision . . . . .	71
C. Ionescu et I. Matei (Roumanie) — Lénine et la prévision sociale . . . . .	84
N. V. Pilipenko (USSR) — V. I. Lenin on the Relationship of General Laws and Specific Features in the Building of Socialism . . . . .	88
V. G. Afanasiev (USSR) — V. I. Lenin on Scientific Administration of Socialist Society . . . . .	98
P. Pinzaru (Roumanie) — La pensée politique de V. I. Lénine et la vie sociale contemporaine . . . . .	104
Ch. Djugder (Mongolia) — Realization of Lenin's Idea About Mongolia's Transition to Socialism By-Passing Capitalism . . . . .	112
T. Trendafilov (Bulgarie) — La doctrine léniniste de l'impérialisme en tant que conception sociologique d'ensemble du développement de la société . . . . .	118
E. Nikolov (Bulgarie) — La pensée de Lénine et la prévision scientifique . . . . .	124
J. H. von Heiseler (GFR) — Codetermination-Participation of Workers' Control . . . . .	128
J. Sommerville (USA) — The Relation of Lenin's Principle of Partinost to the Method of Sociology . . . . .	133
F. Ferrarotti (Italy) — The Social Function of Violence in Lenin . . . . .	141
G. Besse (France) — Classe ouvrière, alliances de classes, révolution . . . . .	146
M. Lötsch (GDR) — On the Socio-Economic Conditionality of Power Structures in the Process of Social Decision . . . . .	153
M. N. Rutkevich (USSR) — V. I. Lenin and Problems of Development of Intelligentsia . . . . .	161
 LIST OF PAPERS . . . . .	 171
LISTE DES RAPPORTS . . . . .	171
 LIST OF PARTICIPANTS . . . . .	 217
LISTE DES PARTICIPANTS . . . . .	217

## PREFACE

The Seventh World Congress of Sociology was organized by the International Sociological Association in cooperation with the Bulgarian Organizing Committee, under the sponsorship of UNESCO and under the high patronage of the President of the Council of Ministers of the People's Republic of Bulgaria Mr. Todor Zhivkov.

Le Septième Congrès Mondial de Sociologie a été organisé par l'Association Internationale de Sociologie en collaboration avec le Comité d'organisation Bulgare sous l'égide de l'UNESCO et sous le haut patronage du Président du Conseil des Ministres de la République Populaire de Bulgarie S. E. Monsieur Todor Jivkov.

## AVANT-PROPOS

Le présent volume contient des rapports faits à la session „Léonisme et les problèmes théoriques du développement social moderne" au cours du Septième Congrès Mondial de Sociologie (Varna, 14-19 septembre 1970), ainsi que les listes des rapports et des participants au Congrès.

Les rapports et les participants au Congrès sont rangés par ordre alphabétique de l'alphabet anglais, à savoir:

1. Contents

2. Pays

3. Auteurs des rapports et participants

Les auteurs des rapports publiés dans ce volume portent entièrement la responsabilité du texte qu'ils ont présenté.

L'édition de ce volume des Actes du Septième Congrès Mondial de Sociologie ainsi que celle des autres volumes, est réalisée par le Comité d'Organisation Bulgare



## PREFACE

This volume contains the papers presented at the 'Leninism and Theoretical Problems of Modern Social Development' sessions during the Seventh World Congress of Sociology (Varna, September 14-19, 1970), as well as the lists of papers and participants in the Congress.

The papers and the names of the participants are arranged in alphabetic order, on the basis of English alphabet, namely:

1. Continents
2. Countries
3. Authors of papers and participants

The authors bear full responsibility for the texts they have presented.

The publication of this volume of the Transactions of the Seventh World Congress of Sociology, as well as that of the remaining volumes, is effected by the Bulgarian Organizing Committee.

## AVANT-PROPOS

Le présent volume contient des rapports faits à la session „Léninisme et les problèmes théoriques du développement social moderne“ au cours du Septième Congrès Mondial de Sociologie (Varna, 14—19 septembre 1970), ainsi que les listes des rapports et des participants au Congrès.

Les rapports et les participants au Congrès sont rangés par ordre alphabétique de l'alphabet anglais, à savoir:

1. Continents
2. Pays
3. Auteurs des rapports et participants

Les auteurs des rapports publiés dans ce volume portent entièrement la responsabilité du texte qu'ils ont présenté.

L'édition de ce volume des Actes du Septième Congrès Mondial de Sociologie ainsi que celle des autres volumes, est réalisée par le Comité d'Organisation Bulgare

## INTRODUCTION. THE GRANDEUR OF LENIN'S PREVISIONS

P. N. FEDOSEIEV  
USSR

Vladimir Ilych Lenin — a thinker and revolutionary of world historic importance, was an outstanding social scientist with a great range of interests who influenced the development of all the fields of social knowledge. His elaboration of sociological issues was based on his profound knowledge of both economics and history, philosophy and law, politics and culture. In his analysis of social phenomena Lenin always followed the method of approach which is known today as a complex or intersubject approach and which becomes more and more accessory in scientific research. He enriched and further developed basic fields of social sciences. Lenin was a revolutionary in science as well as in politics.

Lenin regarded the task of social sciences not only as explaining the past but as determined prevision of the future as well, disapproving at the same time of social Utopias. Subjectivism in sociology is "narrow intellectual self-conceit" or "bureaucratic mentality" for him, because this method means complete disregard of independent tendencies and action of social classes creating history in conformity with their interests. In analysing social phenomena Lenin thought it mandatory to follow the method which he called "sociological realism"<sup>1</sup>.

Lenin's greatness as a sociologist is characterized by his ability to perceive new properties and peculiarities of social life on each given historic stage in their incipency, to reveal and define new regularities of social development and new possibilities of social progress.

Lenin possessed a rare gift of seeing in the present sprouts and fulcra of the future, of foreseeing the coming turns in the destiny of mankind on the basis of the analysis of the present data.

On this are based Lenin's scientific previsions, his far-seeing predictions about the principal trends of historic developments.

What principal features of the modern era did Lenin note and what conclusion did he draw from them? Here we can only mention these features.

*Firstly, it is the transitional period of the epoch connected with replacement of one social formation by another form of social order.*

Radical changes of social structure even within one country cannot take place as a unilateral act. Revolutionary leap is inevitable during transition from one social structure, more or less prolonged period of time. The transitional period

<sup>1</sup> V. I. Lenin. Coll. Works, v. 2, p. 523.



is even more necessary when the qualitative change involves the social structure of a world scale.

Defining the nature of the modern era which was ushered in by the October socialist revolution, Lenin wrote: "The abolition of capitalism and its vestiges, and the establishment of the fundamentals of the communist order comprise the content of the new era of world history that has set in."<sup>2</sup>

The transition from the capitalist social structure to a new social order, based on public ownership, has taken place or is taking place in many countries of the world.

Today nobody can state that such a transition is a single instance or an exception. On the contrary, now there are more and more reasons to conceive of it as a historic regularity of world significance.

It seems to us that recognition of this radical turn in historic development of mankind is a necessary prerequisite for correct diagnosing of prospects of social development and prevision of basic social processes.

*Secondly, it is dynamism of our era, unprecedented acceleration of historic process* resulting from involving in it broad masses of working people and from increasing pace of scientific and technological progress.

There were times when social and political life was characterised by the activities of a handful of gentry and a small group of bourgeois intelligentsia with masses of working people and peasantry passive and oppressed. At that time, due to it, history could only creep along with awful languor. Now history streamlines at a terrific speed. "The basic reason for this tremendous acceleration of world development is that new hundreds of millions of people have been drawn into it" — wrote Lenin.<sup>3</sup>

Masses have become an active conscious moving force of historic process. "History is now being independently made by millions and tens of millions of people," emphasized Lenin.<sup>4</sup>

And here he put forward as the principal condition of progress, organization of harmonious cooperation of masses "...on the basis of modern machine industry". It is typically enough that already a month after those lines had been written Lenin made a "draft plan of scientific and technical work for the purpose of rational reorganization of industry and economic development of the country"<sup>5</sup>.

The experience of modern development clearly shows that masses of working people are stirring to action, rising to struggle for their human rights not only in economically developed countries but also in previously backward and dependent countries of Asia, Africa and Latin America, and no force can stop them. Likewise it becomes more and more evident that social progress is impossible without employment of achievements of science and technology.

Hence, an indisputable conclusion that it is impossible to ignore in social prevision, in the diagnosing of prospects of social development an increasing role of working people and a qualitatively new role of science that successively develops into an immediate productive force.

<sup>2</sup> V. I. Lenin. Coll. Works, v. 31, p. 392.

<sup>3</sup> Ibid., v. 33, p. 349.

<sup>4</sup> Ibid., v. 27, pp. 162 - 163.

<sup>5</sup> Ibid., p. 321.



*Thirdly, increasingly uneven development of capitalism* and connected with it aggravation of contradictions and antagonisms in the world arena.

Uneven development of various countries and various aspects of social life was to a certain extent characteristic of the previous eras as well. But uneven economic and political development has become a law for the modern capitalist system. It was Lenin who discovered this law and analysed its basic consequences. Without this law being taken into account it is impossible to understand the emergence of those most acute antagonisms that caused world wars. Only in the light of this law it is possible to understand certain discrepancies between technological and economic development of different countries, on the one side, and their social and political development, on the other. The fact that socio-political revolutions took place in the countries which were less developed economically and technologically can be explained as an effect of this law. It was in these countries that the contradictions were manifested most acutely, and it was these countries that proved to be the weakest links of the capitalist system.

The consequences of uneven development can be found in the history of the world socialist system, too. Of course, other sociological laws act here, and first of all the law of alignment and proportional development of economics on the basis of mutual cooperation. However, the difference in the degree of economic and socio-political development, inherited from the past, has a certain effect on the interrelations among various countries. Due to this, certain problems and difficulties appear in the development of the world socialist system. But these difficulties are of historically transient character. They will naturally be removed in the process of successive realization of basic regularities characteristic of the new organization of society.

On a global scale unevenness of development does not decrease but grows on and it brings along contradictions and conflicts in world development. Sociologists cannot ignore this complex way of modern history, cannot discount it in social prevision. Now with the accumulation of more and more acute antagonisms that are fraught with the threat of new wars, special attention is attracted by Lenin's ideas about the possibility of lasting co-existence of states with different social structure.

*Fourthly, it is a combination of social, national-liberation and scientific-technological revolutions in modern era.*

Lenin was the first to see new possibilities of revolutionary process, to discover maturing of objective prerequisites for social revolutions with the development of imperialism and especially of state-monopoly capital. It was he who discovered the possibility of victory of the socialist revolution in several or even in one separate country as a first step of the world revolution.

Lenin was the first to see a great revolutionary force in the national-liberation movement and the possibility of combining it on a world scale with the working class liberation struggle for socialism. He predicted downfall of colonialism when the world colonial empires seemed to be indestructible. And now we witness the emergence of about eighty young national states in place of former colonial empires.

Lenin was the first to define the discoveries in science at the beginning of our century as the revolution in natural science. As an outstanding example of well-grounded prevision in science may serve Lenin's thesis that electron is as inexhaust-



ible as atom, that Nature is infinite. With deep penetration into the future Lenin said: "Human reason has discovered many amazing things in nature and will discover still more, and will thereby increase its power over nature" (Lenin, "Coll. Works", v. 14, pp. 281-282). Modern scientific and technological revolution has already resulted in deep social changes, and its consequences for the future are immeasurable. And its increasing influence on the world development is already evident now.

Interrelation of social, national-liberation and scientific-technological revolution makes it possible to define our era as the most revolutionary era in the history of mankind. That is why correct social prevision and planning is impossible without understanding of this basic feature of the epoch.

Actually Lenin was both a theoretician and an organizer of social planning. As the leader of the first socialist state he was at the head of the elaboration of the long-term plan of the country's development which was named GOELRO plan, i. e., The State Plan of Electrification of Russia.

Lenin would not deny the possibility of planning under state-monopoly capitalism. As far back as in 1917 he explained that planning was also quite possible under state-capitalist monopoly. "Capitalism is now evolving directly into its higher, regulated form," he wrote. But he warned that these possibilities of planning are limited, as there still exists antagonism between labour and capital. Implementation of planning, Lenin concluded, means that capitalists extract profits more "... according to plan"<sup>6</sup>.

Lenin was positive that boundless possibilities for social planning are created by passing over of power, industrial enterprises and basic means of production to people. Socialism that exists in our present-day reality has demonstrated in practice the planned character of its both economic and overall social development.

In connection with Lenin's centenary many opinions are being spoken out about his role in the history of social thought and social life. I would like to express the main idea of the given book without going into analysis of these opinions. Lenin followed a scientific approach to the analysis of the specificity of the modern era, and that is why he was able to define correctly the principal landmarks of the historic way of mankind in the future.

<sup>6</sup> V. I. Lenin, Coll. Works, v. 24, p. 306.

## LENIN AND SOCIOLOGY: SOME THEORETICAL PROBLEMS

P. BANLAKY

HUNGARY

Marx is considered a pioneer of their science by sociologists of authority all over world. Lenin, however, is rarely mentioned as a sociologist. I believe that it is only partly due to political prejudice or insufficient knowledge of his works. It is a much more likely reason that both his conception and methodology can hardly be fitted into any recognized bourgeois sociological school having developed so far. What does this peculiarity mean? First of all, the maximum complexity of his analyses. In his works, abstract theory and concrete facts, societal aspects and personal motives, exact mathematical and pure logical reasoning are all present at the same time.

In the following, I wish to show some central elements of his methodology — taken in a very wide sense. It will be based on the analysis of his work *The Development of Capitalism in Russia*.

Let me say a few words about the character of this work. It would be unfounded to qualify it as pure sociology. Lenin himself called it an economic analysis. Is it justified then to describe it as a sociological work (or at least partly sociology)? I am convinced that it is. For with Lenin — just as with Marx — it is a fundamental theoretical-philosophical principle (proved in their philosophy of history) that social conditions depend on economic relations. Hence, when Lenin wants to expose the *macro-structural* relations of Russian society, he cannot help analysing its *economic relations* in minute detail. The system of social relations thus evolves from an expert analysis of the economic sphere.

I shall try to reconstruct some of the principal moments of that process.

The basis of Lenin's sociological methods is constituted — in a broad sense — by two elements that complement each other. The first is his wish to analyse those relations that are characteristic of partial phenomena and are quantitatively demonstrable as the components of complex systems and macro-structures. The other is to check out every theoretical problem by facts, and possibly by interrelations that can be numerically analysed. This method provides such an oscillation between the spheres of empirical examination and theoretical generalization which enriches and modifies both. What results is a continuous interpretation and intertransition of abstraction and the concrete. The empirical data enrich the theorem and provide it with concrete contents. At the same time, these facts gain a more profound meaning and show, in the light of the theory, those deeper values



which transcend the facts themselves. In this way, Lenin is able to give such a picture of society and of social motions which, though abounding in colourful details, yet represents a coherent totality.

Let us now see how all this appears in the work in question.

It begins with the establishment of some theoretical questions of primary importance. By this, Lenin sketches out the framework of the problems and clarifies the starting-point of his analysis. He defines that system of values, that sphere, within which he is going to interpret the facts. As a basis he takes Marx's analysis of capitalism. He emphasizes those fundamental characteristics which determine the capitalist nature of a given society, such as e. g. the development of the home market, production of goods, separation of the actual producer from the means of production, the features of the realization of the products, etc. In this work he examines whether these characteristics exist in the Russian economy, and if they do, what is their quality. His main problems are the following: to what degree and by what concrete process has Russia become capitalistic, what sorts of concrete formations have evolved and are evolving? Accordingly, he raises the question: "How and in what direction are the diverse aspects of the Russian national economy developing? What constitutes the connection between and interdependence of these diverse aspects?"<sup>1</sup>

The first partial analyses show the disintegration of traditional peasant farming; namely the process in which the more or less independent peasantry engaged in subsistence farming becomes differentiated, commodity production develops, and a major part of the peasantry become wage workers whose independence is lost. At the first stage, Lenin uses the data of the Zemstvo statistics — data given according to households — first of all those referring to the *use of land*.

The analysis of these relatively simple data yields the first important condition, namely, that sharply separable strata have developed within the peasantry. On top, there is a relatively small number of rich peasants in whose hands the majority of tilled land, of agricultural productions is concentrated. They produce much more than their own demand, hence, they produce commodities. They cannot cultivate their land themselves, so they employ wage workers at the bottom, there are the poor peasants, the agrarian proletariat constituting fifty per cent of the peasantry, whose land — in case they have any at all — is not sufficient for their subsistence. What happens to them?

The logic of the analysis and the answering of the question need the introduction of a new factor. It is the ratio of wageworkers employed on farms of various dimensions, and as its opposite, the ratio of those having a "supplementary occupation" (by this name the Zemstvo statistics refer to work done elsewhere than on one's own farm). By the analysis of these data, the picture of the differentiation of the peasantry has become again more subtle. Now it can be clearly seen who sell their labour power and who buy it.

Lenin even sums up his analysis of the disintegration of the peasantry in a table. A point of methodological importance to be observed is, that he took into consideration no less than fourteen factors in these relatively short, rather general analyses which provide so far only an approximate picture. (Such factors are, for example, the different legal grounds for the use of land, the amount of cattle

<sup>1</sup> V. I. Lenin. Collected Works. Moscow, Progress Publishers, 1964, v. 3, p. 69.



stock, the degree of supply of equipment, etc.) These data also prove the essential differentiation and disintegration of a peasantry that used to be comparatively homogeneous in the past.

However, the data on which the above analyses were based did not characterize the whole Russian peasantry. There are few Zemstvo statistics that are arranged in the right way, so not all of them could be used. Therefore, Lenin had to face the question whether and to what extent these ratios were valid for the whole Russian peasantry. Thus, he had to look for a new factor again which, on the one hand, was clearly related to the size of the farm, and which, on the other, could be used for the whole of Russia. He had already pointed out that the number of draught animals (mainly horses) was in direct proportion to the standard of a given farm. Moreover, there was a quite complete list of the horse stock, which had been made for military purposes. The collection of the previous analyses with the military list proved that the conditions pointed out were in fact valid for the whole of Russia.

All this shows the inner differentiation of the peasantry. Lenin, however, was also interested in the degree of integration between peasant farms and the whole economy, that is, in the nature and extent of the "external" relations of the peasantry outside their own circle. In order to establish it, he takes another dimension. Namely, he analyses the peasants' budgets and their circulation of money, since this determines the peasantry's relation to the market. The result is the following: peasantry has become *producers for, and consumers from, the market*, of course, to different degrees and in different ways according to groups or strata. It is the middle peasantry that remained mostly self-supporting. The poor peasant sells his labour power and buys consumers' goods. The rich peasant spends his money mainly on means of production, on economic investments; in other words, *he turns it into capital*.

Lenin's final conclusion drawn from the analyses of the peasantry's disintegration is clearly sociological in nature (most probably because of the motivations included in the partial analyses). Differentiation by wealth does not appear here as an economic category only, but it also indicates a basic social motion. He says: "The old peasantry is not only differentiating; it is being completely dissolved, it is ceasing to exist, it is being ousted by absolutely new types of rural inhabitants. . . the rural bourgeoisie. . . and the rural proletariat. . ."<sup>2</sup> Thus, out of partial analyses of economic character, in which the social aspect is nevertheless always present, we get a result that is purely social and sociological.

Lenin's analysis of peasant farming ends here. Now he turns to the change in the conditions of landlord farming.

But let us stop here for a moment, and try to define *expressis verbis* the logic of Lenin's method.

Lenin starts his analyses with the simplest, elementary facts. By this, we get a gross picture of the examined phenomena in which the details are still obscure. We could say that we are given only the outlines. Then he considers more and more new dimensions, new statistics and new data of a different type. The framework becomes increasingly filled with content, the survey provides an ever more differentiated picture. Furthermore — and it is most significant for us — it gains

<sup>2</sup> V. I. Lenin. Collected Works. Moscow, Progress Publishers. 1964, v. 3, p. 174.



more and more *social content*, until he can declare that the peasantry *has divided into classes*.

All this, however, is far from being complete. There are still many questions unanswered. For example, we do not know as yet where, in which form and within what framework the "free manpower" is employed, namely that major part of the agrarian proletariat whose work is unclaimed by agriculture. These, as well as all the other similar questions, are to be answered by further analyses.

As we have mentioned, Lenin examines in the following passages the transition of landlord farming into a capitalistic one. We cannot follow here the logic of his analyses to the end, so we shall give only the outcome. Here too, just as on the peasant farms, capitalist conditions have become predominant. It is manifest in the fact that *wage-work* has supplanted the feudal, natural, *corvée-like* "paying off in labour". This capitalist class-division has replaced the *feudal division* in this field as well. (That is, in place of the landlord — serf relation, the capitalist landowner — wage worker relation has come into existence).

Peasants' subsistence farming and landlord farming constitute such two types of Russian agriculture which for historical reasons can be sharply distinguished. Heretofore, their *inner conditions* were analysed. However, there is need for an intermediate synthesis, namely, for the analysis of the changes in agricultural production in general. The question, in other words, is: to what measure is agriculture *producing for the market*? We know that this is the fundamental condition and characteristic of capitalist production. The previous analyses have shown how far the *conditions* of commodity production exist in the individual sectors of agriculture (as for example, adequate size of the estate, adequate amount of livestock and equipment, enough wage workers available, etc.). The next step is to examine to what extent has it all become reality, that is, *to what degree* is Russian agriculture a commodity-producing one, that is, *capitalist*.

One after the other, Lenin examines the different productive branches (wheat production, animal husbandry, flax cultivation, etc.) and the processing industries of agriculture (distillation, oil-pressing, etc.). He analyses the development of each on the basis of the following conditions: absolute increase in production, distribution of the volume of production among the productive units, trends in the number of workers. The data clearly prove that the bulk of agricultural products is being produced on those farms which employ wage workers. Hence, they are commodity-producing units: they produce for the market, and the workers appear on the market with their wage as consumers.

All these, of course, being fundamental changes in the *social conditions* of the agricultural population. As a result, great classes develop, encompassing the whole nation, which take different places in the universal system of capitalist economy. It also means that the personal dependence of the peasant comes to an end. The patriarchal relationship of landlord and serf is replaced by the impersonal relationship of capitalist and wage worker, which means freedom at least in the formal, legal sense of the word. Consequently, the mode of life or the form of existence of the peasantry also changes. This fundamental transformation of the relations of production shifted the village from its age-old languishment. The rearrangement of economic relations has brought about the recombining of human relations.



Let us close this sphere of problems. I have tried to describe one of the characteristics of Lenin's method by analysing that part of his work which deals with agriculture. The essence of this characteristic is: to proceed from a tabloid sketch of the most general, most simple coherencies, through more and more differentiated and refined analyses, to the detailed, multi-coloured picture. In other words, to proceed from pure, simple economic facts to complex social motions.

Actually, this train of thought could also be traced through the analysis of industry which constitutes the second part of the work. He applies the same fundamental systematic method of construction when he follows the development from handicraft industry to mechanized large-scale industry. We could not find much novelty in the logic of his analysis if we compared it to the first part. Therefore in the following we shall rather present another methodological principle through some partial analyses.

I have already mentioned my opinion that one of the characteristics of Lenin's method is the continuous oscillation, interplay and combination of the theoretical and the empirical.

We can observe this feature first at the very start of the analysis of peasant farming. As I have said before, Lenin departs from the traditional practice of the Zemstvo statistics which are based on allotments, and uses the actual dimensions and type of the given farm as a basis. This in itself means that he re-interpreted the available data on the basis of Marx's general political economy. It is very interesting that he treats the problem of categorization in an explicit way only at the end of the third partial analysis. What is the reason? Why does he not state his grounds for using that particular categorization, where he uses it first, namely, at the first table of the book? I think he does so because there he can prove the rightness of his method on the basis of the results of his previous analyses, that is, when the empirical data have already testified to the value of his method. Thus, the *theoretical* principle of his categorization appears before the reader not as an abstract theory, but as an *empirical result*. It is quite obvious that without being based on theory, the analyses would hardly have been successful (they would have remained incoherent and meaningless like the majority of the Zemstvo statistics). But it is equally true that the theory manifest in this categorizational principle would have remained abstract and empty, had it not been supported by the force of the empirical.

Let us see another partial analysis, still within the sphere of agriculture. According to the Narodnik economists, the principle of communal land, that is, the system of allotments, makes it impossible that the Russian economy become capitalist. Lenin challenges this view when summarizing his analyses of agriculture. On the basis of all his former examinations he points to the fact that no peculiar manner of land-owning can raise an unsurmountable barrier in the way of capitalism, which takes different form according to the different legal and existential conditions of agriculture. What is the problem here? For Lenin, it is irrelevant if the development of Russian agricultural capitalism shows the same features as the Prussian or the American course does. His main question — one of theoretical significance — is whether commodity production has become predominant. Since he proves that it has, he unambiguously qualifies Russian agriculture as capitalist. But he is not satisfied with this level of abstraction; he goes on and points out the *particular* forms of appearance of Russian capitalism. He exposes the parti-



cular, individual forms, but, along with it, he also shows the essence, the content behind them, namely, the *concrete-universal*.

Now let us take a somewhat more complicated example, this time from the field of industry. In Lenin's opinion, the key to the understanding of industry, or in a more general sense, of the whole capitalist economic system, lies in our comprehension of the mechanized large-scale industry. Here, capitalist relations appear in their purest form. Indeed, here the capitalist-worker relation can be found in its nakedness, with all its positive and negative consequences. In mechanized large-scale industry, money economy becomes a total system, while even the last traces of patriarchal relations are vanished. At the same time — as his detailed analyses prove — this form is in close connection with all the other forms, and in one way or the other it subordinates them all: agriculture, village handicraft industry and manufactures alike. "Therefore," as he says, "only by examining the whole of the present economic system from the angle of the relationships that have grown up in this 'corner' (viz. manufacturing industry) can one become clear about the main relations between the various groups of persons taking part in production, and, consequently, trace the system's main trend of development."<sup>3</sup> That is why Lenin so strongly emphasizes the difference between the forms of industry, between handicraft industry, manufacture and large-scale mechanized industry. Only on the basis of this distinction can Russian relations be understood. If the analysis confuses the concepts of small-scale handicraft industry, manufacture and factory, there can be no distinction between the "pure" wage worker, the artisan (working at home and preserving the illusion of his independence) and the peasant who works partly or mainly in handicraft industry, and partly in agriculture. Without distinguishing these strata and registering their different ambitions, their ways of life and thoughts, the social motions in Russia cannot be understood. Lenin therefore clearly sees that the exact definition of the factory is far more than a mere statistical problem. It is actually the clue to understanding the social motions and the developmental tendencies.

Finally, I should like to tell a few words about one more sphere of thoughts. The dynamism of class and stratific relations is represented throughout the whole work as principal motive. It is a *par excellence* sociological element. In every one of his partial analyses, Lenin points out the social, structural motions by which the analysed economic processes are accompanied. Of course, this element, too, shows a more and more differentiated and variegated picture as the economic conditions become more and more complete and complicated until finally it develops into the outlines of a whole macrostructure. It would be worthwhile to follow the full train of thought, but here we can only grasp some nodal points.

The problem appears first in an explicit form when Lenin establishes — as I have mentioned earlier — the emergence of new peasant types. At that point he makes only a general note on the existence of these classes, but he does not introduce data on their proportions and characteristics. The picture of the peasantry will be modified when he has already described the relations of agricultural commodity production. There he analyses in more detail, among other things, the changes in the social status of the peasantry, and draws his conclusions. The principal moments are as follows. Capitalism has changed the peasant essentially into a

<sup>3</sup> V. I. Lenin. Collected Works. Moscow, Progress Publishers. 1964, v. 3, p. 586.



tradesman. Of course, on the other pole, it has done the same to the landlord. It has entailed a radical change in their relations. The peasant turned worker has got rid of the pressures of his personal bond. The capitalist must use more up-to-date equipment and technology, and he needs skilled workers. There are data to prove that education among workers has increased in those districts where capitalism has become strong. Furthermore, capitalist agriculture involves the migration of workers on large scales, which in turn results in a crucial change in the rural way of life, as it radically broadens the stable, centuries-old traditional outlook of the peasants. Hence, the character of the peasantry has changed completely in capitalism.

Lenin's first statement which is interesting to us in connection with industry is that the role of wage labour increases simultaneously with the size of the factory. It does not simply mean that a bigger factory employs *more* workers (that being quite natural), but it also means that the *importance* of the workers is greater in a certain sense; for example, in a bigger factory the single worker has a higher productive value. Here, like in the case of agriculture, we can only find a very general characterization which is only later filled with real content.

The first detail in the break-down of the general picture consists in the description of small peasant industry. I shall take only one point of it. Lenin demonstrates that the small peasant industry is inevitably in a state of continuous disintegration, and that its condition is instable. A few of the craftsmen become small capitalist, the majority wage worker. Quite a number of them remain virtually "independent", but these in fact depend on the capitalist as much as does the wage worker. The independence they retain is only formal. In return of it they are often worse off than the wage workers.

One of the significant consequences of the manufacture is that it completely separates agriculture, i. e., the peasant, from industry. The majority of the workers are not independent, they are paid wages and work with the capitalist's raw material. But they are not yet *workers* in the real sense of the word, as the character of their work is still quite close to artisanship. *This* facilitates home-working on a wide scale, which further separates the worker of a manufacture from that of the factory.

The most developed and dynamic form is mechanized large-scale industry. This places the worker into the "pure relationship" mentioned above. That is, there appears the so-called "professional worker" who is separated from the land, from agriculture and mostly even from his original rural home. It is the rise of the *working class* concentrated in big factories. What that means in Marxist political theory is, I think, known to all. It must be added that it is the most rapidly developing and increasing stratum. The number of workers in big industrial plants not only increases more rapidly than any other stratum, but also faster than the population in general. Therefore, its supply is secured partly from other strata, first of all from the peasantry. However, when mechanized large-scale industry completes the separation of industry from agriculture and destroys the rural-patriarchal way of life, it at the same time makes conditions ripe for a higher union, namely, for a mutual approach between agricultural and industrial way of life to the villages, and stirs their population into motion.

Finally, on the basis of all this, Lenin draws the outlines of a structural picture. But as it is actually the model of contemporary Russia, its discussion is outside the scope of our examination.



## CERTAINES BASES THÉORIQUES DE LA RECHERCHE DU DÉVELOPPEMENT DES SOCIÉTÉS CONTEMPORAINES

JINDŘICH FILIPEC  
TCHÉCOSLOVAQUIE

Les tentatives d'interpréter et d'expliquer le progrès scientifique et technique dans le monde, ses conséquences et ses perspectives occupent une place-clé non seulement dans la sociologie, mais aussi dans toute une série d'autres sciences humaines. Malgré toutes les nuances et les relations compliquées de ces différentes interprétations, on distingue une barrière de principe entre la théorie marxiste-léniniste de la révolution scientifique et technique, d'une part, et les différentes variantes non marxistes et antimarxistes de ce phénomène, d'autre part. Examinons certains signes distincts et communs de ces variantes qui prédominent dans la pensée des sciences sociales dans les pays du „capitalisme avancé“. La vaste gamme de ces attitudes et analyses oscille entre deux pôles dont l'un représente une approbation plus ou moins optimiste du progrès scientifique et technique, l'autre son refus énergique. Les partisans de l'optimisme de civilisation renouent avec la tradition du concept rationaliste de la transformation du monde et de la société à l'aide de la science et de la technique. Descartes avec sa conception de l'homme en tant que „maître et possesseur de la nature“ constitue le prototype de cette tradition. Le pôle opposé est incarné, par exemple, par Pascal et par des tendances antirationnelles analogues, anticivilisatrices dans leurs conséquences. Ces deux positions extrêmes impliquent des critères axiologiques correspondants qui associent au progrès de la science et de la technique des valeurs diamétralement opposées.

Les conceptions scientistes et technicistes, d'une part, et les conceptions culturelles critiques, d'autre part, sont l'aboutissement et la reproduction modernes de ces traditions extrémistes dans la théorie sociale bourgeoise contemporaine. Ainsi, la première tendance est représentée, par exemple, par la théorie des stades de la croissance économique (Rostow) et par ses dérivations sociologiques, futurologiques et culturologiques (Rostow, Bell, Fourastié, Scheuch, Popper, etc.). La seconde conception culturelle critique englobe les personnalités du type de H. Marcuse, T. W. Adorno, M. Horkheimer, E. Fromm, etc. et leurs ouvrages. Nous n'avons l'intention ni d'énumérer ici toutes les interprétations du phénomène scientifique et technique, ni de saisir leurs traits spécifiques et leurs différences. Nous nous attacherons par contre à opposer les types de pensée caractéristiques et à souligner en même temps ce qu'ils ont de commun sur le plan méthodologique et socio-historique. En outre, nous nous efforcerons d'entrevoir les fondements philosophiques et les intentions des groupes qui se dissimulent derrière ces conceptions et ces catégories, apparemment non partielles, strictement „objectives“ et „conventionnel-



les". Disons d'emblée que la notion et le concept de la „société industrielle“ ou „post-industrielle“ constituent l'une de ces catégories centrales. L'évidence, la *vérisimilitude* et l'indépendance vis-a-vis de toute idéologie auxquelles ils prétendent doivent être soumises à une analyse critique exacte.

Cette analyse critique, loin de vouloir glisser sur le terrain d'une dispute terminologique scolastique, se propose de démontrer les raisons qui nous poussent à rejeter la notion de „société industrielle“ comme une déformation mythique de la réalité sociale. Ce refus n'est pas fondé sur notre seule considération de cette notion comme instrument de diversion idéologique. La réduction des notions à leur aspect instrumental et à leur fonction sociale est l'expression d'un point de départ gnoséologique métaphysique, antidialectique, méthode étant en contradiction avec le processus de connaissance réel et la nature des notions. C'est pourquoi elle est aussi contraire à la théorie de la connaissance marxiste-léniniste et représente en quelque sorte sa révision instrumentaliste, tout en étant, bien entendu, enveloppée d'une prétendue orthodoxie. La *notion* de société industrielle, comme toute catégorie-clef de la théorie sociale, porte en elle les germes du *jugement* et implique, consciemment ou non, une certaine périodisation, voire une certaine interprétation de l'histoire. La catégorie de „société industrielle“ est logiquement liée à la périodisation de l'histoire de l'humanité en trois étapes historiques de développement social: préindustrielle, industrielle et post-industrielle. Les critères utilisés pour délimiter ces étapes reposent sur la prépondérance des secteurs primaire, secondaire ou tertiaire et, finalement, sur les facteurs de production techniques qui provoquent ces changements de stratification. C'est ainsi que nous en arrivons, à partir de la notion de société industrielle, en passant par la périodisation correspondante de l'histoire, à l'interprétation et à la conception de l'histoire que cette catégorie de départ contient en elle „in nuce“. Le paradoxe, et je dirai même l'ironie fatale, réside en ce que cette conception de l'histoire est fondée essentiellement — dans une mesure plus ou moins grande, bien sûr — sur le déterminisme économique et technique mécaniste qui tient les facteurs économiques et techniques (et souvent même technologiques) pour les facteurs décisifs du mouvement socio-historique, sans évidemment tenir compte du caractère médiateur des rapports de production et de l'unité dialectique des forces productives et de ces rapports. Des sociologues, économistes et philosophes bourgeois dont des générations s'étaient employées à récriminer la conception matérialiste de l'histoire de Marx, déformée d'une façon vulgaire, dans le feu de la polémique contre ce fantôme ainsi ajusté, ont fini par devenir eux-mêmes prisonniers du déterminisme économique et technique que Marx refusait catégoriquement. Même Raymond Aron enregistre ce fait, d'une façon quelque peu originale il est vrai, lorsqu'il écrit: „La théorie des stades de la croissance économique, une sorte de marxisme occidental, n'évite pas toujours les pièges du marxisme vulgarisé. De quel droit consigne-t-on toutes les sociétés non industrialisées dans la même catégorie — les sociétés traditionalistes des tribus centre-africaines, par exemple avec la Chine, le plus ancien des empires de l'histoire? Les étapes de croissance économique offrent-elles un schéma plus satisfaisant que la succession de systèmes sociaux lorsque les „étapes“ correspondantes peuvent et sont atteintes à un endroit par les méthodes du dix-neuvième siècle et à un autre par celles du vingtième siècle; à un endroit, par un système de libre entreprise et à un autre par celui de la planification d'Etat? A-t-on raison de poser en postulat ou de suggérer que les différents systèmes seront les mêmes après avoir atteint la même étape de croissance?“ (R. Aron,



The Impact of Marxism in the Twentieth Century, in *Marxism in the Modern World*, Stanford University Press, 1965). En fait, les différentes variantes du technicisme dans la sociologie et dans l'économie bourgeoises contemporaines ne sauraient être considérées comme des variétés du marxisme, bien que les références à Marx et à Lénine soient, comme on le sait, aujourd'hui à la mode dans certains milieux alors que, récemment encore, ces mêmes milieux observaient à ce sujet un mutisme quasi complet. Les tentatives de définir le type de société et le type d'homme sur la base de la consommation calorique ou de la production par tête d'habitant ne tendent pas à considérer le rôle correspondant de ces facteurs dans la totalité des éléments de la structure sociale, mais répondent à l'esprit de la thèse bien connue selon laquelle „l'homme est ce qu'il mange“ ou encore „l'homme est ce qu'il produit“. C'est donc là non pas une variété du marxisme, mais bien au contraire une adaptation moderne du principe de la société bourgeoise que „l'homme est ce qu'il a“, principe que Marx a jadis critiqué et qui apparaît ici de surcroît sous une forme modifiée et fort plate de principe méthodologique de la recherche sociale, de ses hypothèses et de ses interprétations.

Il est aussi intéressant de constater qu'Aron, qui exprime ses doutes sur le caractère approprié du concept de la société post-industrielle, évoque l'économisme vulgaire en tant que source à laquelle puise la périodisation de l'histoire ainsi conçue et va jusqu'à adresser une mise en garde contre l'idéologie occidentale qui, dit-il, par l'acceptation de cette catégorie prête le flanc à la critique de la part des marxistes. De cette manière, toutefois, la discussion sur la notion de la société industrielle prend un tournant mettant en relief la catégorie de l'intérêt qui est sous-jacente, sous une forme plus ou moins voilée, à toutes les notions-clefs des théories sociales. Le champ d'observation étant ainsi mêlé au champ d'intérêts, le classement apparemment anti-idéologique des données „purement“ empiriques devient soudain, et inévitablement, l'objet d'analyse des intentions, des intérêts, des implications et des tendances qui motivent ce classement des faits empiriques d'une manière multiforme, compliquée et très médiatisée. Certains sociologues bourgeois même ont trouvé nécessaire de rendre compte du moment idéologique qui accompagne l'application de la notion de société industrielle. Les objections qu'ils avaient élevées contre cette catégorie, étaient cependant souvent dictées par la crainte de ne faire trop parler des progrès industriels dans les pays socialistes et notamment en Union Soviétique. C'est en ce sens que R. Dahrendorf a refusé que la notion de la société industrielle en tant que produit de la „fantaisie sociologique“ est une „généralisation trop aimable“ qui élude l'essence de la chose: l'Amérique et la Russie sont une société industrielle, pourtant c'est précisément leur antagonisme qui détermine le caractère de l'époque.<sup>1</sup> Au fil des années, toutefois, ont prévalu parmi les sociologues bourgeois des tentatives d'envisager la catégorie de la société industrielle et notamment celle de la société post-industrielle dans l'esprit de la théorie de la convergence et de tourner son fer de lance contre l'alternative socialiste de la révolution scientifique et technique. Malgré ces tentatives et les déclarations anti-idéologiques des théoriciens de la société post-industrielle, la thèse de Dahrendorf demeure typique. En effet, il affirme que cette théorie est l'idéologie de „cette couche petite-bourgeoise et bureaucratique que l'on désigne par le terme de couche moyenne“ et qui embrasse évidemment aussi les sociologues. Selon lui, la fonction

<sup>1</sup> R. Dahrendorf. *Gesellschaft und Freiheit*. München, 1961.



principale de cette théorie est une apologie „scientifique“ voilée de l'inégalité sociale.<sup>2</sup> Ce n'est pas non plus par hasard que le dernier 16<sup>e</sup> Congrès de l'Association Sociologique en Allemagne Occidentale a choisi pour sujet: „Le capitalisme avancé (Spätkapitalismus) ou la société industrielle?“

Il est indiscutable que l'application scrupuleuse des catégories de la société préindustrielle, industrielle et post-industrielle appelle directement une critique philosophique et gnoséologique de ces points de départ apparemment débarrassés de préjugés, mais en réalité fortement idéologiques et mythiques. La fructification mutuelle de la connaissance philosophique et sociologique est au fond le problème No. 1 du développement de ces deux disciplines scientifiques. Sa solution dépend essentiellement de l'application de la théorie léniniste du reflet sur la connaissance sociologique et ce, bien entendu, dans toutes les déterminations dialectiques par lesquelles Lénine a défini la pensée humaine. Les notions — et nous avons à l'esprit ici notamment les notions des théories de l'évolution sociale — sont essentiellement le reflet des lois tendanciennes et des processus sociaux, leur reproduction intellectuelle dans la conscience des hommes, c'est-à-dire le reflet — selon les circonstances et le caractère scientifique de telle ou telle théorie — plus ou moins adéquat, plus ou moins correspondant à la réalité. Le reflet de la réalité objective dans la pensée de l'homme est largement médiatisé par le langage. Ce n'est certes pas un reflet dans le miroir identique à la réalité. Les catégories de la théorie sociologique, son langage et la réalité sociale constituent non pas des structures identiques, mais des structures isomorphes dans lesquelles la pensée médiatisée par le langage reflète plus ou moins la réalité à l'aide de relations sémantiques et de communications spécifiques. Hormis ces définitions de reflet et sémantiques, les catégories de la connaissance humaine, en général, et les notions centrales des théories sociales, en particulier, revêtent le caractère de moyens spécifiques d'expression (ou de dissimulation) des intérêts, des intentions et des tendances de groupe, de classe ou autres. En ce sens, les catégories, et par conséquent toute la théorie qui représente leur somme, apparaît comme l'instrument de l'action sociale, comme une arme dans des affrontements sociaux, politiques et idéologiques. Située dans ce contexte, l'analyse des fonctions sociales, des racines de classe et du caractère idéologique de ces notions et de ces théories est un impératif de l'auto-réflexion de la science. Un autre aspect, et en quelque sorte l'aboutissement de toutes les déterminations précitées de la notion, est son importance pratique et prospective, l'aspect de la notion en tant que projet et instrument des changements sociaux ou, dans le cas de théories conservatrices, l'aspect de la notion en tant qu'instrument de pétrification du statu quo.

La philosophie fondée sur le matérialisme dialectique, la théorie marxiste-léniniste de la connaissance, représente ainsi une critique *complexe* des catégories-clefs de la sociologie bourgeoise, tenant compte de toutes les déterminations de reflet, de signe, d'instrument et de projet de l'action sociale susmentionnées. En ce sens, elle met à jour toutes les limites des catégories telles que société industrielle, société technocratique, société à canaux multiples, société de consommation, société de loisir, civilisation technique, civilisation du „gadget“, etc. Leur faiblesse fondamentale consiste en ce qu'elles boursoufflent un certain moment „fort“ de l'un des aspects du mouvement social objectif. On peut évoquer à leur

<sup>2</sup> R. Dahrendorf. *Gesellschaft und Freiheit*. München, 1961. p. 25, 26.



sujet la critique simultanée de Lénine de l'idéalisme philosophique et du matérialisme métaphysique: „L'idéalisme philosophique n'est qu'ineptie du point de vue d'un matérialisme grossier, simpliste, métaphysique. Au contraire, du point de vue du matérialisme dialectique, l'idéalisme philosophique est un développement exclusif, exagéré, überschwengliches (Dietzgen) (une boursofflure, une bouffissure) de l'un des traits, de l'une de ces aspects, de l'une de ces limites de la connaissance, qui devient ainsi un absolu, détaché de la matière, de la nature, divinisé.“<sup>3</sup> Dans notre contexte, cependant, il ne s'agit pas de la nature, mais d'un traitement de la société qui s'avère être „incontestablement une fleur stérile, mais une fleur stérile poussée sur l'arbre vivant de la connaissance humaine vivante, féconde, vraie, robuste, toute-puissante, objective, absolue“<sup>4</sup>.

Hypertrophier les aspects partiels, faire passer des parties pour l'ensemble, des aspects d'une chose pour son essence relève non seulement d'une méthode, mais cache aussi des raisons sociales et de classe, une fonction de classe lourde de conséquences sociales. C'est vrai non seulement de l'apologie plus ou moins ouverte du progrès scientifique et technique sans tenir compte du contexte de classe de son action, mais aussi du grand refus de la „science-technique“ comme cause de l'aliénation totale et de la manipulation unilatérale de l'homme. Je fais ici allusion à l'opinion selon laquelle la technologie moderne est „fondamentalement un pouvoir irresponsable“ (Herbert J. Muller, *Scientific Progress and Human Values*, New York, 1967, p. 179) et à celle qui affirme que „non seulement son application, mais la technique elle-même est une domination établie sur la nature et sur l'homme, une domination méthodique, scientifique, calculée et calculant“ (H. Marcuse, *Industrialisierung und Kapitalismus im Werk Max Webers*, Frankfurt a/Main). Dans les deux cas, il ne s'agit pas seulement d'une erreur méthodologique et gnoséologique, mais d'une tentative d'apologie ou pour le moins de justification des rapports sociaux capitalistes au sein desquels la technique agit comme un instrument d'assujettissement de l'homme par l'homme. L'idéologie de la critique culturelle (Kulturkritik) est aussi en partie un fondement des conceptions gauchistes qui, tout en critiquant la technique et les institutions, accusent aussi le socialisme réel dont elles traitent les efforts visant à trouver et à réaliser la variante spécifiquement humaine du progrès scientifique et technique de technocratie et d'embourgeoisement. Du point de vue du marxisme-léninisme, ce contenu de la critique de civilisation, n'est pas trop critique, mais au contraire trop peu critique, non pas trop révolutionnaire, mais au contraire — au sens propre de ce terme — trop peu révolutionnaire. Elle est fondée essentiellement sur l'incompréhension de l'action sociale, sur l'incompréhension du processus dialectique de réalisation des projets de l'esprit humain dans la praxis de l'histoire. La catégorie de médiatisation revêt une importance fondamentale en relation avec le processus d'incarnation des idées dans la praxis de la société et dans l'histoire. Comprendre la catégorie de médiation dans l'histoire signifie maîtriser la pensée dans les contradictions, prendre conscience de la nécessité de se servir de moyens adéquats sur le chemin menant au but fixé. La réalisation de l'idée prospective du sujet authentique, universellement développé, suppose un développement indispensable

<sup>3</sup> V. I. Lénine. Cahiers philosophiques. Paris, Ed. Sociales, 1955. p. 282.

<sup>4</sup> Ibid., p. 282.



de certains maillons médiateurs dans la sphère des institutions sociales, de la technique et de ses produits multiformes.

Il est évident que ces moyens d'action sociale, de caractère à la fois industriel et notamment technique, comportent certains traits et aspects superficiels analogues, au sein des systèmes sociaux contradictoires de notre époque. Ainsi, par exemple, la révolution scientifique et technique reproduit, dans les différents régimes socio-économiques, en présence de tendances fondamentalement divergentes, certains phénomènes analogues. Se servant de ce fait partiel, la critique culturelle à la Marcuse, par exemple, s'élève, sous forme de „dialectique négative“, contre toute la sphère des institutions, de la science et de la technique. Soit dit en passant, au nom de Hegel, elle prône une thèse foncièrement antidialectique selon laquelle l'idée ne trouve et ne trouvera nulle part l'espace nécessaire pour son incarnation. Les attaques pseudoradicales lancées contre les moyens d'action sociale sans lesquels le socialisme ne saurait faire valoir son intention historique et sa spécificité d'alternative réellement humaniste de la révolution scientifique et technique sont en-deçà de l'idée hégélienne: „L'impatience demande l'impossible: atteindre le but sans moyens.“<sup>5</sup>

Notons aussi que, sous le mot d'ordre de la dialectique négative et de la pensée critique, certains de ses avocats en Tchécoslovaquie s'étaient dressés contre le postulat d'accélérer la synthèse de la révolution scientifique et technique socialiste, en le présentant comme un concept bureaucratique ou encore comme un concept technocratique. Traiter de technocratie ou de scientisme le fait de considérer la garantie d'un certain degré du mouvement technique de la société socialiste comme une condition non pas suffisante, mais tout de même indispensable à réalisation adéquate du programme communiste reviendrait à préconiser l'idéal d'un communisme en quelque sorte ascétique, de cellule. Ce n'est pas un hasard si la critique culturelle gauchiste, s'enlisant dans son accusation généralisée de „l'homme consommateur“, a souvent fait cause commune avec les représentants de la théorie conservatrice des „élites“ au sein de l'extrême droite.

Dans la philosophie et la sociologie occidentales contemporaines la critique de l'homme consommateur n'en a pas moins des gradations et des nuances aux couleurs les plus sombres. Dans certaines variantes de la critique de la consommation de masse, les appréhensions quant au sort de l'homme et de l'humanisme sont éclipsées par le mépris spiritualiste des producteurs de l'esprit devant le „matérialisme“ et l'„avidité des jouissances“ des producteurs des choses. Cette dernière attitude est souvent associée à des présages ténébreux sur l'avenir de l'humanité dans son ensemble. Ainsi, par exemple, Hannah Arendt critique sous ce rapport le caractère „utopiste“ de la thèse de Marx prédisant que la réduction de la durée du travail libérera l'homme, lui permettant de faire davantage valoir son esprit créateur, et dégagera l'énergie de l'humanité en vue de la création de valeurs nouvelles, supérieures. Hannah Arendt ne parle même pas de l'homme, mais de „l'animal travailleur“ et elle rejette la conception de Marx d'un seul trait, comme une illusion pure et simple: „Cent ans après Marx, nous ne savons que trop bien combien cet argument est faux; le supplément de temps de l'animal travailleur (animal laborans) ne sera jamais utilisé à d'autre but qu'à la consommation, et plus il disposera de

<sup>5</sup> G. W. F. Hegel. Fenomenologie ducha (Phénoménologie de l'esprit). Praha, 1961. p. 62.



temps, plus insatiables et plus menaçants seront ses désirs et ses appétits. Les besoins seront, il est vrai, plus raffinés, si bien que la consommation ne sera plus confinée aux nécessités vitales, mais cela ne change en rien le caractère de cette société, mais au contraire comporte le grave risque que tous les objets de ce monde, tout ce qu'on appelle des biens culturels, en même temps que les biens de consommation, finiront par être engoutis et détruits.<sup>6</sup>

Nous n'avons nullement l'intention de sous-estimer les aspects négatifs de la consommation ou la menace que constitue pour l'homme le fétichisme des objets. Il s'agit cependant d'un litige fondamental qui réside dans l'appréciation différente du travail en tant qu'essence humaine générique, de l'homme travailleur en tant que créateur de toutes les valeurs ainsi que dans l'appréciation différente du rôle historique du plaisir de la consommation des choses produites. Nous sommes en présence d'une appréciation spiritualiste du plaisir en tant que péché corporel, en tant que préférence du ventre ou d'un quelconque autre propre profit devant la notion et le critère de principes „supérieurs“. Sous cet angle, en effet, la consommation n'apparaît que comme une ingestion vorace, intéressée et orientée vers le seul plaisir de tout ce qui a été produit. A l'opposé, il y a la notion dialectique, explicative, de l'histoire qui n'est pas une dénonciation de l'avidité des jouissances, mais une explication fondamentale de l'importance historique de tous les aspects liés à la consommation, à la satisfaction des besoins et à la réalisation des buts „de plaisir“, „intéressés“, propres à l'homme. Cette dernière réfute l'opinion plate et pseudoradicale selon laquelle l'histoire humaine n'est que fonction des efforts déployés par des personnalités pour atteindre leurs buts intéressés, du carriérisme et de la course au profit personnel aux différents niveaux de la vie sociale. Les efforts faits dans la vie par des individus et les occupations de travail destinés à atteindre leurs propres buts „intéressés“, orientés vers le „plaisir“ et la simple „consommation“, conduisent objectivement à la réalisation de quelque chose de supra-individuel, à la réalisation de l'histoire et à l'autoréalisation de l'homme. C'est dans cette perspective qu'il faut aussi envisager la dialectique historique de la consommation. Chaque choix de l'individu (qu'il s'agisse de telle ou telle finalité de la vie ou de modèle de vie supposant des choses et des biens de consommation très concrets), a lieu, en toute circonstance, sous la pression plus ou moins médiatisée de l'histoire et de la totalité sociale. En ce sens, il constitue aussi, d'un point de vue supra-individuel, une activité sociale et en tant que telle s'incorpore dans la totalité du processus historique, faisant partie du processus de sa co-réalisation. Si tout le monde se rend compte ou non de cet aspect, c'est déjà une autre affaire. C'est pourquoi aussi le marxisme, pour ce qui est des questions de „l'homme consommateur“, ne tend pas à le condamner, mais à lui donner une explication historique en même temps qu'à indiquer les voies de sa synthèse supérieure, plus humaine. La critique de „l'homme consommateur“, la mieux intentionnée du monde, dans la mesure où elle repose exclusivement sur l'indignation devant son manque d'intérêt pour les valeurs supérieures, aboutit à la fameuse tour d'ivoire. La critique spiritualiste de l'homme de masse débouche sur l'isolement vis-à-vis de la force principale qui, en dépit de toutes ses faiblesses, est à même de transformer, en pratique, le monde et de se transformer soi-même. Ainsi, il y a plus de cent ans, Ruge considérait les tisserands affamés, et par conséquent le prolétariat en général, comme hommes finis. Or, aujourd'

<sup>6</sup> H. Arendt. *Vita activa oder vom tätigen Leben*. Stuttgart, 1960. pp. 121, 122.



hui certaines personnes adoptent la même attitude à l'égard de leurs descendants qui consomment davantage. Dans les deux cas, cependant, cette attitude relève de la tendance spiritualiste à régenter l'histoire, à primer les forces historiques. Aujourd'hui, la tête pensante n'a pas non plus pour tâche de sermonner et de dénoncer „l'insuffisance“ de ceux qui, à leur manière, contribuent à façonner l'histoire, mais d'étudier et de comprendre l'originalité de la forme historique de ces forces (et faiblesses). Une attitude critique, un verbiage infatué, une simple tendance à régenter l'histoire d'une manière purement théorique n'aident pas à grand-chose, car la réalisation de cette tâche des „têtes pensantes“, comme l'a jadis indiqué Marx, implique un certain niveau scientifique, l'amour de l'homme et un parti pris inconditionnel dans le combat politique ainsi qu'un apport pratique à l'effort de façonner la situation historique donnée.

C'est pourquoi nous n'imaginons le monde de l'avenir ni comme un simple supermarché où il ne serait question que du cercle vicieux de métabolisme, ni comme un paradis céleste privé de tout plaisir matériel et de toutes les jouissances et dans lequel il serait possible d'entrer à travers le chas de l'aiguille. L'homo consumens et avec lui les autres types idéaux semblables de la sociologie occidentale contemporaine ne sont, dans la majorité des cas, que des schémas abstraits rendant compte souvent de tel ou tel aspect plus ou moins caractéristique de la situation de l'homme dans le monde de nos jours. Or, ils sont souvent fortement marqués par leur origine qu'ils tirent, d'une manière ou d'une autre, des traditions de la „critique de la culture“. En général, on peut dire que ces différents „types idéaux“ de l'homme peuvent être dépassés théoriquement au moyen d'une autre critique, universelle, dialectique, de ce genre de critique de l'aliénation, cette dernière se fixant pour but de saisir plus à fond l'essence véritable, dialectique, de l'homme, conçue non pas sous forme de construction spiritualiste, mais dans l'esprit de la thèse de Marx de „l'homme véritable, physique, vivant sur la Terre solide, ronde, expirant et aspirant toutes les forces de la nature“<sup>7</sup>. Examiner l'essence historiquement et dynamiquement conçue signifie, avant tout, étudier les manifestations de l'autoréalisation de l'homme dans le travail, la science et l'art.

Le phénomène de la science et, avec lui, la catégorie de la rationalité revêtent, dans ce concept du présent et de l'avenir, une importance primordiale. Ainsi, D. Bell considère la croissance de la science comme une tendance fondamentale façonnant la société humaine. En s'appuyant sur cette thèse, il construit sa vision des différentes forces sociales: selon lui, l'organisation du savoir théorique est décisive pour les innovations et les institutions intellectuelles occuperont dans la société une place pilote.<sup>8</sup>

D'une façon analogue, A. Touraine, en caractérisant la société post-industrielle, fait tenir à la recherche scientifique une place d'honneur.<sup>9</sup> Apparemment, on voit se dessiner là une corrélation entre ces affirmations et les conceptions marxistes-léninistes de la révolution scientifique et technique qui font l'objet d'une élaboration judicieuse dans les pays socialistes et qui soulignent le rôle croissant de la science, en tant que force productive directe. Or, cette analogie n'est que le fait des paroles.

<sup>7</sup> K. Marx. *Ekonomicko-filosofické rukopisy z roku 1844* (Manuscripts de 1844). Praha, 1961. p. 141.

<sup>8</sup> D. Bell. *Notes on the Post-Industrial Society*, in: *The Public Interest*, 6, 7/1967.

<sup>9</sup> A. Touraine. *La société post-industrielle*. Paris, 1969. p. 10.



En réalité, il s'agit d'une attitude, à tout point de vue dissemblable, à l'égard du phénomène de la science qui ne constitue pas en lui-même le critère décisif pour apprécier la qualité et le type de telle ou telle structure sociale, mais qui au contraire doit être expliqué à partir de la totalité sociale et apprécié dans ses fonctions. La croissance de la science peut, en effet, selon les circonstances, renforcer des mouvements et systèmes sociaux tout à fait différents et diamétralement opposés.

D'aucuns pensent que le salut de l'humanité réside dans le savoir qui devient de plus en plus précis. C'est là une erreur fatale. Or, on sait parfaitement que la science même est aujourd'hui l'un des principaux instruments potentiels de destruction de l'humanité, d'autodestruction. On sait tout aussi bien que les branches qui sont à l'avant-poste du savoir contemporain et qui représentent le summum de l'exactitude sont précisément celles liées à l'industrie de guerre et par là même à la production qui constitue une menace directe pour l'existence de l'homme sur cette planète. Voilà un paradoxe de la rationalité de l'action humaine dans une situation historique déterminée et qui est inexplicable pour le scientisme superficiel et l'évolutionnisme techniciste. On a longtemps prêté foi à la superstition naïve — et parfois on continue encore à le faire — selon laquelle la barbarie et la sauvagerie sont logiquement liées au retard économique et technique, le progrès technique entraînant le raffinement des mœurs et l'ennoblissement de l'homme. L'Allemagne techniquement avancée, avec son hygiène proverbiale et sa parfaite organisation, a prouvé le mal-fondé de cette idée. Un autre paradoxe de la rationalité réside dans le fait que le pays du monde techniquement le plus évolué — les Etats-Unis d'Amérique — se sert de son niveau technique élevé pour détruire les germes du progrès industriel dans un pays aussi éprouvé que le Vietnam !

La science et le processus de précision de ses méthodes à eux seuls ne sauraient être suffisants. La mise en place d'un système de contrôle sur l'utilisation des résultats de la connaissance scientifique est plus que jamais un impératif. L'institutionnalisation progressive de la science impose des tâches nouvelles, plus difficiles, au contrôle démocratique. Notons que dans le même temps le progrès de la science offre aux forces démocratiques certains moyens et méthodes de contrôle rationnel, autrefois inimaginables, ainsi qu'une base plus solide pour son évaluation.<sup>10</sup> Robert Jungk insiste sur la nécessité d'unir le principe de démocratisation et de professionnalité, ce qui — si le monde veut éviter de grands conflits et une catastrophe éventuelle — devrait rendre toutes les informations fondamentales accessibles au maximum aux larges couches de la population et permettre à celles-ci de prendre position sur les projets concrets d'évolution sociale ainsi que de décider réellement entre les alternatives proposées.<sup>11</sup> Cette tâche qui revêt aujourd'hui pour l'humanité et la maîtrise de ses propres produits un caractère fatal, est liée à de nombreux problèmes de poids. Certaines personnes vont jusqu'à affirmer que le fait de fixer cette tâche est l'expression d'illusions qui ont fait leur temps et qui ont perdu toute leur raison d'être dans la société moderne, dirigée à l'aide de la cybernétique. Je ne partage pas cette opinion tout en sachant parfaitement que la conviction sur la possibilité de la compréhension et de la solution rationnelles des problèmes sociaux de ce genre ne peut

<sup>10</sup> Helmut Krauch. *Forschungsmethoden und Entwicklungsstrategie*. Heidelberg, rapport No 72, p. 52.

<sup>11</sup> Voir les recueils «Der Griff nach der Zukunft» et «Wege ins neue Jahrtausend», R. Jungk et H. J. Mundt, München, 1964.



pas être rationnellement prouvée d'une façon absolue. C'est pourquoi il faut supposer un espace certain pour la foi dans la raison, dans l'homme et dans le fait qu'il ne se servira pas de sa raison pour l'autodestruction du genre humain.

La notion de société rationnelle n'en demande pas moins une explication du problème de la rationalité et, de ce fait, notamment, le refus de son „évidence“. Je n'aborderai qu'un aspect de la question: la compréhension non historique de la notion de rationalité en tant que quelque chose de donné une fois pour toutes, en tant que quelque chose d'évident une fois pour toutes et pour tout le monde. Malgré toute la continuité des différents types de rationalité dans l'histoire de la société, on ne saurait parler de la „rationalité en tant que telle“. J'ai à l'esprit ici par exemple certaines extrapolations généralisées de cette catégorie que nous trouvons chez T. Parsons et chez d'autres. La mise en valeur de la rationalité et la rationalité même dépendent toutefois en définitive (en dépit du fait qu'elles se recouvrent d'une façon compliquée et qu'un type s'imbrique dans l'autre) de certaines structures historiques et sociales et, dans un certain sens, de certaines couches et de leur milieu. Ainsi ce qui, du point de vue de la société capitaliste avancée, apparaît comme le triomphe de la rationalité est en contradiction de principe avec la rationalité des sociétés primitives. Il faut toutefois ajouter que dans le capitalisme il s'agit du triomphe d'une rationalité limitée et déformée. Or, une question plainement justifiée, fondamentale, se pose dans ce contexte: en quoi y a-t-il accord et écart entre le type de rationalité du capitalisme et le type de rationalité des différentes variantes du socialisme contemporain?<sup>12</sup>

Le problème ne se confine pas à la seule typologisation de la rationalité dans sa confrontation temporelle (historique) et dans l'espace (territoriale-nationale). La hiérarchisation et l'intégration fonctionnelle de la rationalité dans les différentes sphères de l'activité humaine et dans la structure globale de telle ou telle société avec la rationalité globale qui en résulte constituent un chapitre à part. En ce sens, par exemple, la rationalité économique n'apparaît que comme un élément ou un aspect structurel d'une rationalité globale plus large de l'ensemble social. Il faut aussi refuser la tendance à tenir un certain type de société pour un système de référence absolu. A cela s'associe, par exemple, la tentative problématique de considérer la maximalisation des profits financiers de l'individu comme un principe généralement et absolument valable de la rationalité économique, ce qui dans certains circonstances peut revenir à éterniser une situation historique transitoire déterminée. De plus, la vraie spécificité de la rationalité économique agit toujours en corrélation avec la rationalité globale de l'ensemble social. Cela pose évidemment le problème de hiérarchisation de différents niveaux ou de différentes catégories de rationalité, mettant à l'avant-plan la question de l'élaboration des bases axiologiques de l'analyse scientifique et de la mutation de la société. Il s'agit là, en tout premier lieu, de fixer et de motiver les valeurs et les buts de la transformation sociale qui tendrait à l'émancipation réelle de l'homme et à la mise en application de la rationalité dans cette direction.

L'effort tendant à réaliser la variante socialiste de la révolution scientifique et technique est l'expression pratique de cet humanisme réel. Cette variante peut fournir des arguments convaincants pour démontrer que l'humanité, sous la pression des paramètres économiques et techniques, ne suit pas fatalement le chemin qui

<sup>12</sup> V. Maurice Gaudalier. Rationalité et irrationalité en économie. Paris, 1966.



mène vers le modèle américain en tant que seul système de référence perspectif. La sociologie comparative, orientée vers la prospection, se heurte jusqu'ici à de nombreuses difficultés d'ordre subjectif et objectif dans son effort d'explorer et de prouver cette possibilité ou de la réfuter. Parmi les difficultés subjectives, il y en a de nature méthodologique. En effet, malgré les différentes tentatives qui avaient été faites, on n'est pas encore parvenu à élaborer les modes et les critères pour mesurer et comparer les fonctions, les valeurs et les significations propres aux facteurs analogues ou quasi identiques agissant au sein des différents systèmes socio-culturels et politiques de nos jours. C'est pourquoi ceux qui pensent pouvoir résoudre la question des avantages de tel ou tel modèle de la révolution scientifique et technique en dressant simplement l'inventaire des données empiriques ou en confrontant les indices quantitatifs, font fausse route. Or, les complications de caractère objectif sont beaucoup plus importantes. En comparant les sociétés capitalistes et socialistes (par exemple celle des Etats-Unis et celle de l'URSS) nous confrontons la forme historiquement mûre (trop mûre à notre avis) d'une certaine organisation sociale avec une autre forme qui, pourtant, relativement, n'a fait que franchir la première étape de son édification. A cela s'ajoute le fait que les sociétés du capitalisme techniquement avancé ont atteint, pour le moment, en raison d'un point de départ plus propice dans le temps, sous certains aspects, un degré relativement supérieur de développement technique. C'est pourquoi aussi la forme contemporaine du capitalisme aux Etats-Unis est adéquate à la spécificité de sa notion qui reflète aussi, bien entendu, la dialectique de sa crise et de la naissance des conditions de son propre dépassement. Par contre, le socialisme avait été obligé de remplir, en plus de ses tâches spécifiques, certaines tâches historiques correspondant aux formations antérieures et représentées, par-dessus le marché, dans la perspective du programme de la société communiste, une formation sociale transitoire.

Ainsi, nous ne comparons pas deux types *purs*, mais deux formes sociales distinctes qui représentent des phases différentes de manifestation de leur spécificité et de leur qualité historiques. D'où certains phénomènes paradoxaux et certaines dépendances dialectiques qu'on ne saurait saisir ni par la section statique ni par la méthode de projection linéaire, fondée sur l'extrapolation de tendances provisoires. Les données empiriques sur la stratification et la différenciation du niveau de vie et du style de vie dans les pays socialistes témoignent d'écarts sensibles entre divers groupes socio-professionnels que l'on est loin de pouvoir comparer, il est vrai, à la polarité des situations extrême existant dans le capitalisme, mais qui n'en sont pas moins éloignés, pour l'instant, de l'idéal d'égalité exprimé dans le programme communiste. Ce fait est souvent exploité par la propagande anticommuniste. En réalité, toutefois, le seul chemin qui mène vers l'égalité communiste passe précisément par le stade de l'inégalité transitoire et limitée. Les expériences de la Tchécoslovaquie montrent que les tentatives de brûler cette étape transitoire, par l'introduction non organique et précoce de mesures de nivellement, n'accélérent pas, mais au contraire, ayant un effet de boomerang, ralentissent le mouvement de la société vers le but fixé. Cette dépendance dialectique pourrait être caractérisé comme la voie optimale menant au but et ce, précisément, par l'orientation de l'effort vers la nécessité de surmonter ce maillon transitoire qui est caractérisé par des tendances qui ont l'air de s'écarter du but. Une dépendance analogue se manifeste aussi quant aux autres phénomènes. Le concept perspectif du communisme est la fusion des peuples et des cultures nationales; or, le chemin vers ce but passait et passe en-



core, jusqu'à un certain point, par l'étape de formation de l'individualisation et du développement relativement autonome des peuples socialistes, à la fois à l'intérieur de différentes formations fédératives et au sein de la communauté des Etats socialistes. L'idée de la société communiste de Marx et de Lénine, fondée sur les principes de l'autogestion et de la participation la plus directe des travailleurs à sa direction, ne pourra être réalisée que si l'on suit l'itinéraire passant par le système de gestion qui englobe les éléments de participation représentative directe et indirecte. Sous ce rapport également avancer le mot d'ordre de „démocratie directe“, sans tenir compte du facteur de temps (du degré de développement du monde en général et des sociétés socialistes, en particulier) ne nous rapproche pas du but souhaité, mais au contraire nous en éloigne. Telle est la dialectique de l'histoire dans la réalisation des projets humains et avec laquelle il faut compter dans la recherche comparative et prospective.

Les traits spécifiques du modèle communiste de structure sociale dans leur ensemble, de pair avec la création de ses diverses composantes, constituent l'alternative historique face à la variante capitaliste du mouvement de certains phénomènes de civilisations matériels analogues, mais cette spécificité du communisme existe, pour ce qui est de certains indices sociologiques importants, plutôt dans son intention irréversible, dans son orientation tendancielle. Si nous utilisons la terminologie d'Aristote, c'est plutôt *dynamei* (*δυνάμει*) que d'*énergeia* (*ενεργεία*). Ce qui est pourtant essentiel, c'est que cette orientation et cette intention perspectives sont présentes dès leurs formes germinales, passagères, combinées et, si vous voulez, „malpropres“. Les avocats „d'idées pures“ voient, à tort, dans ces médiations la profanation de „nobles buts“ par des „moyens sales“. C'est pourquoi ils ont monté de toutes pièces la contradiction entre la „belle âme“ et le „commissaire“. C'est pourquoi ils ont qualifié, étant eux-mêmes utopistes, les plans léninistes de construction du socialisme dans la Russie tsariste arriérée, d'utopie qui nécessairement allait discréditer le marxisme. La thèse de la limitation du léninisme à la situation en Russie et par conséquent celle de la „non authenticité“ du socialisme fondé sur ces principes ont occupé une place centrale dans cette argumentation. Le cadre de ce rapport ne nous permet pas d'analyser tout cet ensemble de problèmes. Nous n'aborderons donc qu'un aspect de cette fausse argumentation, qui est intimement lié au sujet de cette contribution à la discussion. Il s'agit de la tentative de disqualifier les mesures visant à incarner les idées du socialisme dans les conditions sociales „non adéquates“, „non propres“ et renvoyer ainsi tout le projet aux calendes grecques. Dans cette argumentation, on oppose à Lénine et à ses successeurs, depuis des décennies, des autorités de ce qu'on appelle le marxisme occidental, telles que Korsch, Kofler, Goldman, Garaudy, etc. Dans ce contexte, on a invoqué aussi souvent l'œuvre de l'éminent marxiste italien A. Gramsci. Mais c'est justement Gramsci qui a profondément compris les conditions lourdes de contradictions dans lesquelles Lénine et son parti avaient commencé à réaliser le projet de révolution sociale de Marx. Dans ses notes sur l'entretien de Staline avec la première délégation américaine, qui a eu lieu en septembre 1927, il désavoue sans équivoque l'attitude négative adoptée par Trotski à l'égard de la réalisation du programme socialiste dans un seul pays, par surcroît industriellement peu développé. Aussi estime-t-il nécessaire de combiner les moments „nationaux“ et „internationaux“. Il souligne que „la classe dirigeante n'est dirigeante que dans la mesure où elle explique avec précision cette combinaison dont elle fait elle-même partie, ce qui lui permet de donner en tant



que telle au mouvement une certaine orientation dans certaines perspectives“. Il relève l'originalité des bolcheviks qui est, selon lui, d'avoir „épuré l'internationalisme de tous les éléments vagues et purement idéologiques (au pire sens du terme) pour leur donner un contenu politique réaliste“<sup>13</sup>. Gramsci considère comme parfaitement légitime d'entreprendre la réalisation du projet socialiste dans les conditions de la Russie relativement peu développée sur le plan industriel, car „avant de créer les conditions pour l'économie planifiée mondiale, il faut franchir des étapes compliquées qui peuvent embrasser différentes combinaisons régionales“<sup>14</sup>. Le refus doctrinaire de ce pas réel par Trotski et son incompréhension totale de la nécessité des combinaisons médianes ont été qualifiés par lui, à juste titre, de l'expression d'une passivité et d'un immobilisme de fait.

L'essence du léninisme est, par conséquent, l'engagement du sujet révolutionnaire, exprimé par l'équation bien connue: le communisme égale le pouvoir soviétique plus l'électrification du pays. Dans les conditions actuelles, l'application de ce programme suppose une union accélérée de la révolution scientifique et technique de nos jours et des rapports sociaux socialistes, et vice-versa. L'enjeu est important: c'est le sort de l'homme, son bonheur, son existence même sur cette planète. Dans son ouvrage „40 000 heures“, Fourastié ne met pas en doute que le système socialiste ou — comme il le dit explicitement — le système soviétique, mieux que tout autre, facilite la solution complexe du problème du bonheur humain. Il pense pourtant qu'il n'en est pas ainsi pour d'autres questions.<sup>15</sup>

Notamment en ce qui concerne les phénomènes liés à ce qu'il appelle, imprécisément, la „société de consommation“, l'Occident, selon Fourastié, joue un rôle de pionnier dans lequel il ne peut, dit-il, que compter sur sa propre expérience et sa propre existence. Cette attitude présume, vaguement, plusieurs niveaux de comparaison et l'hétérogénéité des critères pour l'appréciation des divers phénomènes au sein des sociétés confrontées. Kahn et Wiener voient l'avenir (en dépit des paradigmes et des paradoxes découlant de la croissance de la production et du niveau de vie) dans la société post-industrielle plus ou moins universelle vers laquelle s'achemine l'humanité par l'ascension linéaire des indices du G. N. P. Le socialisme, là notamment où il est lié aux pays techniquement moins évolués, est ainsi condamné au rôle d'un coureur de fond éternel qui verrait son partenaire, avec une imprécision mathématique d'extrapolation du schéma fixé une fois pour toutes, lui échapper constamment. Ce schéma est faux et ne correspond nullement à l'état de faits réel. La comparaison scientifique de deux types fondamentaux de la société contemporaine dans le monde ne saurait être fondée sur le schéma du mouvement unidimensionnel, car il s'agit en fait d'une confrontation de mouvements multidimensionnels dans des hiérarchies dialectiques fondamentalement différentes. A certains égards par exemple, en ce qui concerne la stratification des secteurs sociaux et à un certain point aussi la saturation de la vie quotidienne en quelques biens de consommation les pays du capitalisme techniquement avancés constituent un but de l'avenir vers lequel le socialisme ne ferait que tendre. A d'autres égards,

<sup>13</sup> A. Gramsci. Poznámky o Macchiavellim, politice a modernim státu (Notes sur Machiavel, la politique et l'Etat moderne). Prague, 1970. p. 112.

<sup>14</sup> Ibid., p. 113.

<sup>15</sup> G. Fourastié, 40 000 hodin (40 000 heures). Praha, 1969. pp. 18, 19.



ces deux types de société différents comportent des phénomènes superficiels qui ont l'air de témoigner d'un *présent* analogue. Pourtant en ce qui concerne les aspects aussi fondamentaux que le caractère de la propriété, l'essence du système politique, la distribution du revenu national et les buts du développement planifié de la société, le capitalisme contemporain, aussi techniquement avancé qu'il puisse être, représente un *passé* irréversible des sociétés socialistes. C'est là que le socialisme contemporain joue un rôle de pionnier unique, sans précédent dans l'histoire. Et ce sont précisément ces aspects qui représentent une sorte de *dominante* de la structure sociale, une dominante qui, dans toutes ses relations rétroactives et réciproques, détermine le caractère de la structure sociale dans son ensemble et forme, d'une manière spécifique, toutes ses autres composantes. Elle marque de son sceau indélébile toutes les interventions du sujet dans le mouvement social, le type et les formes d'application de la rationalité, les fonctions et les significations de l'action des hommes et la nature et le sens des décisions, des priorités et des actions sociales. Cette affirmation ne saurait en aucun cas être interprétée comme un refus de l'utilité des comparaisons sociologiques des différents systèmes sociaux. Au contraire, elle ne tend qu'à rendre plus précis les critères nécessaires pour élaborer des méthodes adéquates destinées à saisir toutes les réalités pour lesquelles la comparabilité fondamentale des différents phénomènes sociaux demande que l'on comprenne que le principe dialectique „Cum duo idem, non idem“ doit être appliqué dans ce domaine et comment il doit l'être.

En outre, cela signifie le refus du principe comparatif non adéquat du mouvement convergent unidimensionnel des deux sociétés dont l'une éternellement rattrape l'autre. La recherche fondée sur ce principe mécaniste n'est pas adéquate, car le socialisme ne saurait être imaginé comme un coureur de fond qui rattrape désespérément les buts dépassés par le capitalisme, mais bien plutôt — pour conserver l'image comme un coureur de fond qui suit une autre direction, une autre piste que le capitalisme. Ces deux trajectoires dans le développement du monde contemporain qui représente une unité dialectique déchiré de contradictions, constituent aussi la base matérielle de ses différentes interprétations. Seule l'une représente la réponse à la devinette de l'histoire humaine, fait dont elle est aussi parfaitement consciente.

## LES ASPECTS SOCIOLOGIQUES DE L'ANALYSE DE LÉNINE DE L'ÉVOLUTION DU CAPITALISME

PAUL BOCCARA  
FRANCE

La théorie sociale de Marx part d'une période historique définie des relations sociales totales pour découvrir „la loi naturelle qui préside à son mouvement“. Cette période est fondamentalement caractérisée, comme on le sait, par „le mode de production capitaliste“. Dès 1894, dans une de ses premières œuvres, *Ce que sont les „Amis du Peuple“*, Lénine souligne :

„Le pas de géant réalisé par Marx... a consisté précisément en ceci qu'il a rejeté tous ces raisonnements sur la société et le progrès en général et donné une analyse scientifique d'une société et d'un progrès, savoir la société et le progrès capitalistes.“<sup>1</sup>

Devant Lénine se pose la tâche qui consiste à appliquer et à développer la théorie de Marx pour les besoins de l'action révolutionnaire du parti ouvrier social-démocrate, puis bolchévique, russe. Il caractérise lui-même, en 1900, cette exigence dans „Une critique acritique“ publiée en annexe du „Développement du capitalisme en Russie“<sup>2</sup>.

L'analyse de l'évolution concrète du capitalisme, dont Lénine est le contemporain agissant, se trouve au centre de cette tâche.

Cependant, comme la théorie de Marx qu'elle vise à développer, l'analyse que Lénine fait de l'évolution du capitalisme dépasse les cloisons académiques, conscientes et inconscientes, dressées entre les différentes disciplines des sciences sociales, histoire, économie, sociologie, politologie, etc.

Il est de notre intention de parler des aspects sociologiques de l'analyse léniniste de l'évolution du capitalisme pour dégager à travers la dimension historique essentielle de l'analyse une typologie sociale; les liens des aspects sociologiques aux autres aspects fondamentaux de cette analyse, économiques et politiques tout particulièrement et les rapports de l'analyse de l'évolution du capitalisme avec l'objectif de développement conséquent de la théorie marxiste par son application.

Afin d'esquisser une réponse schématique à ces questions, il convient de considérer successivement les trois moments de l'analyse de l'évolution du capitalisme élaborée par Lénine, moments déterminés par les trois séries de phénomènes auxquels il se trouve confronté, de ce point de vue, au cours de sa vie.

<sup>1</sup> V. I. Lénine. Oeuvres choisies. I. Première partie. p. 109—110.

<sup>2</sup> Ibid., p. 723—724.



Ce sont: l'analyse du développement du capitalisme en Russie; celle de l'impérialisme, stade suprême du capitalisme; celle du capitalisme monopoliste d'Etat.

### 1. LE DÉVELOPPEMENT DU CAPITALISME EN RUSSIE

Cette première analyse est particulièrement importante du point de vue de notre sujet. En effet, c'est en l'élaborant que Lénine expose sans doute, le dessein général de sa démarche concernant l'évolution du capitalisme. Cette analyse se rencontre dans plusieurs ouvrages, depuis la brochure de 1893: „A propos de la question dite des marchés“ jusqu'à celle de 1907: „Le programme agraire de la social-démocratie“ et même au-delà, en passant par le gros livre central de 1899: „Le développement du capitalisme en Russie“.

Lénine part de l'analyse économique, pour situer le processus social total concret de la Russie de la fin du XIX<sup>e</sup> s., comme un moment de l'évolution de la formation sociale capitaliste. Il part de la théorie marxiste de la *réalisation* capitaliste des marchandises, pour développer la théorie de la formation du *marché intérieur* capitaliste, question située au centre du débat avec les populistes. Il peut ainsi expliquer pourquoi et selon quelles modalités concrètes, c'est bien le capitalisme qui se développe en Russie à travers la ruine de la vieille économie agraire. Il peut montrer comment l'économie capitaliste caractérise de plus en plus la Russie, malgré les résistances et les difficultés provenant des survivances considérables de la formation sociale correspondant au mode de production antérieur. D'où, selon son expression: „la possibilité d'appliquer à la Russie la théorie de Marx“ („A propos de la question dite des marchés“).<sup>3</sup>

A partir de la théorie économique de Marx et de l'analyse minutieuse des données statistiques disponibles, concernant aussi bien l'agriculture que l'industrie, il démontre que la ruine de la masse de paysans et des petits producteurs est loin de réduire les débouchés et de rendre impossible le développement du capitalisme. La ruine des paysans développe au contraire le marché intérieur capitaliste, avec le développement des moyens de production sous la forme marchande et capitaliste de capital constant et avec l'entrée des paysans plus ou moins prolétarisés dans l'économie marchande capitaliste, ainsi que dans la partie du capital représentée par les salaires (capital variable) à la campagne comme à la ville.

Cette situation de la société globale concrète russe de la fin du XIX<sup>e</sup> s., par rapport à l'évolution de la formation sociale capitaliste, dépasse les points de vue unilatéraux des populistes, d'une part — privilégiant les aspects négatifs, versant dans la critique sentimentale de „gauche“ et dans l'utopie réactionnaire — et des marxistes légaux ou opportunistes de droite, d'autre part — privilégiant de façon apologétique le caractère progressif du développement du capitalisme. Lénine souligne en conclusion de son „Développement du capitalisme en Russie“.

„Admettre le caractère progressif de ce rôle (historique du capitaliste — P. B.) est parfaitement compatible avec... l'admission absolue des côtés négatifs et sombres du capitalisme, avec l'admission absolue des vastes et profondes contradictions sociales inhérentes au capitalisme et révélant le caractère historiquement transitoire de ce régime économique.“<sup>4</sup>

<sup>3</sup> V. I. Lénine. Oeuvres choisies. I. Première partie, p. 5.

<sup>4</sup> Ibid., p. 682.



Lénine indique que les conceptions unilatérales proviennent de l'incapacité d'appliquer la théorie *dialectique* de la réalisation de Marx.<sup>5</sup> Il montre qu'elles sont liées à une analyse insuffisamment matérialiste, insuffisamment sociologique, fondée sur des schémas spéculatifs, négligeant *les rapports effectifs* entre groupes sociaux du point de vue de *la production et toutes les nuances des groupes sociaux* qui y correspondent. Ces rapports et ces nuances se rattachent aux rapports de classes fondamentaux du capitalisme — entre prolétariat et bourgeoisie. Lénine termine son „Développement du capitalisme en Russie“ en évoquant „la cause la plus profonde, peut-être, de notre désaccord avec les populistes“ en ces termes:

„En étudiant ces processus, le populiste en tire d'ordinaire telles ou telles déductions moralisantes. Il ne regarde pas les divers groupes d'individus participant à la production comme des créateurs de telles ou telles formes d'existence; il ne se propose pas de présenter l'ensemble des rapports économiques et sociaux comme le résultat des rapports entre ces groupes dont les intérêts diffèrent, ainsi que les rôles historiques qu'ils jouent.“<sup>6</sup>

Il expliquera, d'ailleurs, comment les conceptions unilatérales des populistes se rattachent à l'influence de la petite bourgeoisie dans le mouvement socialiste; et celles des marxistes légaux à l'influence de la bourgeoisie elle-même.

Lénine ne se contente pas de démontrer le processus de *différenciation* qui s'opère parmi les paysans et artisans, entre une majorité en voie plus ou moins avancée de prolétarianisation et une minorité bourgeoise ou en voie d'embourgeoisement. Il analyse minutieusement toutes les catégories intermédiaires des „semi-prolétaires“ (mi-paysans, mi-ouvriers), la pénétration complexe des rapports capitalistes à la campagne (drainage de l'épargne des agriculteurs, etc.), les différents types de régions rurales et les différents types d'agglomération urbaine, etc. Cependant, loin de se perdre dans un tableau „pointilliste“ éclectique, il conclut avec force sur l'essentiel:

„Le régime économique moderne est basé sur l'achat et la vente de la force de travail. A ne prendre que les plus petits producteurs agricoles ou industriels, vous verrez que ceux-là forment une exception qui ne se louent pas eux-mêmes ou ne louent pas quelqu'un. Mais ces rapports. . . n'arrivent à leur plein développement et ne se séparent entièrement des formes économiques précédentes que dans la grande industrie mécanique. Aussi, ce „petit domaine“ qui semble si insignifiant à tel populiste, forme en réalité la quintessence des rapports sociaux modernes, et la population de ce „petit domaine“, c'est-à-dire le prolétariat, n'est au sens littéral du mot, que la première rangée, l'avant-garde de toute la masse des travailleurs et des exploités.“<sup>7</sup>

Cette analyse de la polarisation de l'ensemble des rapports sociaux débouche sur des conclusions relatives au rôle des différents groupes sociaux dans les luttes sociales et politiques, sur une sociologie politique, pour ainsi s'exprimer, et sur un programme politique.

<sup>5</sup> Voir la précision du caractère dialectique et de la double portée idéologique, contre l'«apologétique» et contre la «critique» «petite bourgeoise» populiste, de la théorie de la réalisation de Marx, dans «Nouvelles remarques sur la théorie de la réalisation» (août 1899).

<sup>6</sup> Ibid., p. 687.

<sup>7</sup> Ibid., p. 669.



Dans sa préface de 1908 à la deuxième édition du „Développement du capitalisme en Russie“, Lénine évoque de façon suggestive le caractère des différents partis politiques et les nombreux courants politiques et idéologiques. Il commence par remarquer que son „analyse du régime économique et social, et partant celle de la structure de classe de la Russie“, „se trouve confirmée“ au cours de la révolution qui a éclaté en 1905 „par l'action politique directe de toutes les classes“. Ainsi „le rôle dirigeant du prolétariat s'est amplement affirmé“; „la dualité de la paysannerie se révèle de façon toujours plus marquée“.

„D'une part, les vestiges très appréciables d'une économie fondée sur la corvée et les multiples survivances du servage, avec l'appauvrissement et la ruine sans précédent des paysans pauvres expliquent pleinement les sources profondes du mouvement paysan révolutionnaire.“<sup>8</sup>

D'autre part, la „nature petite-bourgeoise“ de la masse paysanne éclate avec l'oscillation du petit exploitant appauvri entre la bourgeoisie contre-révolutionnaire et le prolétariat révolutionnaire, tandis qu'„une infime minorité de petits producteurs s'enrichissent“ et que „l'immense majorité se ruinent“<sup>9</sup>.

Sur cette base, dit Lénine, deux voies d'évolution sont possibles:

„Ou bien l'ancienne exploitation seigneuriale, rattachée par mille liens au servage, demeure et se transforme lentement en exploitation purement capitaliste, en exploitation des „hobereaux“ (. . .) ou bien l'ancienne exploitation seigneuriale est brisée par la révolution qui détruit tous les vestiges du servage, notamment le régime de la grosse propriété foncière.“<sup>10</sup>

Dans le deuxième cas, on aura „le rôle prédominant du prolétariat et de la masse paysanne“ et „la création des conditions les plus favorables à l'accomplissement par la classe ouvrière de sa mission véritable et fondamentale: la refonte socialiste“<sup>11</sup>.

Lénine montre comment, non seulement les ultra-réactionnaires mais les „libéraux“ travaillent en faveur de la première voie, tandis que même des couches supérieures d'hommes politiques appartenant aux partis populiste et travailliste sont contaminés par l'esprit „libéral“ d'hypocrisie et de trahison, sans compter „l'aile droite de la social-démocratie“<sup>12</sup>.

Dès l'ouvrage *Le programme agraire de la social-démocratie* de 1907, Lénine s'affirme avec les bolchéviks contre Plekhanov et les menchéviks, contre la répétition dogmatique de la théorie de Marx au lieu de son application aux conditions historiques originales russes, pour la modification et la concrétisation du programme agraire du parti, tirant les enseignements, impossibles à anticiper auparavant, de la lutte des masses sans précédent de la révolution de 1905 (p. 485 et 247). Il s'y prononce avec le mouvement paysan révolutionnaire pour la „nationalisation de la terre“ (p. 244), pour „l'alliance du prolétariat et des masses paysannes“ (p. 248), contre „la création d'une Russie des bourgeois et des junkers“ (p. 245), pour la réalisation des meilleures conditions de la révolution socialiste elle-même au-delà de la révolution démocratique agraire.

<sup>8</sup> V. L. Lénine. Développement du capitalisme en Russie, p. 10.

<sup>9</sup> Ibid., p. 11.

<sup>10</sup> Ibid., p. 12.

<sup>11</sup> Ibid., p. 13.

<sup>12</sup> Ibid., p. 11 et 14.



## II. L'IMPÉRIALISME, STADE SUPRÊME DU CAPITALISME

La „terre“ va jouer un rôle de première importance dans les deux révolutions russes de 1917. Mais on y rencontre aussi la question de la „guerre“ impérialiste, la question „nationale“, celle de la „nationalisation“ des monopoles.<sup>13</sup>

*L'analyse économique, appliquée à un moment historique de la formation sociale capitaliste à l'échelle mondiale, débouche sur la définition d'un stade nouveau de cette formation.*

Dans „L'impérialisme, stade suprême du capitalisme (Essai de vulgarisation)“, écrit en 1916, ce que Lénine vise à caractériser c'est la société globale concrète telle qu'elle se présente, non seulement en Russie, mais dans le monde entier, à la veille de la guerre de 1914—1918.<sup>14</sup>

Ici il part à la fois de l'analyse économique et des statistiques économiques d'ensemble, en vue d'aboutir à une explication de la société concrète de son temps, de ses rapports de classe ainsi que de ses phénomènes sociaux dominants, comme la Première guerre mondiale. Il écrit dans la préface aux éditions française et allemande :

„Pour montrer cette situation objective, il faut prendre non pas des exemples ni des données isolées (avec l'extrême complexité des phénomènes de la vie sociale, on peut toujours trouver, tant que l'on veut, des exemples ou des données isolées à l'appui de n'importe quelle thèse) mais absolument l'ensemble des données sur les fondements de la vie économique de toutes les puissances belligérantes et du monde entier.“<sup>15</sup>

Lénine part des théories de Marx sur les tendances de la concurrence et de la concentration capitalistes, ou encore sur l'exportation des capitaux, il utilise de façon critique les thèses de Hilferding sur le „capital financier“ et diverses études d'économistes bourgeois sur les banques, les monopoles ou la politique coloniale, etc. . . Il aboutit, en analysant à leur lumière les réalités de la société globale de son temps, à définir un véritable *stade* nouveau du mode de production capitaliste.

Il convient de souligner l'importance de ce concept de „stade“, du point de vue de toute la sociologie marxiste et de la conception matérialiste dialectique de l'histoire. Certes, on rencontre déjà dans le *Capital* de Marx la distinction rigoureuse, sur tous les plans, d'une première période du capitalisme, „la période manufacturière“, distincte de la période de la „fabrique“, ainsi que des indications sur des phases à l'intérieur d'autres modes de production historiques, comme l'esclavagisme, par exemple. De même, à propos du communisme, Marx distinguera la phase „socialiste“, encore marquée par les „stigmates“ du capitalisme, de la phase „communiste“ supérieure. Mais avec l'ouvrage de Lénine, s'appuyant d'ailleurs sur les travaux contemporains concernant la phase du capital financier ou de l'impérialisme, on assiste à une systématisation nouvelle. C'est pourquoi, on peut, aujourd'hui, distinguer un stade primitif (ou manufacturier) du capita-

<sup>13</sup> Les questions agraires, de la guerre, nationale, de la nationalisation des monopoles, sont cruciales, par exemple dans la brochure de Lénine: «Les tâches du prolétariat dans notre révolution» (1917).

<sup>14</sup> Cette analyse se retrouve dans nombre d'autres écrits de Lénine, comme «La faillite de la Deuxième Internationale» (1915).

<sup>15</sup> V. I. Lénine. Oeuvres choisies. I, Deuxième partie, p. 436.



lisme; un stade classique de pleine concurrence: un stade monopoliste ou impérialiste, final.

Cette conception d'un stade nouveau de l'évolution du capitalisme vise à développer la théorie de Marx, en l'appliquant à la réalité sociale nouvelle, mais non à rejeter la théorie marxiste de la formation sociale capitaliste.

Lénine montre, par exemple, comment le développement nouveau des „monopoles capitalistes“, tout en niant en principe la concurrence, ne la supprime pas, mais en approfondit et exaspère les contradictions. Il écrit: „... Certaines des qualités essentielles du capitalisme ont commencé à se transformer en leurs antinomies; ... sur toute la ligne se sont formés et révélés des éléments d'une époque de transition du capitalisme à une structure économique et sociale supérieure ... La libre concurrence est le trait essentiel du capitalisme et de la production marchande en général; le monopole est exactement le contraire de la libre concurrence (...). En même temps les monopoles (capitalistes) n'éliminent pas la libre concurrence, dont ils sont issus... engendrant ainsi des contradictions aiguës et violentes, des frottements, des conflits.“<sup>16</sup>

Tout en constituant un stade nouveau, opposé au précédent, le stade du capitalisme monopoliste ou impérialisme reste néanmoins capitaliste. La nouveauté de ce moment organique défini de la formation sociale totale provient de la tendance du mode de production capitaliste à passer à un mode de production supérieur. Mais avec le maintien du capitalisme, toutes ses contradictions caractéristiques, loin d'être supprimées s'exaspèrent en raison du caractère antagonique de cette nouveauté même. De là résulte le double aspect de l'impérialisme, dégagé par Lénine: 1. C'est un „capitalisme parasitaire ou pourrissant“, où l'antagonisme s'accroît entre la masse grandissante des exploités, pillés, opprimés, dominés et le cercle réduit des exploités.<sup>17</sup> 2. C'est un „capitalisme de transition ou ... agonisant“ avec la „socialisation de la production“ à l'intérieur de „l'enveloppe“ de la propriété privée.<sup>18</sup>

La définition dialectique du stade impérialiste du capitalisme de Lénine se rattache à son analyse de la concentration de la production, du rôle nouveau de banques, de l'exportation des capitaux, du partage économique du monde, etc. Selon cette analyse de Lénine, l'impérialisme développe la „socialisation“ capitaliste, sur les plans technique et financier notamment, posant les bases d'une organisation sociale supérieure. Mais ce développement s'effectue de manière antagonique, en approfondissant les contradictions capitalistes et en amplifiant les luttes qu'elles engendrent.

„L'impérialisme est l'époque du capital financier et des monopoles qui portent en tout lieu des tendances à la domination et non à la liberté. Réaction sur toute la ligne, quel que soit le régime politique; aggravation extrême des antagonismes en présence... De même se renforcent particulièrement l'oppression nationale et la tendance aux annexions...“<sup>19</sup>

L'analyse des contradictions économiques et sociales nouvelles développées sur la base de la contradiction entre le capital et le travail permet une analyse des

<sup>16</sup> V. I. Lénine. Oeuvres choisies. I. Deuxième partie. p. 525—526.

<sup>17</sup> Ibid., p. 568.

<sup>18</sup> Ibid., p. 570—571. Lénine évoque, notamment, à plusieurs reprises les conditions nouvelles du développement technologique au stade de l'impérialisme.

<sup>19</sup> Ibid., p. 564.



rapports sociaux effectifs et des groupes sociaux concrets, révélant la polarisation sociale accrue du capitalisme à l'échelle mondiale entre bourgeoisie et prolétariat.

Même si l'on se borne à l'ouvrage de Lénine „L'impérialisme, stade suprême du capitalisme“, on y trouve des indications et des analyses concernant :

— l'asservissement de „millions de patrons, petits, moyens et même une partie des grands“, par „quelques centaines de financiers millionnaires“ (p. 444).

— „l'oligarchie financière“ dont la „domination“ se fonde sur les „monopoles“, cartels et trusts, et sur le capital financier, où s'interpénètrent les capitaux industriels et bancaires, ainsi que sur l'union personnelle des banques et des grosses entreprises industrielles et commerciales (p. 472);

— le contrôle des „sociétés par actions“ par l'oligarchie au moyen du „système des participations“, au détriment des „petits actionnaires“ (p. 481);

— le développement de „la couche des rentiers“ (p. 539);

— la tendance à la séparation de la propriété et de la gestion (p. 493);

— le drainage par les banques des revenus „des petits patrons des employés et de la mince couche supérieure d'ouvriers“ (p. 467).

— „l'attraction exercée par les banques“, ou les cartels, sur „les fonctionnaires“ qui passent à leur service (p. 492—491);

— l'„union personnelle“ des sociétés monopolistes et des membres du gouvernement ou du parlement (p. 473), etc. . .

On y rencontre aussi la distinction entre pays „très riches“ ou „avancés“ et pays „arriérés“ (p. 496—497) dominés par l'oligarchie capitaliste des pays avancés; l'analyse de la liaison de la politique coloniale nouvelle avec le stade du capital financier et monopoliste (p. 512—515); l'indication des diverses formes de domination impérialiste, depuis celle de la „colonie“ jusqu'à celle d'„Etat jouissant d'une complète indépendance politique“ en passant par les „Etats semi-coloniaux“ (p. 518); le problème des „mouvements de libération nationale dans les colonies“ (p. 550—551), etc.

Enfin, on y trouve des indications sur les „couches supérieures du prolétariat“ et la „possibilité économique de (les) corrompre“ de diverses manières, en liaison avec les „profits élevés de monopole“, notamment le „monopole colonial“, ce qui „alimente l'opportunisme. . . et le consolide“ (p. 542, 544, 548).

„Mais, remarque Lénine, ce qu'il ne faut pas oublier, ce sont les forces dressées contre l'impérialisme en général et l'opportunisme en particulier.“<sup>20</sup> Il note, en ce sens, que: „Ce qui distingue la situation actuelle, c'est l'existence de conditions économiques et politiques qui devaient forcément rendre l'opportunisme encore plus incompatible avec les intérêts généraux et vitaux du mouvement ouvrier.“<sup>21</sup>

Dans sa préface de 1920 aux éditions française et allemande, tout en reprenant son analyse de „l'aristocratie ouvrière“, il insiste sur la nécessité pour le parti du prolétariat, en luttant contre l'opportunisme.

A l'analyse du stade impérialiste du capitalisme se relie toute une sociologie politique et tout un programme de lutte politique.

Il s'agit, d'abord, de l'analyse de „l'attitude des différentes classes de la société envers la politique de l'impérialisme, attitude en rapport avec l'idéologie générale

<sup>20</sup> V. I. Lénine, Oeuvres choisies. I. Deuxième partie, p. 544.

<sup>21</sup> Ibid., p. 549.



de chacune d'elles" (p. 550). Lénine examine les conceptions *apologétiques* bourgeoises, qu'il s'agisse de la thèse de la tendance au cartel général, qui éliminerait l'anarchie de la production capitaliste (p. 571—572), ou celle de la nécessité et du caractère progressif de l'impérialisme, opposée aux mouvements de libération nationale (p. 551 et 531). Il montre comment se développe „une idéologie impérialiste“, avec „le passage en bloc des classes possédantes“ à cette idéologie et sa pénétration „dans la classe ouvrière, qui n'est pas séparée des autres classes par une muraille de Chine“ (p. 550).

La progression du „social-chauvinisme“ vise à empêcher la révolution (p. 315). Il analyse les critiques petites bourgeoises craignant „de reconnaître la liaison indissoluble entre l'impérialisme et les trusts, et partant entre l'impérialisme et les fondements du capitalisme“ (p. 552). Ce point de vue petit-bourgeois se retrouve dans la critique se réclamant du marxisme d'un Kautsky, d'où son caractère opportuniste et réactionnaire, détournant les masses de la lutte effective contre l'impérialisme. Kautsky coupant l'impérialisme du capital financier et des monopoles, la politique de l'économie, considère l'impérialisme comme „une politique déterminée“ et non comme „une phase“ ou stade du capitalisme (p. 528, 531).

Il prétend que „les tendances du capital à l'expansion“ peuvent être favorisées par les méthodes de „la démocratie pacifique“ (p. 554). Il évoque aussi la possibilité d'une „politique nouvelle, ultra-impérialiste“, qui substituerait à la lutte des capitaux nationaux l'exploitation de l'univers en commun (p. 560). Il masque les contradictions monopolistes effectives et inéliminables sur la base du capitalisme monopoliste.

L'analyse sociale de Lénine est intimement liée à une politique et à un programme de lutte. Ainsi, l'analyse de faillite de la social-démocratie se relie intimement à celle de l'impérialisme. D'où le programme de lutte contre l'opportunisme, contre le social-chauvinisme et pour la séparation des partis révolutionnaires du réformisme de la II<sup>e</sup> Internationale. Ainsi, la preuve du caractère social véritable ou plus exactement du caractère de classe de la guerre de 1914—1918, „impérialiste des deux côtés“ (p. 436), fonde théoriquement le programme de lutte révolutionnaire contre la guerre, pour la paix. L'analyse de l'oppression nationale impérialiste explique le programme national l'alliance du mouvement prolétarien et des mouvements de libération ainsi que le soutien de ces mouvements jusque par la lutte pour le droit à la séparation dans les métropoles.

Toutes ces analyses seront appliquées lors de la Révolution d'Octobre, mais la pratique révolutionnaire se fondera alors aussi sur la théorie du capitalisme monopoliste d'Etat.

### III. LE CAPITALISME MONOPOLISTE D'ÉTAT

La théorie du capitalisme monopoliste d'Etat (C. M. E.) a seulement été ébauchée par Lénine en 1917, bien qu'elle ait joué un rôle important dans la conception de la révolution soviétique. On la rencontre surtout dans la brochure „La catastrophe imminente et les moyens de la conjurer“, écrite en septembre et publiée en octobre 1917, mais aussi dans d'autres ouvrages, comme „l'Etat et la Révolution“, écrit au même moment et publié en 1918.



Lénine pour éclairer les luttes de 1917, dans les conditions de la débâcle économique provoquée par la guerre impérialiste, utilise l'analyse de l'évolution économique des pays capitalistes avancés pendant la guerre. Il évoque, dans „La catastrophe imminente“, la „réglementation de la vie économique“ à laquelle précèdent „des Etats aussi avancés que l'Allemagne et les Etats-Unis d'Amérique“, réalisant „des réformes qui leur sont nécessaires par la voie bureaucratique réactionnaire“.<sup>22</sup> Il indique que cette régulation permet aux principales banques de percevoir sur ce même Etat des millions et des millions de „surprofit“. Il souligne la „cartellisation forcée“ des industriels appliquée par l'Etat allemand (p. 131) et les progrès considérables de la monopolisation (p. 120, 123). Il dénonce „la dilapidation du Trésor systématique et légalisée“ par les fournitures de guerre en Russie (p. 128), la „pire forme d'emprunt forcé“ par „l'émission de papier-monnaie“ et la montée de la vie chère laquelle aggrave surtout la situation des ouvriers, de la partie pauvre de la population (p. 143—144).

Pendant sur la base de son analyse précédente du capitalisme monopoliste simple, Lénine ne voit pas dans ces transformations toutes récentes uniquement des mesures de circonstance ou un changement de politique, mais, sous la pression des circonstances, le début d'une transformation structurelle. Au lieu de répéter de façon dogmatique la définition de l'impérialisme qu'il a publiée quelques mois auparavant, il définit dans „l'Etat et la révolution“ l'impérialisme, comme l'époque du capital financier, époque des gigantesques monopoles capitalistes, époque où le capitalisme de monopole évolue en capitalisme de monopole d'Etat<sup>23</sup>.

Dans „La catastrophe imminente“ on rencontre cette phrase devenue célèbre aujourd'hui: „La dialectique de l'histoire veut précisément que la guerre, qui a extraordinairement accéléré la transformation du capitalisme monopoleur en capitalisme monopoleur d'Etat, ait *par là même* considérablement rapproché l'humanité du socialisme. . . Non pas seulement parce que ses horreurs engendrent l'insurrection prolétarienne — aucune insurrection ne créera le socialisme s'il n'est pas mûr économiquement, — mais encore parce que le capitalisme monopoleur d'Etat est la préparation *matérielle* la plus complète du socialisme, l'*antichambre* du socialisme, l'échelon historique qu'aucun *autre échelon intermédiaire* ne sépare de l'échelon appelé socialisme.“<sup>24</sup>

Lénine souligne, dans le contexte, le point de vue de „doctrinaires“ des menchéviks et des socialistes-révolutionnaires présentant le socialisme „comme un avenir lointain obscur“ sans voir qu'il apparaît „directement et *pratiquement* dans chaque disposition importante constituant un pas en avant sur la base du capitalisme moderne“, c'est-à-dire du C. M. E. (p. 151).

Toutefois, il marque aussi avec force, le maintien du capitalisme, le caractère capitaliste de cette phase. Dans „l'Etat et la révolution“, il insiste sur cette idée: „L'erreur la plus répandue est l'affirmation réformiste-bourgeoise prétendant que le capitalisme de monopole ou le capitalisme de monopole d'Etat *n'est déjà plus* du capitalisme, qu'il peut dès lors être qualifié de „socialisme d'Etat“, etc. (. . .) nous

<sup>22</sup> V. I. Lénine, Oeuvres choisies. II, Première partie, p. 119.

<sup>23</sup> Ibid., p. 218.

<sup>24</sup> Ibid., p. 150, 151.



restons en régime capitaliste, dans une nouvelle phase certes, mais indéniablement en régime capitaliste.<sup>25</sup>

A cette définition d'un „échelon historique“ nouveau de l'impérialisme, correspond un nouvel affinement de l'analyse des rapports de classe et de groupes sociaux.

Il s'agit tout d'abord de l'approfondissement de l'analyse de classe de l'Etat lui-même. Déjà, dans „La catastrophe...“, Lénine remarque à propos des monopoles d'Etat: „Or, qu'est-ce que l'Etat? C'est l'organisation de la classe dominante; en Allemagne, par exemple, celle des hobereaux et des capitalistes.“<sup>26</sup> L'ouvrage „l'Etat et la révolution“ consacré à l'analyse de l'Etat se réfère, à maintes reprises, au capitalisme monopoliste d'Etat. Il l'aurait certainement fait encore davantage, s'il n'était pas inachevé.

On rencontre aussi dans „La catastrophe...“ de nombreuses indications concernant la „bureaucratie“. Lénine ne se contente pas d'évoquer, à son propos, la règle de la „corruption“ des fonctionnaires de l'Etat aux Etats-Unis et en Allemagne, il précise: „Le contrôle sur les capitalistes est impossible s'il reste bureaucratique, la bureaucratie étant elle-même liée, enserrée à la bourgeoisie par mille liens.“<sup>27</sup>

Il propose d'opposer à la „réglementation bureaucratique réactionnaire“ de l'Etat capitaliste, la „réglementation démocratique révolutionnaire“, en faisant „appel à l'initiative des ouvriers et des employés“ et en l'organisant, en utilisant „le contrôle par les syndicats ouvriers“, par „les syndicats d'employés, de commis“, en supprimant „le secret commercial“ sur les revenus et les dépenses des capitalistes, à partir de la „nationalisation“ des „banques et des syndicats capitalistes“.<sup>28</sup>

Il évoque alors le rôle des „employés, ingénieurs, directeurs“. Il indique la possibilité de s'appuyer notamment sur les „employés pauvres“ pour empêcher les manœuvres des „directeurs et employés supérieurs qui perdraient leurs sinécures particulièrement lucratives“.<sup>29</sup> D'une façon générale, il insiste sur la nécessité de „développer l'initiative des ouvriers et des travailleurs en général“, de l'„association de la population, par branche d'activité, par objectif de travail“, du contrôle par „les classes opprimées“, dans l'intérêt du „peuple entier“.<sup>30</sup>

Lénine caractérise tous les courants politiques par rapport à la conciliation ou à la rupture systématique avec le grand capital, allant jusqu'au programme de nationalisation des monopoles.

Il évoque „la politique hésitante et irrésolue des socialistes-révolutionnaires et des menchéviques“ („politique qui est une vraie trahison“) qui „continuent“ à „préconiser l'entente avec les milieux industriels et commerciaux“ et à ménager le gouvernement de Kérenski qui n'est „en fait“ que „l'homme de paille“ des capitalistes (p. 143, 142). Il montre comment le gouvernement soi-disant socialiste de Kérenski „est obligé, pour ne pas se brouiller avec la bourgeoisie, pour ne pas rompre la „coalition“ avec elle, de pratiquer un contrôle bureaucratique réactionnaire“. Ainsi „il trompe à chaque pas le peuple“ (p. 145). Au contraire, les bolche-

<sup>25</sup> V. I. Lénine. Oeuvres choisies. II. Première partie. p. 253.

<sup>26</sup> Ibid., p. 148.

<sup>27</sup> Ibid., p. 144.

<sup>28</sup> Ibid., p. 122—125, 147.

<sup>29</sup> Ibid., p. 122, 118, 117.

<sup>30</sup> Ibid., p. 136, 132, 113, 118, 143.

viks, véritables représentants du prolétariat, „s'affirment. . . comme les représentants des intérêts du peuple entier“ (p. 143). De leur côté, les „socialistes-révolutionnaires de gauche inclinent à l'alliance avec le prolétariat et repoussent l'alliance (coalition) avec la bourgeoisie“ (p. 177).

En effet, „seule une rupture conséquente, absolue avec les capitalistes, en politique intérieure comme extérieure, peut sauver notre révolution et notre pays pris dans l'étau de l'impérialisme“. D'où le programme original proposé, évoquant une „étape vers le socialisme“<sup>31</sup>.

Lénine propose de „substituer à l'Etat des grands propriétaires fonciers et des capitalistes, l'Etat démocratique révolutionnaire“ (p. 149).

Il propose „la nationalisation des banques“ — sans laquelle „parler de la réglementation de la vie économique“. . . c'est faire preuve de l'ignorance la plus crasse, ou tromper le „bas peuple“ (p. 115).

Lénine souligne: „L'on ne saurait nationaliser les banques seules, sans prendre des mesures visant à établir le monopole de l'Etat sur les syndicats de commerce et d'industrie (monopole du sucre, du charbon, du fer, du pétrole, etc.), sans nationaliser lesdits syndicats.“<sup>32</sup>

Il indique enfin que ces „mesures“ sont des mesures „démocratiques“ prises dans „l'intérêt de la démocratie révolutionnaire“. Elles constituent „une étape vers le socialisme“ (p. 148—149).

„Ce n'est pas encore le socialisme, mais ce n'est déjà plus le capitalisme. C'est un pas immense vers le socialisme.“<sup>33</sup>

\*

De la présentation, même schématique, des trois moments de l'analyse léniniste de l'évolution du capitalisme, il résulte, à la fois, qu'il est légitime de parler des aspects sociologiques et que ces aspects ne constituent pas une partie à part de cette analyse. Celle-ci est en réalité, toute entière, caractérisée par une *dimension sociologique*. On n'a pas affaire simplement à une phase sociologique, permettant de passer de la théorie économique à la théorie politique. D'une façon plus complexe, c'est la dimension sociologique fondamentale de la théorie économique marxiste des rapports capitalistes de production (de circulation, de répartition et de consommation), de ses concepts mêmes, qui permet de faire le lien entre l'analyse économique et l'analyse politique et *vice-versa*, par l'intermédiaire d'une typologie de la société capitaliste en mouvement.

Sur la base de l'analyse économique peut donc se développer une typologie des moments d'évolution de la formation sociale totale historique (capitaliste) ainsi que des divers rapports concrets entre groupes et fractions de groupes sociaux, à la fois fonctionnels et évolutifs, qui structurent la formation en question.

A travers les péripéties phénoménales des luttes sociales, leurs figures idéologiques, leurs formes politiques, la théorie marxiste permet à Lénine d'utiliser les critères des rapports économiques afin de dégager les solutions de continuité relatives les formes sociales typiques nouvelles et le sens de leur mouvement, à la lumière de la pratique sociale.

<sup>31</sup> V. I. Lénine. Oeuvres choisies. II. Première partie, p. 155, 149.

<sup>32</sup> Ibid., p. 122.

<sup>33</sup> Ibid., p. 151.



L'application par Lénine à la réalité sociale concrète de son temps, de la théorie de Marx s'efforce d'utiliser (et de développer) les dimensions historiques et sociologiques de la théorie économique marxiste, ainsi que la liaison essentielle de cette théorie dialectique avec l'analyse des luttes politiques déterminées et des combats idéologiques correspondants. Cela lui permet de ne pas se contenter de répéter, en l'appauvrissant théoriquement et en l'illustrant de façon plus ou moins positive, l'analyse de Marx; ni d'abandonner ses acquis scientifiques, intimement liés à sa nature révolutionnaire. Il peut, au contraire, la développer avec audace, tout particulièrement dans ses aspects sociologiques. Il avance ainsi le concept de stade impérialiste du capitalisme, correspondant à plusieurs analyses de son temps faisant le bilan de toute une époque historique écoulée depuis la mort de Marx. Plus hardiment encore, il avance le concept de capitalisme monopoliste d'Etat, annonçant, au moment de sa naissance, toute une période à venir et toute une restructuration relative de la formation sociale capitaliste grosse de la révolution socialiste.

Dans l'esprit de Marx, c'est la théorie léniniste du capitalisme monopoliste d'Etat et notamment ses aspects sociologiques que les marxistes-léninistes s'efforcent de développer aujourd'hui. C'est le cas en France tout particulièrement, en liaison avec les luttes nouvelles de la classe ouvrière, des salariés, des travailleurs intellectuels, de la petite bourgeoisie des villes et des campagnes, pour la démocratie et pour le socialisme.

En France, nous nous efforçons d'appliquer et de développer à cette fin la théorie économique marxiste, plus précisément la théorie si féconde bien qu'encore largement méconnue, de la „suraccumulation“ du capital. Dans ce cadre pratique et théorique, l'idée nouvelle de „crise de structure du capitalisme monopoliste d'Etat“ vient d'être avancée, pour caractériser la période qui se serait ouverte vers 1967—1968, ainsi que les conditions du passage révolutionnaire de notre société capitaliste développée au socialisme et au communisme, à travers l'étape de „transition“ d'une „démocratie avancée“, économique et politique, antimonopoliste.

## LENIN'S POLITICAL SOCIOLOGY, WHAT IT IS AND WHAT IT IS NOT

PAUL CROSSER  
USA

It is to be noted that in the early political theories of the commercialized West the societal aspects of those theories can only be gathered by implication. A societal aspect can well be read into the political theories of such representative Western writers as Thomas Hobbes and John Locke. Hobbes is the spokesman for the big landowners, Locke speaks for the small landowners and tenant farmers. Yet, those societal factors are not openly expressed in the respective writings of those two theorists. On its face value, we are confronted with a formulation of an individualistic kind of behavior in those writings, which is not in any way directly related to specific societal factors. When Hobbes admonishes individuals to refrain from violating the rights of other individuals and when Locke repeats that admonition, we are left in the dark about the societal framework in which those individuals are placed. It can only be surmised, what the societal characteristics of those individuals are supposed to be, to whom Hobbes and Locke address themselves.

It is only in the writings of Marx, Engels and Lenin on political issues that one finds an explicit societal aspect referred to. The explicit societal aspect of the writings of Marx, Engels and Lenin is presented as a societal analysis in terms of classes. A class, in the formulations of Marx, Engels and Lenin, refers to a group which is brought about through societal relations shaped by the production process. Those class relations shaped by the technological factors of production are at the same time expressive of societal factors, in the formulations of Marx, Engels and Lenin. Those societal factors are in the main based on a group division characterized by the differentiation between propertied and non-propertied. This division, in its turn, is related to economic factors, which find expression in the appropriation of the means of production by one group. That appropriation predetermines the income division between the propertied and non-propertied. The relation between the propertied and non-propertied, which predetermines the relation between classes, forms also the determinant for the domination of one class over another. Class domination is made the preconditioning factor of exploitation. The dominating group, the proprietors of means of production, forces the dominated group, the people working in the industrial enterprises and the farms, to submit to an inequitable ratio between profits and wages.

Class relations as specified by Marx, Engels and Lenin are at variance with the kind of group differentiation as presented by representative Western empirical so-



ciologists. Income division, occupational division, a difference in the educational background and a difference in the prestige of the particular occupation are presented as criteria of group differentiation. What is missing in all the four above-stated criteria is the relation of the economic differentiation to the factor of production and in particular to the appropriation of the means of production by one group at the sufferance of other groups, in particular, at the sufferance of the group of industrial workers. Neither of the four criteria is predetermined by the appropriation of the means of production by one group at the sufferance of other groups. Neither of the above-stated four criteria of group differentiation, either taken singly or put together, could properly be characterized as constituting a basis for a class division.

Neither, for that matter, is the division of society into an upper class, middle class and lower class, which is based on the four above-cited criteria, in line with Marx's, Engels's and Lenin's approach to class division. The specification of the three levels of classes is in no way related to the appropriation of the means of production and thus avoids the identification of the very source of the accruing of income, to which Marx, Engels and Lenin refer. Moreover, in the division specified by the designation of upper class, middle class and lower class, a subjective factor of self-evaluation is made to enter to a substantial degree.

As an example of the subjectivization of the specification of the class character the following can be stated. In answer to questionnaires distributed to working people in the United States, all but a few of the questioned stated that they belonged to the middle class, though most of them barely made a living by American standards. That kind of subjective evaluation by individuals of their own class position, it can be countered, can be made subject to a refutation by a reference to some objective factors. Spending budgets and the specification of the purchased items by various ranges of income receivers could be made to check the reliability of the self-evaluation of the class position of the receivers of the questionnaires. Yet, even a correction, which came to be based on the stated objective factors, would not allow for the kind of class identification which Lenin, Marx and Engels require. The objective ranges allowed for a division into upper class, middle class and lower class would not be comprehensive enough without the inclusion of the objective factors of appropriation of means of production. It is that factor, it should be recalled, which counts as the paramount criterion in the division into classes as spelled out by Lenin, Marx and Engels.

Even more remote from the range of categorization of class division as specified by Lenin, Marx and Engels, is the entry of the conception of status as a *pendant* to class differentiation by some Western writers. First the American writer Thorstein Veblen at the beginning of the twentieth century and at the later date in the post World War II period the American writer Vance Packard had come to picture consumption items as symbols of status seekers. The indulging in the consumption of certain high-priced consumer goods has come to be associated with a differentiation in status. Those, who were willing and able to spend money, either their own, or borrowed money, on ostentatious consumer goods, were rated to be in the game of status seekers. Those in turn, who were unwilling or unable to spend money on what Veblen has called *conspicuous consumption*, meaning show off consumption, were rated as the outs in the contest for status. In dangleing a wide range



of consumer goods before his audience Vance Packard addressed himself to a much wider range of people than the range of people Veblen had been able to reach.

The so-called consumer society came to be pictured in the books of Vance Packard as a society in which more and more material means are used for the production and acquisition of practically useless goods. Waste of material and waste of money is being effected on an increasing scale in the irrational striving for keeping up with the Joneses. That keeping up with the Joneses refers to the producing and acquiring of things in order to impress one's neighbours. This kind of succumbing to the zest for status through the acquisition of a greater and greater number of consumer goods, many of them useless, have come to be rated by the contemporary American writer, David Riesman, as the most characteristic pattern of present-day American society and economy. The status seeking in the quest for keeping up with the Joneses can well be considered to constitute a veneer behind which the real class division remains hidden.

Neither is the class division, as brought out by Lenin, in any way related to the elite concept. The concept of elite, it should be realized, singles out one class for a specification without making any provisions for a specification of other classes. The elite concept as such, as brought out by such sociologists, as the Italian Pareto and the Spaniard Mosca, conceives of the elite as a kind of chosen people with superior qualities. Those chosen people which are called upon by Pareto and Mosca to bestow upon themselves privileges are by those very privileges to be prevented from dropping out from the elite.

Thus, Pareto and Mosca devised a scheme for the perpetuation of privileged groups, which by their very privileges are fenced off from any direct societal relationship with anybody not belonging to the elite group. It is to be understood that it is not made clear in the schemes of Pareto and Mosca that the privileged position of any elite group is predetermined by the underprivileged position of the non-elite group. There is to be hardly any doubt, however, that the perpetuation of that kind of division is to be regarded as constituting the aim of Pareto and Mosca.

The underprivileged are to be prevented from forming any group of their own and voicing any group demands by being degraded to the level of masses. That kind of specific degradation is undertaken by the Spaniard Ortega Y Gasset, who wants to horrify his readers by the prospect of a revolt of the masses. Those revolting masses are, in the expectation of Ortega Y Gasset, likely to destroy the civilization and culture which have been brought about and maintained by the privileged elite. This kind of mirage is the outgrowth of a distorted presentation of social stratification.

Lenin, on his part, proceeded to apply the supreme law of Dialectical Materialism to have class division transformed into classlessness. Such transformation as specified in Lenin's book, *The State and Revolution*, came to be conditioned by the degree of class consciousness. In Lenin's presentation the fact of class consciousness, as subjective factor, came to be coalesced with the objective factors of class domination and subjugation. The modus operandi of the transformation of the class division into classlessness is in Lenin's formulation the class struggle. The locus operandi is, in its turn, presented by Lenin as the aspect of state power.

The respective class relationship as it is reflected in the production process, as well as in the power relationship of the state, can, in Lenin's view, be overcome only by a dialectical turn of events. That dialectical turn is represented by Lenin as



the transformation of class division into classlessness. With the establishment of classlessness there would be no need to maintain state power. The state could consequently be made to wither away in sequence. That is the grand design. There are, however, quite a few not easily removed obstacles in the way of its realization.

In drawing upon Marx's and Engels's presentations, Lenin spelled out the pitfalls of the Revolution of 1848 and the failure of the French Commune in 1871. One could summarize the lessons Lenin wanted to be drawn from the 1848 and 1871 experience as the unripeness of objective historical conditions in the respective European countries and the low level of class consciousness of the subject classes at those particular periods of time. Lenin himself avoided those failures by leading the Russian social and political revolution of 1917 to a successful fruition.

Lenin, moreover, foresaw future dangers lurking were the first phase of the social revolution and its political counterpart to succeed. The abolition of class division, based on the ownership and non-ownership of the means of production, through the acquisition of national ownership of those means, did not by itself present a condition for the relinquishing of state power, according to Lenin. Lenin joined in the stated context the polemical battle which Marx and Engels had conducted against the anarchists. The anarchists can well be characterized as spontaneous revolutionists. None of the anarchistic writers and agitators, such as the Englishman Godwin, the American Thoreau and the Russians Bakunin and Kropotkin furnished any historically relevant analysis of the conditions which were to prevail, if and when state power is to be made to vanish.

The word vanish is very appropriate in assessing the anarchist's position, because it can well be linked to a waving of the magic wand. The anarchists did their very best in spelling out the evils of state power in terms of a coercion of individuals. They did very little, however, in terms of presenting specific historically relevant conditions under which those evils could be made to cease. The state appears in the writing of one of the major ideologists of anarchism, the German Rudolph Stirner, as a kind of falling from the grace by individual sinners. How the state of grace is to be gained and how the sinners are to be transformed into virtuous men is not specified in Stirner's book nor for that matter in any other books of the anarchists.

Were Lenin to be alive today, he would have had to renew his polemical battle against the anarchists by deflating the pretensions of present-day anarchists. The anarchist movement, which had remained dormant since the end of World War I, has shown signs of revival in the last few years of the 1960-1970 decade. Some student groups in Western commercialized countries on both sides of the Atlantic have unfurled the black colored banners of anarchism in their demands for educational reforms. Those demands are, in turn, coupled with demands for a social revolution in some countries, such as France, West Germany and the United States. The riots resulting from the pressing of those demands on the part of the students have resulted in the creation of a pseudo-revolutionary situation.

Such a pseudo-revolutionary situation cannot, in the long run, in its turn, fail to bring about a sustained political reaction. Bendit Cohn in France, Dutschke in Western Germany and Mark Rudd in the United States were some of the most influential leaders in student riots in those respective countries who displayed strong anarchistic leanings. Self-generated spontaneity, not a study of a given historical situation in any given country, came to ignite the sparks of the disorders on various



university campuses in the commercialized Western world. Voluntaristically projected sparks led to riots.

It is exactly no more riots which can be expected to take place, if and when a pseudo-revolutionary situation is brought about. Such was the case in the riots caused by anarchists in Marx's and Engels's time as it is in our time. A revolution can never take place, if a historically given and properly assessed revolutionary situation does not prevail. That bitter lesson had to be learned by the leaders of anarchism in Marx's and Engels' time as it has to be relearned in our time.

The disorientation and confusion of the anarchist inspired student riots in Western commercialized countries in our time has been much furthered by a misprojected analysis of contemporary social forces by such writers as Herbert Marcuse. Marcuse, an American by adoption, became the idol of the anarchistically inclined students and their leaders in all the Western commercialized countries where student riots had occurred in the last few years. Marcuse's ideas, though not by themselves anarchistic, give support to anarchistic tendencies in the student movement. That support is based on the attempt of Marcuse to deny any revolutionary potential to the working class and the basing of his revolutionary expectations on the radicalized middle class intelligentsia and their student offsprings.

Marcuse's book *One Dimensional Man*, which constitutes a misconstrued analysis of the social, economic and political implications of technological progress, were it to be taken on its face value, could but result in the mood of despair. That mood of despair comes to be explained by the impact of Marcuse's thesis presented in his above-mentioned book. He damns the alleged effects of technological progress, no matter where such progress takes place, whether it is the case in Western commercialized countries or in Eastern socialist countries.

To put it differently, technological progress comes to rate in Marcuse's presentation as a movement leading the peoples in industrialized countries toward a dead end. That dead end is spelled out by Marcuse as alienation. That kind of alienation is to be visited in particular on the intellectuals and their student offspring in all industrialized countries, no matter what social structure the particular industrialized country is to have. Were that kind of expectation of alienation to be realized, the intellectuals and their offspring were to find themselves in isolation from other social groups in all industrialized countries in the expectation of Marcuse.

That kind of development, spurred by the self-isolation of intellectuals and their student offspring, fitted in beautifully with the mood of despair which came to prevail on the campuses of the universities in the commercialized Western world. The despondency over a dead-end situation came to be broken by a pseudo-revolutionary activity. The illusion a revolutionary action did no more, however, than deaden the sense of self-alienation of intellectuals and their student offspring in Western commercialized countries.

Lenin, on his part, when he was alive, had not only to hold off the assaults of the anarchists on the state power with which he had endowed the first socialist state in the world. Lenin had also to hold off the assaults of some of his fellow Marxists, who were not satisfied with the pace of progress which the society and economy of the newly established socialist state was able to make. Lenin defended the need for maneuvering on the part of the state power of the new socialist state.

Lenin specifically insisted on tolerating a degree of private accumulation of wealth, to save Russia from famine. Ruined by four years of World War I and se-



veral years of Civil War, the economy of the country needed a respite. It was this respite, which the so-called New Economic Policy, abbreviated called NEP, was to provide. Lenin also agreed to offer concessions to private investors from foreign lands in order to fill gaps in the first phases of social and economic reconstruction. He branded all attempts to hasten the pace of the establishment of a socialist society and economy, regardless of prevailing social and economic conditions, as infantile.

The ultimate aim of dismantling the socialist state Lenin envisioned only in the wake of the disestablishment of class division in all countries, or at least in most countries of the world. Until that time state power in the newly established socialist state was to be used to make counter-revolutionary attempts to overthrow the new regime doomed to failure. The state power of the new socialist state was, in addition, to ward off and counter any assaults on that state by foreign powers.

In regard to the retention of state power, Lenin's reference to bureaucracy and the army are to be taken account of. Lenin insisted on the dismantling of the Tsarist bureaucracy and the Tsarist army, which he viewed as holdovers of the pre-socialist regime. He was adamant, on the other hand, on the need for establishment of a new government apparatus and new armed forces, for them to serve the newly-established socialist state. He clearly recognized the need to establish a government machinery to make the newly-formed socialist state operative. It is this endeavor to establish a new type of government apparatus from the scratch, which served as a safeguard against any counter-revolutionary attempts. A counter-revolutionary attempt, in terms of a place revolution came to be made impossible in the new socialist state, because the bureaucracy and the army of the old regime had come to be disestablished. Hence, the attainments of the socialist revolution were given a chance to be perpetuated.

As to the representation of the public at large in the exercise of government functions, the socialist state gave the people the opportunity to send their elected representations into so-called soviets, which in the Russian language means councils. Soviets were established on all levels of the government, from the village level to the national level. The competition between individuals for a public office, which prevails under the condition of class division, was not made the sole basis for attaining and holding an office in the various levels of the soviets. The realization that any public official in the socialist state represents interests of collective ownership of means of production, made the seeker and holder of public office more of a trustee of state property, instead of being a competitor for representing private interests. In that sense the word political democracy, in a setup of private ownership and in a setup of public ownership, does not have the same meaning.

It is of interest to notice that the political theorists of the early period of commercialization in the West, Hobbes and Locke, postulated individual interests as the precondition of political activity and political representation. Moreover, aspects of economic and social life were for the most part divorced from political activity in the respective analyses of those two just named writers. What political activity amounted to in the heyday of the commercialization of the economy and society in the West was but committed to the sphere of what generally goes in the West by the name of civil liberties.

To put it differently, one can say that politics, according to the above-cited theories and practices, concern themselves with the means of exercising political power at the price of the neglect of the ends to be attained by that power. That



divorce of means from ends is not present in what can be termed as Soviet politics. The delegates of the peoples of the Soviet Union to the soviets on the various levels use the political authority granted to them as a means to serve the ends of the public domain.

The administrators on all levels in the Soviet Union, including those of the highest national level, are made to serve at the pleasure of the soviets on each respective echelon. The naming of Lenin's recommendation of the administrators on the highest national level as peoples' commissars was effected in order to emphasize the temporary recall character of any administrative official in the country. The name and the practice were instituted as an imitation of the stated device by the Paris Commune of 1871. Even the renaming of the peoples' commissars ministers, in the course of World War II, did not change the character of the accountability of those high administrative officials to the Supreme Soviet. Likewise, the judges of all ranges serve at the pleasure of the soviets on all levels. They, too, are subject to recall by direction of the respective soviets.

Montesquieu's theory of the balance of power between the legislative, the administrative and judicial branches of the government is in need of revision, when applied to the state apparatus of the USSR. Montesquieu, in providing a theory and practice of government operations for the commercialized states of the West, offered but a formalistic presentation of the functioning of the three branches of government. In Soviet social and political theory and practice such a formal division is not necessary and is not granted.

Instead, we are in the Soviet Leninist position confronted with an integrated view on the function of the government. The peoples' representatives, as trustees of the national economy and its collective ownership, are imbued, in Leninist theory and practice, not only with the right to legislate but also to oversee the administration of Soviet law.

Montesquieu's theory of the revision of the branches of government, it should be remembered, was aimed at curbing the political power of absolute monarchs. In Soviet social and political theory and practice, the absolute monarch had been replaced by the sovereign people. The sovereign people who are represented by their delegates in the soviets do not have to part with their sovereignty in favor of either administrative officials or of the members of the judiciary.

In the above-stated connection, it should be stressed that the USSR is not a mono-national state but a multiple peoples state. There are many different peoples in the USSR who have a claim to be represented in the Supreme Soviet. The different peoples called ethnic groups or nationalities are, in turn, provided with legal means which enable them to develop their own culture in their own language in their respective territory. They are accorded the legal right to have schools, courts, entertainment and publications in their native tongue. This is a far cry from the assimilationist policy applied towards non-Russian nationalities or ethnic groups, which had been in force during the entire Tsarist period of Russian history.

The maxim, on the basis of which the nationality policy is conducted in the Soviet Union, is characterized by the devise national in form and socialist in content. National in form refers to the legal authorization for the use of the native language in all cultural pursuits in any given nationality. Socialist in content, means, in turn, that all the nationalities within the borders of the Soviet Union are required to conform to the policy of public ownership and public operation of indu-



strial and agricultural production units. In the above-stated sense, one can draw the conclusion, that the component nationalities of the USSR are granted autonomy, they are not granted political independence. The sovereignty of the whole country is vested in all the peoples populating the Soviet Union put together and not in any particular people as a separate entity.

As far as the preservation of the societal basis of the peoples of the Union of the Soviet Socialist Republics is concerned, there appears to be a need for an ideological direction. That need for direction is provided by the Communist Party of the Soviet Union and its constituent multi-national parts. The Communist Party of the Soviet Union cannot be considered as one of the kind of parties which are known in Western commercialized states. The parties in the commercialized Western states are first of all parties which represent antagonistic group interests in those countries. That basic group conflict is removed in the Soviet Union by the abolishment of the division between the propertied and unpropertied. With a basis of a class struggle eliminated, there is no need to form several parties in response to different group interests. It is in that context that the one party system, prevailing in the Soviet Union, is to be viewed as finding its realization.

An example to what low level degradation an analysis of party activity could fall is given by the writings of the Italian by adoption Robert Michels. Michels brought down the analysis of any party activity and in particular of the activity of radical party leaders to the level of self-seekers of power. In leaving out not only the ideological aspect of a party policy but also the objective interests of parties, Michels arrived at the formulation of the party activity imbedded in a subjectivistic quagmire.

Any meaningful party activity, even a party activity conducted in the commercialized West, has to have an ideological perspective and has to be geared to particular group interests. Short of that, any party activity can be rated just as a kind of emotional release for pushy individuals. It is exactly that kind of approach to party activity which reels from the writings of Robert Michels. It is also present in the writings of the German Adorno. What Adorno calls the authoritarian personality is based on a crude behaviorist assessment of human action. It is the kind of action which can be attributed to a human, who does not act above the level of the conditional reflex of the dogs, which have been used for experimental purposes by the famed Russian physiologist Ivan Pavlov.

In adopting Michels' and Adorno's approach Hannah Arendt, an American by adoption, has attempted to place the political activity of Communists and Fascists under a common denominator. The authoritarian personality as misconceived by Adorno and the ultra subjectivism as misprojected by Michels, stand guard over the tour de force performed by Arendt. Within the folds of the artificiality and perversion to which she had committed herself, Hannah Arendt is unable to account for any distinction between communists as harbingers of societal progress and fascists as harbingers of social regression, repression and plain murder.

Hannah Arendt's ill-conceived performance is indicative of the degradation to which political sociology has come to descend in the commercialized West. That kind of stultified analysis to which Hannah Arendt had succumbed can well be regarded as being indicative of the kind of political practice which has come to prevail in the West. Much of the political activity conducted in the commercialized West, has to be conducted under a disguise. The politicians have to use ruses in order to

make the voters cast their votes for them. Political sociology in the West is, in turn, called upon to cover up ruses by putting up smoke screen.

At best political sociology in the commercialized West is limiting itself to emptying and misconstruing the societal aspect of political activity. That also fits into the kind of political activity which is conducted in the commercialized West, namely the manipulated kind of activity. It is difficult, if not impossible, to form a theory of manipulation, because manipulation as such depends upon improvisation which defies any theoretical comprehension.

It is that kind of futile theoretical endeavor which is presented in the writings of a representative contemporary political sociologist in the United States Martin Lipset. Martin Lipset along with the U. S. sociologist Daniel Bell are well-known for their effort to de-ideologize social thought. It is in the process of the attempted de-ideologization of any social thought that Lipset and Bell fall into the trap of having landed in a pile of empty conceptual shells. In engaging in a series of destructive conceptual games Lipset and Bell end up by endorsing political manipulation for the sake of political manipulation.

As far as the destructive aspect of societal formulations of the Lipsets and Bells are concerned they can be put into three phases. One phase can be identified as the phase of atomization, the other can be characterized as the promoting of a deliberate artificiality in the delineation of the structure of groups, the third phase presents itself as the form of misconceived relations between misconceived groups. These three phases of misleading societal analysis continue to be interwoven in the writings of representative political sociologists of the commercialized West for which Lipset as well as Bell are but some of the spokesmen. As against those misconceived and misconstrued formulations prevailing in the West, Marxist's political sociology, as the one inaugurated by Lenin has, aside from its ideological impact, the advantage of clarity in its presentation. That clarity is well in accord with the rules of conceptualization as they have been set forth by René Descartes, the founder of post-medieval secular philosophy.



## LENIN'S THEORY OF PERSONALITY

HOWARD L. PARSONS

USA

Lenin's theory of personality must be understood within the context of his theory of society and history. Following Marx, he saw individual personality as shaped and directed by the physical, biological and social conditions of his body and his environment, all interacting in determinate ways. Individuality exists; it is evident to everyday observation. But we must not be misled by taking it as an ultimate fact. The ultimate facts are the facts of spatio-temporal, material nature and, in man's case, the facts of his socio life and social production. These material things and events, however, are not given, fixed and static. They are in continuous motion, interaction, change and transformation. Lenin's viewpoint of nature, society and personality is the viewpoint of dialectical materialism. This viewpoint is not a still picture. It is a dialectical method which *engages* the knower through *practice* in *social struggle* with the world of nature and with classes that stand over against him. Lenin's theory of personality was a reflection of his revolutionary social practice on the side of the working class and peasants against the ruling class of old Russia.

Such struggle is an inescapable feature of all persons living in class society. This struggle is a particular expression of the generic feature of every person to struggle in a creative way with his environment. A principle of unrest, of negativity, characterizes man as it characterizes all things.

In the case of man this unrest appears in the forms of specific needs and in the drive of man to move toward other persons and toward the non-human environment to explore that outer world interactively and to fulfil those needs. This is an arbitrary, spontaneous, necessary self-movement driving the individual toward his world.

The unrest in man takes the form of "the purposive activity of man"<sup>1</sup>, or valuation toward a more or less imagined, conscious outcome. This factor is not philosophically stressed by Lenin, but it is presupposed throughout.

In his drive to live and to overcome the negativities within his body, the individual comes up against conditions which resist his action, which interlock and unite with that action and which negate and affirm it. He discovers a scarcity of food, of clothes and of housing; other men who command and buy his labor power; and conditions of war, poverty and the exploitation of one class of men by

<sup>1</sup> V. I. Lenin. Coll. Works, v. 38, Moscow, 1963-1969, p. 188.

another class. These conditions of the other, however, are not a pure or "empty" negation of man.<sup>2</sup> As objective, material conditions that exert their own power upon their own environments, they impinge upon man as material forces and in the form of sense data. They are mediated to man in the patterned reflections in his brain.

Things and persons do not exist "in themselves", self-contained and autonomous, as in the models of bourgeois thought from G. Leibniz to R. Nixon. Their very being is determination by others and their movement toward and against others, as, reciprocally, others move toward and against them. Thus, everything is interconnected, in transition, in process of being united and differentiated. Everything is mediated.

The world other than the individual man is mediated to him through his sense organs and his brain. Materially removed and uncognized by man, the world of the Other is indeterminate for him (though determined for its affected environment). The moment that world affects man and is mediated to him, then it determines him: it opposed him, but it also unites with him. Man acts toward it with a specific purpose, and it accordingly is mediated to man through man's senses and the patterning of sense data in man's brain. The negation of man by the Other is thus not a vacuous negation but is a negation that is in part determined by what man brings initially to it. The negation contains and preserves man's determination in some sense and reacts to man not only as opposite but also in unity. Cognition brings man into a unitary relation with the Other. Sense data and their patterns signify the qualities and relations, the character, of the external, objective world. "*Mechanical and chemical technique* serves human ends just because its character (essence) consists in its being determined by external conditions (the laws of nature)."<sup>3</sup>

"Our sensation, our consciousness is only *an image* of the external world"<sup>4</sup> that is prior to and independent of our perception. And sensation provides the link between man and the external world; sensation is "the transformation of the energy of external excitation into a state of consciousness."<sup>5</sup> Such transformation goes on repeatedly among us. At the same time this recapitulation of the external material in the brain in the form of sense data, images, forms and relations is not merely passive reflection. Man's consciousness is active; it is in part a function of his purposiveness. Purposiveness is the drive of man transformed by the impact of events upon the organism, imparting to it sensations and patterns (ideas) of events. But the brain in turn transforms these transformations. Under the influence of need and vague purpose, it selects, emphasizes and organizes the data induced in it. It creates hypotheses and imaginatively projects their consequences. This creation and projection is a function of purpose. ("Man's consciousness not only reflects the objective world, but creates it.")<sup>6</sup> But purpose in turn is a function of the dialectics of the human body with its total operative environment. Lenin has a theory of man's creativity, but that creativity is always determined.

<sup>2</sup> V. I. Lenin. Coll. Works, v. 38, Moscow, 1963-1969, p. 226.

<sup>3</sup> Ibid., p. 188.

<sup>4</sup> Ibid., v. 14, p. 69.

<sup>5</sup> Ibid., p. 51.

<sup>6</sup> Ibid. p. 212.



Bourgeois theorists puzzle as to how Marxists can reconcile freedom and creativity with determinism. They presuppose a sharp dualism of freedom and determinism. But this dualism is a reflection of the antagonism between the individual worker, loosed from feudal ties and protection and "free" in the market and the coercions of the capitalistic economy and state. (The alternative is the pessimism of mechanical materialism.) Similarly, ancient thought could extricate the individual from the coercions of slavery and empire (symbolized as the will of the gods, or blind fate) only by presupposing a dualistically separated "free" soul which has its reward in the after-world. The Marxist theoretical reconciliation of freedom and determinism is a guide to present action for overcoming the antagonism between the capitalist, "free" in his wealth, power and status, but determined by the economy and the worker, whose "freedom" to achieve the freedom of the capitalist is a sham both as a human value and a practical possibility within the determinations of monopoly capitalism. Marxist theory is an anticipation of a society when all men will purposively determine their own genuinely *human* freedom (creative self-fulfilment) in association with the self-determining freedom of all other men on the planet.

For Lenin consciousness — as sensing and thinking — is only an intermediate phase in the dialectic of man with the world.

Unless to Thought is added Will,

Apollo is an imbecile.

Man must fulfil his unrest, he must unite himself with an antagonistic world and overcome it, he must feed and clothe himself, he must negate poverty and war, the great negations of his species. The logic of man's life is to test his consciousness through practice.<sup>7</sup> Practice is the criterion of the objectivity of man's thought. Only then does the object emerge from its hidden and meaningless "in-itself" character and become "for-others". Only then does the notion become "for-itself", relevant to a man's and a class' purposes.

Thus, for Lenin as for Marx man is a practical-critical being. He is also social; he is a member of a ruling class or a ruled class; he is engaged in a struggle to survive, and this struggle is concurrent with the class struggle going on throughout the world. Class struggle is an ultimate fact of all history thus far. Personality, creativity and morality are all shaped by it. Insofar as a man may choose sides in this struggle, the right side to choose is that of the proletariat. "Our morality," wrote Lenin, "stems from the interests of the class struggle of the proletariat."<sup>8</sup> The reason for that choice is the drive of men to live and to fulfil themselves not of the few, who own and exploit, but of the great mass of men who struggle against exploitation. That is a decision against the "accursed" maxim: "Every man for himself and the devil take the hindmost" and for the rule: "All for each and each for all."

For Lenin all men *can be* moral, altruistic and creative in the highest human sense. But the fact is that they are not because of dehumanizing class systems. Hence the problem is to create a classless society. *Then* personalities can set about to become genuinely *human* beings. Bourgeois analysts put the problem the other way round. Conservatives claim that only the members of an elite are creative and that the

<sup>7</sup> V. I. Lenin. Coll. Works, v. 38, Moscow, 1963-1963, p. 202.

<sup>8</sup> *Ibid.*, v. 31, p. 291.



mass of men do not matter, hence exploitive systems must be maintained and extended. Liberals claim that all men are potentially creative; hence bourgeois government (excluding the workers) must dispense "welfare" and so help men to realize their potential. Both views proceed from an identification with the interest of the class struggle. Both views posit a fixed "human nature" independent of the class struggle. They thus blunt profound, revolutionary, truly human change.

For Lenin the class struggle is a necessary, essential part of man making his humanity. Men can collectively change and create their own history. The first step in this self-creation is the overthrow of the class system. After that men can then seriously begin to transform the old "human nature". This transformation cannot occur where men are exploited under a class system — even where half of the population of the class society, as in the United States, has a high standard of living. This "middle class" — an euphemism for a class of white-collar and blue-collar workers ambivalent about their role in the class struggle — is testimony to that. Here the high incidence of crime, delinquency, personality disorders, boredom, pleasure-seeking, drugs and unhappiness show that the misery of feudal man and ancient enslaved man has not been overcome; it has only taken on a new form.

The critical difference is that Lenin stressed social struggle; the conservatives and liberals want to suppress, control and balance the drive and struggle of the masses of men for creative, humanizing, social change. Lenin was a realist. "People always have been the foolish victims of deception and self-deception in politics," he wrote, "and they always will be until they have learnt to seek out the *interests* of some class or other behind all moral, religious, political and social phrases, declarations and promises."<sup>9</sup> Interest is a specific form of man's drive to live. It is shaped and directed by one's material and social situation. Personal interests arise within and are determined by social classes. All interests are interests of persons; thus a "class interest" is the summated interests of persons in a given class — the defense of that class. The problem of revolutionizing practice, of class struggle on the part of the exploited class, is to bring into consciousness the real, *human* interests of the workers, to become consciously aware of class antagonism and class struggle, to develop a theory of revolutionary change and to organize their power. For "the *only effective* force that compels change is popular revolutionary energy". This energy must be materially organized, disciplined and directed by a revolutionary ideology.

Lenin was a man of practice and his theory reflected that emphasis on practice. Practice comes from interest and it feeds, develops and channels interest into habit. Lenin despised all that is impractical-abstract theory, phrase-mongering, sectarianism, opportunism, bureaucracy, inefficiency — not because he was a "pragmatist" but because practice is the way of testing the value of ideas in man's realization of his life. The impractical is the anti-human. Speaking of the cooperatives, he called for the participation of large masses, material support of the cooperatives, and "as little philosophising and as few acrobatics as possible".<sup>10</sup>

As a man of unbounded interest and enthusiasm himself, he realized the importance of these elements in the lives of people and especially in revolutionary social change. To say that such change must be mass-based meant that it must be

V. I. Lenin. Coll. Works, v. 19, Moscow, 1963-1969, p. 28.

<sup>10</sup> Ibid., v. 33, p. 470.



based in what is deepest in people — their drive to live, their love of life and their enthusiasm for it. But this drive and enthusiasm must be sustained and rendered effective. That requires social organization. It requires “Personal interest, personal incentive”, and at one stage “business principles”.<sup>11</sup>

Lenin believed that persons can and will free themselves from exploitive conditions and create a human social order. “Life will assert itself.” This belief was confirmed by the success of the Bolshevik revolution and the building of socialism. But he did not believe that any theory or any man was absolutely infallible. Marx’s theory is not “completed and inviolable”; it is a general guide and must be applied differently to different situation. To live and fulfil themselves, persons are compelled to plan both their private and social lives. But plans must be tried out in practice. Men must observe and reflect on their practice, correct and analyse the significance of their mistakes, and feed their corrections back into their plans and theories. This dialectical unity of theory and practice is the only path of progress. Lenin did not hesitate to acknowledge the mistakes of the workers. He pointed out that after centuries of poverty, savagery and ignorance workers and peasants cannot be expected to create socialism flawlessly. And he spoke of the thousands of “great and heroic deeds” done by the toiling masses. “*For the first time* not the minority, not the rich alone, not the educated alone, but the real people, the vast majority of the working people, *themselves* building a new life, are *by their own experience* solving the most difficult problems of socialist organization.”<sup>12</sup> Here Lenin could point with pride to the living actions of masses which corresponded to his theory of personality and history.

Almost all professional theorists of human personality in the United States do not share Lenin’s optimism about human personality and his militant belief in the efficacy of social action and the possibility of radical political change toward a human order of society for all. Their theories constitute a large variety of types: eclectic equilibrium theories (S. Lipset, T. Parsons), neo-Freudian theories (E. Erickson), behaviorism (B. Skinner), descriptive functionalism (R. Merton), psycho-social theories (E. Fromm), field theories (K. Lewin), interpersonal theories (R. Bales), existentialism (R. May), self-actualization theories (G. Allport, A. Maslow), etc. These theories reduce to two general types: mechanistic, positivistic theories which by “naturalizing” personality dehumanize it and remove its valuation, purposiveness, drive toward unity and creativity; and “humanistic” theories which stress the phenomenologically felt qualities and act of personality but do not undertake to study the laws of mass conflict and progressively directed social change. The latter (humanistic) theories tend to be either individualistic or “other-directed”, depicting man as isolated in individual freedom or as absorbed into the local or national group. Neither set of theories faces the broad social conflicts and the class struggle.

Such theories of personality reflect the pluralism and fragmentation of American society. Their attention to surface rather than to depth, to individual behavior or experience rather than to social dynamics, to immediate appearance rather than to underlying processes, to existing structure of personality, role and institution rather than to insurgent social transformation, to static details rather than

<sup>11</sup> V. I. Lenin, Coll. Works, v. 38, Moskow, 1963-1969, p. 58.

<sup>12</sup> Ibid., v. 28, p. 72.



to dissolving and developing patterns, to passive responsiveness and dependency on environment rather than to active and creative change, to individuality and other-directedness rather than to interactive and reconstructive relations of persons with other persons and with their world, to isolated "facts" rather than to facts as means to man's values — such is a symptom that the theorists themselves have been determined and captured by the objects of their study, and that the educators themselves need to be educated.

The theorists have accommodated themselves to the values and demands of the ruling groups of a capitalist society. Not until 1940 did the *American Journal of Sociology* publish an article on the Nazi Party. An index of the Journal from 1895 to 1947 showed three listings under Marx or Marxism and no listings under Lenin or Leninism. Yet American theorists of personality put forward their theories as if they were universally true, unaware that their descriptions of mechanical men eviscerated of power and purpose, of lonely individuals, and of other-directed, organization men are descriptions of crippled and sick personalities. Healthy theory develops when the theorist puts himself in touch with healthy actions, and revolutionary theory emerges when the theorist puts himself on the side of revolutionary forces among men.

Lenin was such a theorist. He observed and joined the struggle of Russian workers and peasants against the conditions of their oppression. His theory of personality was not contemplative, passive and pessimistic. It was practical, active and optimistic. That was not existentialism, creating a world out of the vacuum of its despair. It was a dialectical practice which endeavoured to draw forth from the masses of men the objective, collective, creative power within them in an objective situation demanding struggle, and in which practice and theory developed one another. Under the oppression of capitalism, to say and theorize that man is mechanical, lonely or dominated by society is to find confirmation in society as it is; such theory leaves things just as they are, and it is rewarded by the powers that be. But if one says and theorizes that the oppression must be, can be and will be transformed by the struggle of the masses, then the theory necessarily becomes an instrument of social practice. It is a hypothesis to be proved. And no one can prove it except men from the masses. That is what Lenin meant when before the Revolution he called for mass struggle and when after it he wrote:

"The local Soviets, depending on time and place, can amend, enlarge and add to the basic provisions worked out by the government. Creative activity at the grass roots is the basic factor of the new public life. . . Socialism cannot be decreed from above. Its spirit rejects the mechanical, bureaucratic approach; living creative socialism is the product of the masses themselves."<sup>13</sup>

<sup>13</sup> V. I. Lenin, *Coll. Works*, v. 26, Moskow, 1963-1969, pp. 287-288.



## LENIN, SCIENCE AND REVOLUTION

HERBERT APTHEKER

USA

The application of reason towards the comprehension of nature and of society, and the testing of that application through experiment and practice are essential to science. But these together are not yet science; fundamental to it and part of its definition is the purpose towards which the reason is applied and the testing conducted. That purpose must be the ennoblement of Man.

Science is *essentially* humanistic; in its qualities: truthfulness, objectivity, assiduousness, curiosity; and in its purpose: to improve the human condition. From this follows the fundamental challenge of Marxism: hitherto philosophers have sought only to comprehend the world, but the point is to change it.

Involved in this is the Marxian insistence that mere contemplation, being passive and non-participating, *cannot* be fully comprehending. Involved also is the absolute necessity for practice to ascertain truth; the indispensable unity between theory and practice — the first without the second being abstract and unproven; the second without the first being directionless, disconnected, haphazard and therefore ineffective.

Involved in this also is the Marx's idea that he who understands the world will therefore want to change it; and more: that a demonstration of the understanding is the existence of the effort to change this world. And the test of the understanding is the capacity to change.

Present here also is the idea that hitherto philosophy has been in the service of the Powers-that-be; for this reason, too, it has hitherto been merely contemplative, passive. Before philosophy has become the working class philosophy, its role has been at best mere critical. When the progressive mission of the class holding it decreased, it began to play an apologetic role. In this sense, prior to the appearance of the modern working class — which is the recipient of the exploitation and at the same time that class whose position in itself generalizes the oppression of all humanity and is therefore that class whose liberation means the elimination of such oppression — there could not appear that which R. Palme Dutt has aptly called "the essential character of Marxism" — namely, "a single scientific world outlook on the whole of nature, life and activity".<sup>1</sup>

Until that class appeared — and matured to the point where its power to qualitatively transform society could be comprehended — one could have dreams

<sup>1</sup> R. Palme Dutt. *Life and Teachings of Lenin*. N. Y., 1934, International, p. 8.

of equality, communalism, abundance, peace, fraternity, universal cultural development, whether from Campanella, More, Fourier or Owen, but dreams they remained. But with the appearance of that class there then could grow the outlook associated forever with the name of its greatest creator and protagonist, Marx.

\*

Ascending social classes tend to cherish reason and to advance scientific endeavour. Thus, the Age of Reason challenges the Age of Faith because it is the age of the appearance and rise of capitalism and its increasingly successful challenge to feudalism. Nevertheless at its greatest and noblest, this Age of Reason is inhibited by its historic limitations and so its science is partial. At its best, the Age of Reason is simultaneously an Age of fierce exploitation, savage colonialism, chattel slavery, the subjection of women, of the assumptions of elitism and the poisons of racism.

When capitalism moves into its final stage, imperialism, it is characterized, as Lenin emphasized, by its monopolistic nature, its parasitism and its moribund quality. Hence, quoting Lenin: "Political reaction *all along the line* is the attribute of imperialism." It is a system which, quite literally and again using Lenin's words, is "rotting alive."<sup>2</sup> Politically, the culmination of such reaction is fascism; ideologically, the rotting process reflects itself in the explicit repudiation of reason and the eclipse of science.

Both tendencies are far advanced in the United States. Astute specialists in various areas, with a remaining pride in craft and some scientific commitment, have lamented what the anthropologist, Stanley S. Diamond called "a generation of nihilistic ruminations" which emphasized "the irrelevance of . . . 'values'" and resulted in amoral idiocy. The economist, Kenneth E. Boulding, urging that economics must be viewed "as a moral science" denounced the widely-insisted upon idea in the United States "that science should be *wertfrei*" (free of value-judgment). Professor Kingsley Widmer, of San Diego State College, cries out that the result of this emphasis has been "the professor who no longer professes anything but a supposedly neutral methodology and submissive ideology for technicians."<sup>3</sup>

Prof. L. Charles Birch, who teaches biology in Australia, sums up<sup>4</sup> what is admittedly a widely observed phenomenon: ". . . among Western youth there seems to be a widespread and growing sense of the meaninglessness, even absurdity of life." Obviously youth above all would rebel and is rebelling against so sinister and empty a vista and future.

A characteristic response to the crisis from establishment figures is a kind of grisly humor spiced with the "long view" which, in effect urges that things be left alone. Thus, Dr. Don Price, a former President of the American Association for the Advancement of Science and now Dean at the Kennedy School of Government at Harvard, remarks that, "The dilemma is ages old — the dilemma between truth and power, or rather, between starving in the pursuit of truth and comprom-

<sup>2</sup> V. I. Lenin, *Imperialism and the Split in the Socialist Movement* (1916), in *Collected Works* (N. Y., 1930, International), XIX, 337-38 (italics in original).

<sup>3</sup> Diamond in *Science*, March 8, 1968, Boulding, in *American Economic Review*, March 1969; Widmer in *Nation*; April 28, 1969.

<sup>4</sup> Birch in *Christianity & Crisis*, December 25, 1967.



ising truth to gain material support."<sup>5</sup> With the material support vouchsafed Harvard it is clear as to the choice hitherto made by Mr. Price! Historically there has not been this "dilemma"; rather there has been power on one side and oppression on the other and normally the oppressed have not been well-fed. Increasingly, however, and especially since the Revolution successfully led by Lenin, chronic and general crisis has beset the oppressors which has significantly cut their power while, at the same time, the power of the hitherto dominated has grown enormously.

This change reflects the new quality in the world and that qualitative shift was heralded with the Bolshevik Revolution, the logical result of the science of Marxism-Leninism. The mastery of nature, the development of technique and the science of society have now reached the point where no one need starve any longer; nor need anyone be in want at all. That all three should occur in the same epoch reflects their causal interconnection.

Speaking in New York City, C. P. Snow years ago urged "the moral un-neutrality of science" and said: "For scientists know, and again with the certainty of scientific knowledge, that we possess every scientific fact we need to transform the physical life of half the world. And transform it within the span of people now living. I mean, we have all the resources to help half the world live as long as we do and eat enough. All that is missing is the will."<sup>6</sup>

Even in the age of Auschwitz, Hiroshima and Songmy, the truth of that paragraph constitutes an atrocity without equal. Snow is in error, however, when he says that only the will is missing; it is the consciousness which is not yet universal and it is the necessary power expressing the organization of that consciousness which has not yet fully appeared. The problem, however, has been posed and as Marx remarked, society poses only those problems which historically can be solved. This one has been solved in much of the world and it was the theory and practice — that is, the science of Lenin which made possible the solution. That truth is out and knowledge of it — not thermonuclear power — is the greatest force on earth today.

\*

The Marxist-Leninist concept of science as a living whole, as dynamic and process-filled, as emphasizing the interconnectedness of phenomena, and as fundamentally humanistic is confronted with the conventional compartmentalizing of life. Typical are the ideas of the late George Sarton.<sup>7</sup> He saw in history what he called "three quests;" these were: "for goodness and justice" — which Sarton called religion; "for beauty" — which he called art; and "for truth" — which he called science. He thought it was the love of truth which created science and the love of God and man which created religion and the love of beauty which created art. Quite apart from the crass philosophical idealism present in this approach — with "man" and "love" made static and with socio-economic-historic forces and developments ignored in treating of conceptions such as truth, science

<sup>5</sup> Price, in *Science*, January 3, 1969.

<sup>6</sup> George Sarton. Introduction to Joseph Needham. *Science, Religion and Reality*, N. Y., 1955, Brasiller.

<sup>7</sup> *Ibid.*



God and religion, and beauty, etc. — the separation of truth and science from concern for Man and for beauty is rejected by Marxism-Leninism. Marxism-Leninism holds with the poet that truth is beauty and beauty is truth; it adds that their quintessence is science. Disciplines have a logic of their own, as does art; yet all are socially induced and socially functional. To ignore their individuality is to be crude and wrong; but to see only their individuality is to be narrow and provincial. One must see the unique in the generic, the individual in the universal, the contingent in the necessary and the reciprocal connection of opposites, the motions, the transitions, inter-relationships. This is dialectics and, as Lenin noted, "Dialectics is the theory of knowledge of (Hegel and) Marxism."<sup>8</sup>

\*

In his Address at the 1920 Congress of the Russian Young Communist League, Lenin said: "To expect science to be impartial in a wage-slave society is as foolishly naive as to expect impartiality from manufacturers on the question of whether workers' wage ought not to be increased by decreasing the profits of capital."<sup>9</sup>

One has, then, in Lenin not only the affirmation of the propriety of or the possibility of a science without value-judgements; he has also the idea that the resources of science will be employed in a biased way — reflecting partiality — so long as exploitative classes exist. More is meant here than the well-known prostitution of "science" into such uses as slaughtering peasants in Asia and defoliating thousands of acres of fertile land; or measuring motions so that bosses may enhance their rates of profit; or conducting involved psychological tests to discover how best to lead teen-agers into cigarette smoking.

What is meant also is the fact that scientific development and usage are superstructural phenomena; they will, therefore, reflect the base of a social order and if that base is riven by antagonistic contradictions the science it produces cannot be "impartial". Implicit here, also, is the solution of the age-old riddle of achieving objectivity in science when the scientist cannot overcome the subjectivity in his own person. The answer does not lie in a fruitless search for so-called impartiality; the answer lies in intense partisanship but a partisanship on the side of the oppressed. On the side of the oppressed is justice and where there is justice there is truth. And a social order constructed on the basis of the elimination of exploitation will be a society devoid of antagonistic contradictions. Such a society will have no use for falsehood; objectively its *requirement* will be for reality. Hence, in such a society — and only in such a society — an uncorrupted search for truth in all areas of human life and thought becomes possible. Please note, we have said possible; we have not said becomes simple or comes about automatically. Only that — for the first time in history — it becomes possible and that every force within the social order itself *needs* such truly scientific work.

A society which is exploitative is a society which is based on falsehood as well as injustice. Its science lacks objectivity even in the course of its ascendant

\* The edition gives two following quotations from V. I. Lenin. Collected works, Progress publishers. Moscow, 1960.

<sup>8</sup> V. I. Lenin. Coll. works, M., 1960, v. 38, p. 362.

<sup>9</sup> Ibid., v. 19, p. 23.



development. When antagonist societies stagnate the only scientific outlook is that of the class whose liberation means human liberation; it must seek and face up to reality; it has nothing to hide. And it must penetrate to the heart; that is, it must see all sides, accurately weigh different forces, be dynamic, be concrete, shun dogmatism, be active, test in practice, and it must take sides, it must be guided above all, as Lenin said<sup>10</sup> by "the object's connection with what man requires".

Marxism-Leninism is a study that never ceases, for reality changes. Moreover, its goal is vast, for as Lenin told the 1920 Congress of Communist Youth: "It would be a serious mistake to suppose that one can become a Communist without making one's own the treasures of human knowledge." Hence, he urged the youth "to acquire the whole sum of human knowledge" and to learn not by rote but by thinking for themselves.

\*

John W. Gardner, formerly Secretary of Health, Welfare and Education, said: "The creative society will be one in which there is a continuous and fruitful interaction between the two worlds of action and reflection. . . The life of reflection is not superior to a life of action, or vice versa."<sup>11</sup> It is possible that in the practical and pragmatic USA one must give emphasis here to the need for *reflection* as well as action; in any case, Marxism-Leninism insists on the need for both if one is to engage in scientific effort and if one is ever to have "the creative society". Indeed, in such a society, as A. F. Shishkin has written recently of the Soviet Union, "knowledge has become a social and personal necessity for millions of people, who had formerly been divorced from science and culture"<sup>12</sup>.

\*

Professor Albert William Levi, in a recent major opus, writes:<sup>13</sup> "Despite the belief on one side that responsible political commitment is an essential element in the humanist ideal, there is another branch of the humanist party which holds that the insertion of *any* political claims tends to compromise or destroy the purity of humanistic values. It finds science, philosophy, literature and art to be autonomous products of rationality (or 'understanding') and an ordering of feeling (through imagination) which transcends politics, and it therefore resents any political interference with either the content of its conclusions or the form of its expression. . . It holds that an abstention from politics is mandatory *if* the intellectual life *is* not to be compromised or the artistic life rendered corrupt. This imperative applies equally for the writing of novels, the creation of drama and the governing principles of an independent historiography.

Marxism-Leninism does not see the *insertion* of politics into the pursuits mentioned by Professor Levi; it does not believe that these pursuits are in fact divorced

<sup>10</sup> V. I. Lenin. *Once Again on Trade Unions* (1921), Selected Works, IX. 65 ff.

<sup>11</sup> John W. Gardner. Speech at California Institute of Technology published in *Science*, vol. 19, 1966.

<sup>12</sup> A. F. Shishkin in *Soviet Studies in Philosophy*, Fall, 1966, p. 13.

<sup>13</sup> A. W. Levi. *Humanism and Politicism*, Bloomington, Indiana Univ. Press, 1969, pp. 450-451 (italics in original).

from politics — unless the latter are defined in some crass, colloquial sense. It denies that there are “autonomous products of rationality”; it affirms that science and art has its own logic but it declares that any assertion that such activities as literature or science, or philosophy, or art develop out of time and space, is nonsense.

Marxism-Leninism denies that “abstention from politics” is possible for writers of history or philosophy or creators of art; on the contrary, it insists that even choosing abstention from politics is itself a political act. And Marxism-Leninism has yet to find an example of “an independent historiography produced in the United States is not such an example!”

\*

Paul Lafargue, in his “Reminiscences of Marx” (1890) said: “We shall never understand him unless we regard him simultaneously as man of science and as socialist fighter. While he was of the opinion that every science must be cultivated for its own sake and that when we undertake scientific research we should not trouble ourselves about the possible consequences, nevertheless, he held that the man of learning, it he does not wish to degrade himself, must never cease to participate in public affairs. . . One of his favorite sayings was, ‘Work for the World’.”<sup>14</sup>

Lenin himself noted that Marx “combined in his person the qualities of a man of learning and a revolutionary”. “This combination,” said Lenin,<sup>15</sup> “was not by chance, but because the system he founded combines the scientific with the revolutionary spirit; it does so, intrinsically and inseparably within the theory itself.”

In his “Left-Wing” Communism, Lenin had written that “. . . we can and must unite the intensest passion in the great revolutionary struggle with the coolest and soberest calculations. . .”

Lenin did this supremely well. He did it personally because, as he wrote of Marx, Leninism is the science of revolution. More, science is revolutionary. This is above all true of the twentieth century when the socialist revolution is sweeping the globe, for that revolution, unlike all that preceded, seeks not to alter the nature of class domination but to eliminate class domination. Hence, in such an effort all rationalizations are enemies; only an examination of objective, dynamic reality and a testing of that examination in practice in order to usher in the era of Socialism will do and that is the nature of science as well as the nature of Leninism.

<sup>14</sup> Quoted by J. D. Bernal. *Marx and Science*. London, 1952, pp. 42-43.

<sup>15</sup> V. I. Lenin. *What the “Friends of the People” Are* (1894). *Selected Works*, XI, p. 605.



## LENIN AND PROBLEMS OF SCIENTIFIC PREVISION

G. E. GLEZERMAN

USSR

*"Miraculous prophecy is a fairy-tale,  
But scientific prophecy is a fact."*

(V. I. Lenin)<sup>1</sup>

Problems of scientific prevision of social phenomena have lately been attracting the attention of researchers both in the Soviet Union and elsewhere and there are good reasons for this increased attention.

Realities of this age add importance and urgency to problems of scientific prevision and forecasting of social, scientific and technological progress. Ours is the epoch of the greatest social revolution that marked the beginning of the transition to socialism. At the same time it is the epoch of the greatest revolution in science and technology. Both the changes in social relations and the progress in science and technology developing at a rate unprecedented in the past make it an urgent necessity to consider the present trends which may, within a few decades, bring about profound transformations in the shape of society and in man's environment.

With all this in mind, a study of theoretical foundations of scientific prevision and of what is specific in it when applied to social phenomena is undoubtedly of considerable interest.

In considering these questions it is appropriate, in our view, to turn to the theoretical legacy of V. I. Lenin, this great thinker and revolutionary, who contributed so much to shaping the world as we know it today.

\*

Theoretical foundations of scientific prevision may be studied from two points of view. On the one hand, we may try to establish the nature of the objective relationships that enable us to judge of the future by the present. On the other hand, we may try to find out what logical apparatus is needed to make judgements of this kind.

The objective relationships between phenomena when they are more or less precisely found out by man — that is what constitutes the basis of all successful prevision. Scientific prediction of the future is distinguished from all sorts of religious or mystical prophecies by the fact that it is based on a study of natural, actually

<sup>1</sup> V. I. Lenin. Coll. Works, vol. 27, Moscow, 1965, p. 494.

existing regular relationships between the phenomena of reality. Relationships of this kind exist not only in nature but in society as well. And they reveal themselves, as V. I. Lenin put it, in the "recurrence and regularity in the social phenomena of the various countries."<sup>2</sup>

Neither is scientific prevision the same thing as empirical guessing about the future based merely on observation of attending phenomena or on superficial similarities. Scientific prevision is based on the knowledge of the laws which reveal the inherent, essential and stable relationships between phenomena. And this enables conclusions to be made from what is known about what is unknown, and from the present about the future.

Prevision may be of different kinds. In one set of cases it concerns events that are yet to occur in the future more or less remote. On the other hand, there are cases when a scientist foresees the discovery of what is in existence but has not yet been discovered experimentally (such for instance are the now classic examples of Mendeleev's prediction of the properties of helium, scandium and germanium, chemical elements which were unknown at that time, or Maxwell's discovery of the pressure of light on objects exposed to it, which was later confirmed experimentally by the Russian physicist Lebedev and so on).

According to the Argentine philosopher Mario Bunge predictions are possible not only concerning the future, but also concerning the present and the past. He defines prediction as an inference not necessarily "from present to future, but from known to unknown"<sup>3</sup>.

It seems to me that a temporal element is present in a prevision although, clearly, it is not always built on temporal lines. Indeed in some cases prevision concerns future occurrence of events whereas in others it concerns a future discovery of existing things or their properties.

The logic of prevision, the way conclusions are made from the known about the unknown may also be different. Predictions may be made by means either of inductive or of deductive conclusions. That is to say, they may be based on a scientific classification of phenomena or arrived at by making some kind of models of complex structures or processes.

I will not consider these aspects of the question here but merely point out that scientific prevision in any of its forms is connected with generalization. In his *Conceptus of Hegel's Book The Science of Logic* V. I. Lenin remarked: "So the simplest generalization, the first and simplest formation of notion (judgements, syllogisms, etc.) already denotes man's ever deeper cognition of the objective connection of the world."<sup>4</sup>

General notions, laws and categories were regarded by Lenin as key points in the process of man's ever deeper penetration into nature. And by forming notions and formulating laws which reflect the objective regularities of nature man can go beyond what is immediately given and foresee the future. The future cannot be sensually perceived until it has become the present. Despite attempts by various religious and superstitious mystics to visualize the future it is not open to immediate sensual perception. Scientific knowledge of the future is gained through *logical*

<sup>2</sup> V. I. Lenin. Coll. Works, vol. 1, p. 140.

<sup>3</sup> Mario Bunge. *Causality*, Harvard University Press, 1959, p. 313.

<sup>4</sup> V. I. Lenin. Coll. Works, vol. 38, p. 179.



conclusions, by generalizing and rational processing of sensual data. And therefore theoretical knowledge is of paramount importance for scientific prevision.

Historically, empirical attempts at foreseeing the future preceded scientific prevision. The first step to prevision may be a mere guess about the future based on observation of facts, of connection between them or analogy. Describing the development of human knowledge V. I. Lenin pointed to "the connection of induction with analogy — with surmise (scientific foresight)."<sup>5</sup>

The development of our knowledge does not stop at this stage, however. From guessing about the future men go on to hypotheses which usually proceed from a number of known facts and observations and account for them, enabling at the same time well-founded statements to be made about future events yet unknown. Further experience is used to test the hypotheses, to reject some and to make others more precise thus making it ultimately possible to formulate laws which govern the phenomena. Only then is a scientific theory formulated based on the knowledge of certain laws, and it becomes possible to know the future with great accuracy. This stage corresponds to what V. I. Lenin called "the transition from the syllogism of analogy (about analogy) to the syllogism of necessity."<sup>6</sup>

A law is a way of expressing what is universal in nature. It establishes certain essential relations between phenomena which necessarily occur whenever certain conditions are fulfilled. It is this universality of the law, the fact that it expresses recurrence of phenomena, and the necessary connection between them, that makes scientific prevision possible.

Clearly, one has to bear in mind that this recurrence of events or phenomena is relative. Each individual phenomenon has unique, specific features of its own which are not all included in the notion or governed completely by the law. The domain of law, in the words of Hegel, is a still image of the ever emerging world. Everly law is incomplete, narrow and covers only part of reality. An event, even as simple as the falling of an object, cannot be accounted for by the action of only one law. Only a large number of laws can cover an event or phenomenon completely, in all its concreteness. "The significance of the universal is contradictory: it is dead, impure, incomplete, etc., etc., but it alone is a stage toward knowledge of the concrete, for we can never know the concrete completely. The infinite sum of general conceptions, laws, etc. gives the concrete in its completeness."<sup>7</sup>

It is because of this diversity of reality and of the gradual historic character of its cognition that scientific prevision discloses only the main features of the future and can never exhaust it completely. It should also be noted that the knowledge of the general law alone is not nearly sufficient to permit predictions to be made. The fullest possible knowledge of conditions of its operation is indispensable. For in different conditions the effect of the operation of one and the same law may be very different. Every law, when it operates, is modified by a very complex set of circumstances. This is particularly true of the laws of social development. To determine what modifications a historical regularity is subjected to, the fullest possible account must be taken of the general situation and the specific conditions prevailing in a particular epoch and in a particular country.

<sup>5</sup> V. J. Lenin. Coll. Works, vol. 38, p. 180.

<sup>6</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 180.

<sup>7</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 279.



Finally, the measure of regularity in recurring events cannot possibly be the same in different spheres of reality. The simpler are the phenomena concerned, the clearer is the regularity in their recurring properties and features and, conversely, the higher we go up the scale of qualitative complexity, passing, say, from physics or chemistry to biology or from biological to social phenomena, the more is this recurrence complicated by a great variety of individual and unique features.

This, however, does not preclude the possibility of formulating laws of development and prevision of the basic trends in the development of society. As long ago as in the closing years of the last century, when V. I. Lenin criticized the subjective sociology of the "populists" (narodniki) in Russia, he emphasized the possibility of applying the general scientific criterion of recurrence in studying the life of society.

The recurrence of superficial features in events is to a certain extent accidental in character and, surely, it cannot provide a basis for prevision. But this is not the case with the recurrence of the essential features which expresses the stable and regular connections between phenomena. Precisely this kind of recurrence can be revealed provided we have scientific criteria for revealing it.

The criterion of recurrence in history is to be found first and foremost in the category of socio-economic formation as a historically determined type of society, a specific social body with its inherent specific laws of development. The category of a formation made it possible to proceed from describing social relations (and assessing them in ideal terms) to their strictly scientific analysis revealing, for instance, what is common to all of the capitalist countries while showing at the same time what distinguishes one capitalist country from another.

Marxist theory of class struggle, along with the category of socio-economic formation, was of paramount importance in discovering regularity in social phenomena. The theory of class struggle, as V. I. Lenin pointed out, was a tremendous acquisition for social science precisely because it permitted the innumerable actions of individual persons to be submitted to general laws. No social science can undertake the task of foreseeing the behaviour and actions of each individual man, for these may depend on a host of circumstances in his life, education, views, sentiments etc. It is, however, quite possible to foresee the actions of large masses of people, of whole classes, for they are determined by the conditions of their existence, their interests etc. which can be stated with the precision of natural sciences.

The main feature of social laws is that they are laws of practical activity of men and women, laws that operate not over the heads of the people who make up the society but through their actions. That is why prevision in social life, as distinct from forecasting phenomena of nature, such as solar or lunar eclipses and so on, is an anticipation of the outcomes of historical activity of people themselves. But people participate in the making of history as human beings endowed with consciousness and will, pursuing certain goals. It would be absurd to deny the importance of goals, their impact on the course and outcome of events. At the same time, we know that goals anticipate the future. Does that mean, however, that in history the future determines the course of events in the present, and that causality and causal relations between phenomena should therefore be rejected? By no means so. Causality requires not a denial of the influence of goals on the course of history but their causal explanation. Why do just such and such and not any other goals emerge at certain stages of historical development? What makes people representing certain



social forces, certain classes, fight for or against the realization of those goals? Answers to these questions enable us to reveal regularity in history.

Identifying regularity with predetermination is a device often used by critics of Marxism. They frequently attribute to Marxism a fatalistic view of history which regards it as a process of fulfilment of a predestination of some kind. In contrast to this allegedly Marxist view, they champion the creative role of the individual acting entirely of his own free will which amounts to voluntaristic arbitrariness and denial of any historical necessity whatever.

In fact, however, Marxist determinism, the recognition of historical necessity, by no means belittle the role of the individual and the importance of his activity. But this activity is not tantamount to arbitrary actions. Although in the course of history the activity of men plays an ever increasing part in creating their environment and conditions, people are never entirely free to choose them at will. Conditions of every epoch determine what is possible and confront men with urgent problems demanding solution. But how and to what extent those problems are solved depends on men themselves, on their active participation, on the development of the struggle in which their consciousness, energy and will are significant factors.

The idea that historical events are determined in a way that excludes any alternatives is alien to Marxism. The recognition that historical necessity exists and that it determines the general trend of social development in a particular epoch does not by any means imply denying the possibility of different alternative ways. Historical experience shows that relations of production must of necessity adapt themselves to the developing productive forces. But what forms the transition to a higher type of economy will take, whether or not a particular revolution will be victorious — those are questions to which no single answer can be given, for the outcome is not predetermined.

V. I. Lenin's approach to the problem of relationship between historical necessity and the different alternatives of this realization can clearly be seen from the example of his analysis of the development of capitalism in bourgeois pre-revolutionary Russia.

Lenin pointed out that with the economic base at that time established in the country the revolution must inevitably be a bourgeois one. Objectively, however, two main lines of development were possible: either the old landlord economy would be preserved and gradually evolve into a purely capitalist economy or, else, the revolution would decisively smash all remnants of serfdom and, in the first place, big landlord tenure. Which of the ways capitalist evolution would take, in Lenin's view, depended on the two possible outcomes of the revolution.

"The transformation of the economic and political system in Russia along bourgeois-democratic lines is inevitable and inescapable. No power on earth can prevent such a transformation, but the combined action of the existing forces which are effecting it may result in either of two things, may bring about either of two forms of that transformation. Either 1) matters will end in 'the revolution's decisive victory over tsarism', or 2) the forces will be inadequate for a decisive victory, and matters will end in a deal between tsarism and the most 'inconsistent' and most 'selfseeking' elements of the bourgeoisie. By and large, all the infinite variety of details and combinations, which no one is able to foresee, lead to one outcome or



the other.<sup>8</sup> In another place Lenin noted that "this alternative, like every assumption concerning the social and political future, indicates only the main and fundamental lines of development"<sup>9</sup>.

At any stage in history different and even diametrically opposite possibilities exist. Therefore assumptions concerning social and political future are often expressed as alternatives. Lenin did not formulate the prospects of social development in Russia at that time in one way only. Proceeding from his analysis of the objective social forces, he saw two main possibilities. On what, then, did the realization of one or the other of them depend? On the course of the struggle, on whether the forces of revolution would be adequate for it to win, or the balance would be in favour of counterrevolution.

In historical development the actions of people make as if they were a pattern of intersecting lines. The outcome of the intersection, the historical event, is a kind of "resultant" of a large number of efforts, some of which may be aimed in the same direction while others in different or even diametrically opposite directions. The degree to which these efforts coincide or, conversely, diverge depends in the first place on the stage in the development of society, on the character of its social system, its division into classes, their relationship and so on. Therefore the results of men's actions may either coincide with or be different from their aims and intentions. This lack of coincidence between aims and results, particularly characteristic of pre-socialist societies, shows once again that one cannot see the ultimate cause of historical development in the aims people pursue, that the realization of the aims or failure to realize them depends on deeper lying causes that determine the course of history.

Because of the intersection of efforts of large numbers of people at different angles the laws of social development generally assume the character of statistical laws and manifest themselves as dominant trends. Certain sociologists counterpose trends to laws and deny the former the right to be regarded as laws.

In nature, however, many laws are of statistical character and manifest themselves in trends making their way through a multitude of chance occurrences. In view of this one should not regard scientific prevision as existing exclusively in the form of forecasts like those made by astronomers calculating in advance when solar eclipses will occur or a particular comet will return etc.

Prevision in social life has certain time limits, it is not possible any given number of years in advance. This, however, does not by any means amount to denying the possibility of prevision. It should be noted that even in natural sciences forecasts like those made by astronomers are rather an exception than a general rule. They are possible only for objects which, like the solar system, are very stable, comparatively isolated systems not subject to sudden, abrupt influences from outside. With regard to complex, rapidly changing systems forecasts of a different kind are more common.

The view is sometimes expressed that by means of mathematical methods it is possible to "calculate" both the past and the future with any degree of accuracy that the possibility of such a "calculation" depends only on the amount of initial

<sup>8</sup> V. I. Lenin. Coll. Works, vol. 9, p. 55.

<sup>9</sup> *Ibid.*, vol. 10, p. 228.



data and the complexity of the formula which would take account of all the data. This view obviously suffers from mechanistic oversimplification, for it ignores at least two important considerations. The first is that because of qualitative diversity of reality mathematical formulae describing mechanical motion cannot be applied to processes involved in more complicated fields subject to their specific laws. The second is the influence of chance factors which play a particularly significant role in systems of greater complexity than those involving only mechanical motion.

Chance factors are part of the total process of history, they can, depending on circumstances, retard or accelerate it, cause zigzags and deviations from the general line of development. All these chance occurrences and zigzags cannot be foreseen in advance. And yet, recognition of chance as an objectively existing ingredient of history does not rule out the possibility of prevision. One cannot foresee each of the accidental occurrences but it is quite possible to ascertain their overall effect, to identify the main trend which makes its way as a necessity through a multitude of accidental events that to a greater or lesser extent balance one another.

Marxist conception of necessity is free of metaphysical onesidedness inherent in the mechanistic outlook. Marxism rejects the fatalistic idea that all things in the world, all events in social life, are predetermined and can occur only in one way but not in any other. This view does not take account of the fact that history is the result of creative activity and struggle of millions of people.

In politics marxists have always tried to take the fullest possible account of all aspects of the situation, to weight all the chances for victory, but it is not possible to foretell it with absolute certainty. The reason for this does not lie in the imperfection of our knowledge or in limitations of the human mind. The point is that this outcome is not predetermined. The history of mankind cannot be regarded as a providential process where everything is "programmed" in advance and the outcome of each event is predetermined.

With great contempt Lenin spoke of opportunists who claimed that revolution should be undertaken only when chances for its success were absolutely favorable. "... to attempt in advance to calculate the chances with complete accuracy would be quackery or hopeless pedantry," he wrote.<sup>10</sup> With bitter irony he says that "Revolutions such as Turati and Kautsky are 'prepared' to accept, i. e., revolutions for which the date and the chances of success can be set in advance, never happen."<sup>11</sup>

This, however, does not in any way undermine the foundation on which the forces of progress build their actions. On the contrary. They know that in the long run their cause will be victorious, but in each single battle the success of the struggle, even when all the objective conditions exist, is not predetermined, and this gives them a greater sense of responsibility as the makers of the future.

History is made by the masses, by millions of people who constantly introduce something new, a creative element. Therefore history always proves to be richer in content than what might be foreseen in advance when we theoretically calculate the course it will take.

"History as a whole," Lenin wrote, "and the history of revolutions in particular, is always richer in content, more varied, more multiform, more lively and

<sup>10</sup> V. I. Lenin. Coll. Works, vol. 12, p. 111.

<sup>11</sup> Ibid., vol. 23, p. 270.



ingenuous than is imagined by even the best parties, the most class-conscious vanguards of the most advanced classes. This can readily be understood, because even the finest of vanguards express the class-consciousness, will, passion and imagination of tens of thousands, whereas at moments of great upsurge and the exertion of all human capacities, revolutions are made by the class-consciousness, will, passion and imagination of tens of millions, spurred on by a most acute struggle of classes."<sup>12</sup>

The creative process of history always contains an element of unforeseeable. Hence it does not follow, however, that creative processes rule out the very possibility of prevision as it is claimed by those who adhere to the theory of "creative" or emergent evolution.

They often consider creative evolution as something irrational; a new quality is regarded as something unforeseeable, emerging suddenly from nowhere. This view is just as one-sided as the belief that the new is a mere repetition of something in the past or in the present.

The process of development always brings something new, unseen before. But this new thing or quality does not appear as somebody's sudden act of will, entirely independent of the past. The new appears as a regular result of preceding development. Both in nature and in society the new is born of the old. And since the new emerges from the old, it is naturally possible to foresee its emergence at least in general outline. In building the future men always resolve contradictions of the present. Therefore by revealing contradictions in existing reality one can foresee the results of their resolution and hence their ultimate results although they are not immediately given in the past experience.

It is precisely this way of thinking that Marx used in foreseeing the coming of communism. The analysis of the contradictions of capitalism and of conditions necessary for the new kind of society which ripen within it enabled Marx to discern the basic features of the new social order that had never before existed in history.

"The whole theory of Marx," V. I. Lenin pointed out, "is the application of the theory of development — in its most consistent, complete, considered and pithy form — to modern capitalism." Naturally Marx was faced with the problems of applying this theory both to the forthcoming collapse of capitalism and to the future development of future communism.

On the basis of what facts, then, can the question of the future development of future communism be dealt with?

On the basis of the fact that it has its origin in capitalism, that it develops historically from capitalism, that it is the result of the action of a social force to which capitalism gave birth. There is no trace of an attempt on Marx's part to make up a utopia, to indulge in idle guess-work about what cannot be known. Marx treated the question of communism in the same way as a naturalist would treat the question of the development of, say, a new biological variety once he knew that it had originated in such and such a way and was changing in such and such a definite direction."<sup>13</sup>

<sup>12</sup> V. I. Lenin. Coll. Works. vol. 31, pp. 95-96.

<sup>13</sup> Ibid., vol. 25, pp. 457-458.



Those words of Lenin show, with utmost clarity, scientific foundations of prevision. By studying phenomena of nature and society science is able to discover the direction in which they are moving, trends in their development, and prevision is nothing other than seeing where things are moving and where the development leads. It is precisely because Marx saw the capitalist society of his time in its development, with its contradictions, that he was able correctly to describe the basic features of the future communist society. Marx's foresight concerning the character of the future social order is thus based on a full and comprehensive study of the past and of the present.

However, let it be noted that Marx's prevision concerned only the basic features of the future. "We do not claim," Lenin warned in 1917, "that Marx knew or Marxists know the road to socialism down to the last detail. It would be nonsense to claim anything of the kind. What we know is the direction of this road, and the class forces that follow it; the specific, practical details will come to light only through the experience of the millions when they take things into their own hands."<sup>14</sup>

Attempts at foreseeing theoretically, every detail, on the road to socialism were rejected by Lenin for two reasons. First, it would mean substituting fancy for science, futile guesswork for scientific prevision. Second, it would mean from the very beginning to tie one's hands in practical work. History for Lenin was the result of creative activity of millions of people. And "The minds of tens of millions of those who are doing things create something infinitely loftier than the greatest genius can foresee."<sup>15</sup> Only practice, and moreover, the practical activity of millions of working people involved in the making of history enables scientific prevision to become concrete and specific.

Thus, scientific prevision, like any scientific inquiry, is a process; it develops and becomes concrete in the course of the development of reality itself and of its transformation through practice.

And also, distinction should be made between foreseeing the general direction of historical development, on the one hand, and foreseeing individual events and the time they will occur, on the other. Whereas the former can be foreseen with certainty, the latter can only be guessed at with greater or lesser degree of probability.

Should this be taken to mean that prevision of concrete events and of the time they will occur is not possible at all? Evidently not. The example of Lenin himself shows that as events develop it becomes possible to fill the skeleton of the general forecast with the flesh of more specific details. This possibility becomes greater as the expected event enters the sphere of practical activity of men who not only strive to foresee it but work for its realization. Probably, at the beginning of 1917, immediately after the victory of the February Revolution in Russia, no one, including Lenin, would venture to foretell that the next revolution would win the victory after only 8 months. But as the socialist revolution matured in Russia, its possible timing became clearer, and on the eve of the decisive assault Lenin determined with the greatest accuracy the precise moment to strike, which was of decisive importance for the victory of the revolution.

<sup>14</sup> V. I. Lenin. Coll. Works, vol. 25, p. 281.

<sup>15</sup> *Ibid.*, vol. 26, p. 474.



Consequently, in the practice of the revolution the vision of the general outline of historical development is filled with more specific details and becomes more precise, thus making it possible more or less clearly to discern both the major events of the future and the time they will occur.

Marxism combined realism in taking account of the present with the ability to glimpse into the future, to look ahead.

Those who confine themselves only to superficial observation of phenomena inevitably arrive at groovy conclusions. They see the future as a mere repetition of the past and the present. Followers of this view believe that the more often an event occurred in the past, the more confidently it must be expected to occur in the future. With this approach to the study of reality they do not get to its essence, which is precisely where the negation of the old grows ripe. Therefore, to people whose vision glides on the surface of phenomena the collapse of the old is unexpected and appears to disrupt the regular course of things. They fail to see the events in their development and to understand them.

Marxist approach requires penetration into processes going on deep below the surface, in the essence of the phenomenon where the forces negating it are gaining strength while it still retains for a time its old shape, its shell. "Therefore, the Marxist is the first to foresee the approach of a revolutionary period, and already begins to rouse the people and to sound the tocsin while the philistines are still wrapt in the slavish slumber of loyal subjects."<sup>16</sup>

The ability to discern the germs of the future as they appear in the present, to see in the realities of life not only the forces working to preserve the old but also those working to destroy it and to create the new, that is what makes it possible to foresee the future. At the same time it is evident that the degree of maturity of the elements of the new may be very different at different historical stages of social development. Therefore, the limits of scientific prevision depend on the ripening of social relations themselves, on the measure in which the seeds of the future had the time to germinate in the present. There may be periods in history when those elements of the future have not yet taken shape, and therefore the future can only be an object of guesswork but not yet of scientific prevision.

That is why, in defining the right line of action, it is extremely important not only to consider what can really be foreseen, but also to take sober account of what is not yet foreseeable. V. I. Lenin objected, for example, in the first years after the Revolution, to proposals to include in Party Programme a concrete description of socialism and even of communism, on the ground that material for such descriptions could not yet be available at the time. "The bricks of which socialism will be composed have not yet been made. We cannot say anything further, and we should be as cautious and accurate as possible."<sup>17</sup> Utopianism, hare-brained plans, subjectivism always found in Lenin the severest of critics.

Along with the objective factors that determine the possibilities and limits of prevision, of great importance, needless to say, are the subjective ones, the personality of the political leader or the sociologist himself, his social status, his outlook, his knowledge, his experience in politics, his ability to analyse events, the depth of his penetration, and his "feel" of history.

<sup>16</sup> V. I. Lenin, vol. 11, p. 351.

<sup>17</sup> *Ibid.*, vol. 27, p. 148.



\*

The building of a new society puts forward social prevision as a practical proposition without which control of social processes is impossible. It assumes particular importance in connection with the developing scientific and technological revolution. With the rapidly widening scope of man's productive activity and the growing socialization of labour processes, the living reality itself ever more insistently demands conscious control of the life of society and of its impact on nature.

A specific feature of the present stage in the relationship and interaction between society and nature is that the entire surface of the globe is becoming the field of man's activity. He makes use of nearly all the materials of Earth's crust and all the sources of energy of nature, and even reaches out beyond the confines of the Earth into outer space. "Mankind, taken as a whole," wrote the late Soviet academician Vernadsky, "is becoming a powerful geological force."<sup>18</sup> However, with the growing scale of man's activity the danger of his uncontrolled interference with his natural environment becomes ever greater. A by-product of this activity is the disturbed balance among the various processes in nature. The pollution of air and water with industrial waste, radioactive materials and so on has reached such proportions that it may endanger further existence of mankind. The French scientist Jean Dorst in his book with the characteristic title "Avant que nature meure"<sup>19</sup> ("Before Nature Dies") writes that however paradoxical it may sound, the most urgent problem in preservation of Nature is the defence of our species from ourselves, *Homo sapiens* must be defended against *Homo faber*.

To avoid dangers of this kind nature must be treated as a single whole where everything is closely interconnected. But this is very difficult in a society based on private property where the development of production is subordinated to selfish interests of individual proprietors. However, with the present scale of production even the capitalist world is compelled to think of the consequences of its treatment of nature, for otherwise real disasters will become inevitable.

On the other hand, there is a growing need for forecasting social effects of the developing production and scientific and technological revolution (the growth of large cities etc.). The growing socialization of the process of production ever more compellingly demands its social control. The appearance of trusts was seen by F. Engels, and later by V. I. Lenin, as the beginning of the introduction of planning into production, as a de-facto recognition of the need for planned organization of social production. "... one could not continue to define capitalism as a system of production lacking planning. This is now out-of-date; once there are trusts there can no longer be lack of planning."<sup>20</sup>

In a still greater measure this is characteristic of the state-monopoly capitalism.

Describing state-monopoly capitalism during the First World War V. I. Lenin pointed out: "Capitalism is now evolving directly into its higher, regulated form."<sup>21</sup>

Although the passing war-time circumstances that made capitalism regulate its economy later disappeared, the growing socialization of the process of produc-

<sup>18</sup> V. I. Vernadsky. *Khimicheskoye stroenie biosfery Zemli i ee okruzheniya* (Chemical Structure of the Earth Biosphere and Its Environment). Moscow, 1965, p. 287.

<sup>19</sup> Jean Dorst. *Avant que nature meure*. Switzerland, 1965.

<sup>20</sup> V. I. Lenin. *Coll. Works*. vol. 24, p. 240.

<sup>21</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 306.



tion ever more forcefully compels capitalism to adapt its economic relations to this social character of production. In some countries economic development is "programmed"; programs are worked out for state capital investments, particularly in industries involved in the scientific and technological revolution, weapons production and so on. However, the interference of a capitalist state into economic life is undertaken in the interests of the largest monopolies, and because of even this alone, it is unable to bridle the elemental forces of economic development. And this too was foreseen by Lenin: "The trusts, of course, never provided, do not now provide and cannot provide complete planning."<sup>22</sup>

Only socialism is called upon and able to provide this planning. Characteristic of socialism is not only the comprehensive scale of planned organization of production but also the goals for which it is undertaken and which are different, in principle, from those under capitalism. In his notes on the Draft Programme of the Party prepared by Plekhanov Lenin pointed out that planned organization "will, perhaps, be provided even by the trusts" but only under socialism and communism society as a whole "is responsible for that planning", it organizes production "with the object of ensuring full well-being and free, all-round development for all the members of society."<sup>23</sup>

This kind of production cannot be carried on without a plan. Therefore planning by the state for the whole country is a vital necessity for socialism. Socialism requires complex planning of the development of productive forces and of the changes in social relations that follow from this development. But successful planning requires glancing into the future, defining prospects for the development of production, of science, of social life as a whole.

The first example of scientific determination of the ways of economic and social development which was later to become the foundation of the national economic plan was the plan for electrification of the national economy worked out in the way it was conceived by V. I. Lenin. The GOELRO plan, as it was called, contained the forecast results of scientific, technological and social development all linked together in one document. It was the prototype of the national economic five-year plans which have transformed the entire face of the land of the Soviets.

The higher the stage of scientific and technological development achieved by society, the more important it is to foresee the prospects of its further development. The present stage in the development of socialist economy when tasks of its intensification and of raising the effectiveness of social production to the utmost are being resolved, demand choosing optimal alternatives and drafting long-term economic development plans. Prevision of the basic trends in technological progress makes it possible to pursue the most rational investment policy and to effect planned changes in the structure of social production.

Scientific prevision of the classics of Marxism-Leninism was mainly qualitative in character, e. g., the prevision of the inevitable transition to socialism. Economic development forecasts involve certain quantitative indices which cannot be established without extensive application of mathematical techniques to problems of political economy, and to sociological research as well. However, it is self-evident that cybernetics cannot replace the science of management, neither can

<sup>22</sup> V. I. Lenin. Coll. Works. vol. 25, p. 443.

<sup>23</sup> Ibid., vol. 5, p. 54.



mathematics replace political economy or sociology. They should be placed at the service of the latter. When this is done a combination of qualitative and quantitative analyses will be achieved which may considerably expand the possibilities of forecasting social phenomena. Forecasting the development of the productive forces and of the changes in social relations connected with it is a task of extraordinary complexity requiring the use of data supplied by natural science, engineering and social sciences.

Prevision, forecasting and planning — all of them are categories concerned with information about the future. But they are not identical. A plan under the conditions of socialism is distinguished from a forecast above all by the fact that it is not only an anticipation of the future but also a directive for practical activity. The Plan lays down the direction of economic development, provides a program of action, which has the force of law binding on state bodies and economic organizations. This, by the way, is one of the things that distinguishes socialist planning from state programming of economies in capitalist countries which is, as a rule, only "indicative" in character and is carried out on the basis of agreements between the state and the monopolies.

Planning in a socialist society by no means obviates forecasting as it was sometimes erroneously believed in the past. Forecasting (often covering a longer period than that covered by planning) is a necessary prerequisite for drafting realistic and scientifically sound plans. It is one of the forms of scientific prevision. With some reservations it can be said that forecasting, as distinct from scientific prevision capable of covering long-term development prospects of society as a whole, is concerned with more specific and narrow questions (such as estimating power potentialities of a country by a certain date, say, by 1980 or by the end of this century). Forecasting covers not only the expected results of our conscious activity but also elemental or spontaneous processes in nature and society which are uncontrollable or can only partially be controlled by conscious regulation (e. g. demographic processes). Forecasts involved in selecting the optimal alternative of economic development help to provide a sound basis for planning.<sup>24</sup>

Both forecasting and planning are part of scientific guidance or management of the affairs of a socialist society. Socialism creates the possibility for and at the same time demands scientific guidance of economic and social processes. The advantages of socialism as a social system can be fully revealed and realized when society is guided precisely in this way.

Marxism-Leninism places the solution of all social questions on a scientific footing "not only in the sense of explaining the past but also in the sense of a bold forecast of the future and of bold practical action for its achievement."<sup>25</sup>

The distinctive and basic feature of Marxist theory, which V. I. Lenin pointed out, defines a scientific approach to the study of social processes and to formulating practical recommendations. It also constitutes a necessary condition for scientific guidance in building the new society.

<sup>24</sup> On the difference between forecasting and planning see Herbert Edeling, *Prognostik und Sozialismus*. Zur marxistisch-leninistischen Prognostik moderner Produktivkräfte in der DDR. Berlin, 1968, p. 221.

<sup>25</sup> *Ibid.*, vol. 21, p. 72.



## LÉNINE ET LA PRÉVISION SOCIALE

C. IONESCU ET I. MATEI  
ROUMANIE

L'intérêt suscité sur le plan mondial par la sociologie projective est particulièrement justifié dans les pays socialistes. La prospective du développement social est devenue une nécessité à caractère de loi de la construction du socialisme, confirmant ce que Lénine avait écrit dès 1923: „Nous avons maintenant l'occasion assez rare dans l'histoire de fixer les délais nécessaires pour opérer des réformes sociales radicales.“<sup>1</sup>

Aussi considérons-nous qu'il est indiqué — dans le cadre d'une présentation sommaire des indications léninistes pour les activités sociologiques — de nous axer sur l'esquisse de quelques aspects de l'élaboration des perspectives de développement social.

D'une importance essentielle dans l'élaboration des prévisions de développement social et justifiant *la possibilité même de la prévision dans la sociologie* sont les indications données par Lénine dans sa critique du volontarisme et de l'idéalisme subjectif des populistes ainsi que des tentatives de ces derniers d'attribuer au marxisme une conception fataliste de l'histoire. En partant de l'idée que „loin d'impliquer le fatalisme, le déterminisme offre au contraire un terrain propice à une action raisonnée“<sup>2</sup>, Lénine indique en tant que condition nécessaire aux activités rationnelles de l'homme — par conséquent à la prévision également — *la connaissance des lois objectives* du développement de la société.

En dehors de cette connaissance, le sociologue marxiste doit investiguer aussi *les lois spéciales*, propres à la société à un certain degré de son développement: „La valeur scientifique particulière d'une telle étude, c'est de mettre en lumière les lois (historiques) particulières qui régissent la naissance, la vie, la croissance et la mort d'un organisme social donné, et son remplacement par un autre supérieur.“<sup>3</sup>

Fonder la prévision sur la réalité, sur la connaissance de son évolution conformément aux lois, voilà ce qui la différencie radicalement des simples affirmations utopiques tout en justifiant leur délimitation rigoureuse: „Les prophéties miraculeuses, dit Lénine, sont des contes. Mais les prophéties scientifiques sont un fait acquis.“<sup>4</sup>

De la multitude des apports de Lénine nous considérons que nous devons mettre en saillie quelques-uns, d'une importance épistémologique et pratique ma-

<sup>1</sup> V. I. Lénine. Oeuvres. Paris — Moscou, 1958, v. 33, p. 497.

<sup>2</sup> Ibid., v. 1, p. 454.

<sup>3</sup> Ibid., p. 182.

<sup>4</sup> Ibid., v. 27, p. 526.



jeure, concernant *la possibilité de contrôler l'adéquation de la prévision à la réalité sociale*. En effet, si la possibilité de la prévision constitue un premier problème, la valeur de vérité constitue le second problème de base de la prévision, de nature à justifier ou à ne pas justifier l'activité même d'élaboration de perspectives sociales.

Une première réponse que la théorie léniniste du reflet donne à ce problème se rattache à *la possibilité de la connaissance de la réalité dans son devenir* c'est-à-dire au rapport entre l'objet et le sujet, considéré dans sa processualité.

Selon Lénine, la réflexion ne signifie pas le simple reflet du donné dans un certain moment. Dans ce qui existe l'homme voit non pas la simple existence de l'objet mais sa nécessité, son devenir.

En devançant la réalité, la prévision se rapporte à ce qui n'existe pas encore, mais reflétant la tendance, la nécessité, la loi du devenir, la prévision reflète, au fond, une caractéristique de l'existence.

Le fondement scientifique de ce devancement se trouve dans la manière dont le marxisme considère le développement de la réalité. Le mouvement des phénomènes rattache — par une chaîne dialectique de passages — le passé au présent et au futur. En connaissant ce mouvement l'homme peut apprendre non seulement comment a été la réalité et ce qu'elle est devenue, mais aussi le sens dans lequel elle évolue. Pour le matérialisme dialectique, dit Lénine, „le mouvement est à son tour envisagé du point de vue non seulement du passé, mais aussi de l'avenir. . .”<sup>5</sup>

Ainsi peut-on dire qu'au moyen de la connaissance, l'homme surprend la transformation ininterrompue du futur en présent et l'engendrement du futur par le présent. Ce qu'on préfigure existe en tant que potentiel, en tant que loi, et, par cela la prévision est une partie indissoluble de n'importe quelle connaissance scientifique.

Une seconde réponse touchant le rapport entre la prévision et la réalité a trait à *la valeur de vérité des prévisions*, à la possibilité d'établir le degré d'adéquation de la prognose à la réalité dans son continuel mouvement. Il s'agit de la manière dans laquelle on doit interpréter la thèse marxiste de *la pratique* comme critère suprême de la connaissance. En développant et en enrichissant la doctrine marxiste, Lénine a donné des indications d'une valeur particulière qui nous offrent la réponse aussi au problème essentiel de *la vérification dans la pratique de la prévision de la réalité*.

La possibilité d'établir le degré de véridicité bien avant la réalisation effective est d'une importance essentielle. Sinon, il signifierait qu'on ne saurait juger l'adéquation de la prévision à la réalité qu'alors qu'elle a cessé de constituer un acte anticipatif. Or, l'intérêt réside dans l'établissement de son degré de validité au cours de sa phase de *modèle* de la réalité future.

La solution est offerte par la compréhension dialectique de la vérification dans la pratique non pas en tant qu'acte singulier — le moment de la réalisation — mais en tant que processus qui inclut aussi bien la pratique antérieure, que celle ultérieure. Au cours de l'élaboration de la prévision, l'ensemble de concepts opérationnels dont la validité a été confirmée auparavant par la pratique offre un système de références.

<sup>5</sup> V. I. Lénine. Oeuvres. Paris — Moscou, 1958. v. 21, p. 70.



La concordance avec ce système (résultant d'une pratique antérieure) confère provisoirement à la prévision un certain degré de précision. La vérification au cours de la pratique ultérieure constitue le moment décisif, moment qui non seulement infirme ou confirme la prévision, mais la précise également et quelquefois la dépasse.

Par conséquent la prévision ne saurait se dispenser du critère de la pratique dans la vérification de sa valeur de vérité et, en plus, elle requiert une vérification continue et attentive, utilisant pas à pas, la pratique antérieure, et n'acquérant une vérification totale que par sa réalisation.

Ainsi sont mises en évidence les paroles de Lénine concernant la pratique socio-historique comme seul critère de l'authenticité et le critère de l'objectivité de la connaissance.<sup>6</sup>

Les modalités de connexion de la vérification non médiate avec celle médiate sont incontestablement variées, mais leur conjugaison est obligatoire, notamment dans l'élaboration des prospectives.

Par conséquent, un premier critère dont on doit tenir compte est la théorie sur laquelle s'appuie la prévision.

Lénine a souligné maintes fois le fait que la théorie révolutionnaire du prolétariat a — parmi tant d'autres — le grand mérite de nous préserver d'un „praticisme“ étroit, de l'empirisme aveugle. La grande importance du marxisme — pour la pratique ainsi que pour la théorie — réside dans le fait qu'il permet, sur la base de vérités fondamentales rigoureusement vérifiées, l'élaboration de prévisions. Le socialisme de Marx, dit Lénine, traitant de différents problèmes concrets les résout „... non seulement pour expliquer le passé, mais aussi pour prévoir hardiment l'avenir et entreprendre une action audacieuse en vue de sa réalisation“<sup>7</sup>.

Si la théorie est un premier niveau de vérification de la prévision, ceci ne diminue en rien le rôle fondamental de la pratique non médiate. La prévision marxiste-léniniste de la possibilité de la victoire de la révolution socialiste dans un seul pays d'abord, élaborée par Lénine avant la Révolution socialiste d'Octobre, s'appuyait sur la vie sociale, sur la pratique du mouvement révolutionnaire mondial du prolétariat et des peuples des pays coloniaux, sur les conditions créées au cours de la Première Guerre mondiale. Mais c'est la victoire de la Révolution socialiste d'Octobre qui a constitué la vérification suprême de cette prévision, en confirmant pleinement la théorie de Lénine.

Afin d'avoir une image des applications auxquelles aboutissent les indications léninistes dans les activités de sociologie projective il est nécessaire de rappeler tout d'abord *la vaste aire des domaines qui sollicitent l'apport de la prospective sociologique.*

Dans les conditions de la révolution scientifique et technique, sous l'action directe de l'industrialisation, la réalité de notre pays connaît un profond processus transformateur, à implications innovatrices dans la vie entière de la société.

Le concept qui synthétise aussi bien le but de notre étape actuelle, que le contenu des actions nécessaires en vue de sa réalisation, est le concept de développement multilatéral de notre pays. La valeur scientifique de ce concept réside, entre autres, dans sa capacité de refléter, d'un côté, la corrélation qui doit exister entre

<sup>6</sup> V. I. Lénine. Oeuvres. Paris — Moscou, 1958, v. 21, p. 70.

<sup>7</sup> Ibid., p. 68.



toutes les transformations qualitatives qui s'accompliront dans notre société, et, de l'autre côté, il permet d'avoir un modèle théorique — c'est-à-dire prévisionnel — de la future configuration de la Roumanie socialiste.

L'orientation projective de plus en plus marquée des recherches sociologiques dans notre pays permet d'accroître leur contribution au fondement scientifique des mesures de la direction prévisionnelle de la société.

Une énonciation sommaire de quelques préoccupations de la recherche sociologique roumaine est concluante en ce sens.

Citons, par exemple la connaissance des transformations qualitatives qui se produisent au niveau de la force de travail. Les transformations de la structure socio-professionnelle de la force de travail, le poids croissant du personnel de qualification supérieure, le profil et le niveau de la qualification sont dus — dans le contexte de la révolution scientifique et technique — à une multitude de facteurs, qu'on doit connaître afin de pouvoir prévoir les directions et les intensités des mutations professionnelles.

La détermination de la structure future de la force de travail, l'étude préalable des nécessités et des modalités de formation et de perfectionnement des cadres conformément aux exigences de notre société, s'inscrivent comme un élément de toute première importance dans l'action de planification sociale. En même temps, la connaissance de la situation actuelle et la prévision concernant la mobilité spatiale de la population active, avec des flux et les intensités différents entre les unités territorial-administratives, avec des implications qui vont du niveau des collectivités territoriales et des groupes de production jusqu'au groupe familial, contribuent au fondement de mesures d'une grande efficacité.

Depuis quelques années on effectue en Roumanie d'amples recherches visant la connaissance du processus d'urbanisation, afin de dégager des moyens d'optimisation de l'intégration urbaine des personnes arrivées du milieu rural.

L'accent de plus en plus marqué des préoccupations prévisionnelles dans l'étude du budget-temps a conduit dans les recherches entreprises à l'indication de nouveaux moyens d'accroissement du temps libre pour permettre aux salariés une meilleure formation professionnelle et culturelle et un rétablissement plus accompli de leurs forces physiques et intellectuelles en vue d'une participation plus efficace au processus de production, en complétant ainsi — en tant que modalité supplémentaire — les mesures prises dans le cadre de l'organisation scientifique de la production et du travail. Le pronostic du temps libre — problème d'une particulière actualité — ne se résume donc pas au seul côté quantitatif, mais vise à détacher les modalités de la valoriser, subordonnées au développement multilatéral de la personnalité. De cette manière, les prévisions dans le domaine du temps libre servent à l'élaboration des projets concernant les réseaux des services et l'ensemble des actions culturelles-éducatives.

En dehors de l'aire vaste de sollicitations auxquelles la prévision sociologique doit répondre, nous considérons utile de mettre en évidence aussi l'apport des sciences sociales à l'élaboration de concepts, qui, vérifiés dans la pratique, soient à même de contribuer au jugement — dès l'étape de l'élaboration de la prévision — de l'adéquation de cette dernière à la réalité, modalité essentielle — ainsi que nous avons vu — dans l'établissement de la validité des pronostics sociaux.

Un exemple peut être offert par les concepts d'ensembles fonctionnels, élaborés dans le cadre des recherches sociologiques effectuées en Roumanie, concernant le



développement systématisé des collectivités territoriales. La capacité opératoire qu'elles ont prouvée s'explique par leur valeur de refléter la réalité, par le degré dans lequel elles ont répondu aux exigences gnoseologiques indiquées par Lénine. Ces concepts réunissent des caractéristiques essentielles énoncées par Lénine en tant qu'éléments de la dialectique — tels la considération des interconditionnements et de la dynamique — tout en permettant une typologisation qui contribue à l'accomplissement des conditions nécessaires pour refléter adéquatement la réalité.

Ainsi, l'aire de convergence s'appuie sur les structures d'un certain territoire sur l'étude de la dynamique des fonctions des collectivités territoriales composantes (villages et villes dont les relations les rattachent d'une manière prédominante au même centre polarisateur).

La microrégion est, elle aussi, un concept opérationnel se basant sur l'examen des relations fonctionnelles entre les collectivités d'un territoire donné, à la différence que, si les aires de convergence représentent des ensembles existants, la microrégion est un ensemble préfiguré, en rapport avec une certaine intervention prévue (une grande investition industrielle, une importante construction hydro-énergétique, etc.).

Ces deux concepts se sont avérés utiles dans les perspectives concernant le développement des systèmes de localités, l'élaboration du profil socio-économique de perspective, l'établissement des réseaux futurs de services sociaux. Engendrés et vérifiés dans le cadre des activités d'aménagement du territoire, ils constituent des systèmes de référence utiles à la prospective par leur degré d'adéquation à la réalité, conféré par leur vérification au cours d'une pratique antérieure.

En ce qui concerne la *typologisation* des ensembles fonctionnels nous signalons sa contribution à l'accroissement des possibilités d'appréciation de la validité de la prospective dès l'étape de son élaboration. Compte tenu du fait qu'à chaque type correspondent certains comportements prévisibles (évidemment nuancés conformément à la structure entière des facteurs qui le conditionnent), les vérifications effectuées dans la pratique dans certains ensembles constituent des éléments de jugement et d'évaluation pour les prévisions faites pour des ensembles similaires.

Ce fait permet de mettre en évidence l'intérêt d'une connaissance complète, au moyen des études concrètes, de divers processus et phénomènes sociaux. Ce genre de connaissances, se fondant sur des études qui englobent systématiquement l'aire de processus et de phénomènes sociaux qu'il est nécessaire de diriger rationnellement, sont à même de constituer et d'enrichir graduellement un ensemble de concepts et de modèles de référence. Se trouvant à différentes phases d'application pratique, ceux-ci peuvent par la concordance ou la discordance entre ce qui a été prévu et ce qui a été réalisé — accomplir le rôle de vérification des autres prévisions, au cours même de l'étape de leur élaboration.

Ainsi, dans notre pays, les études d'après les types de collectivités territoriales (celles-là inclues dans le programme du Centre de recherches sociologiques concernant le développement corrélé du milieu urbain et rural) ainsi que les études suivant les stades de développement du processus d'urbanisation (dans le cadre de la chaire de sociologie et du laboratoire de l'enseignement sociologique) constituent quelques exemples de travaux dont les résultats contribuent à la réalisation de cet ensemble de connaissances nécessaire à la sociologie projective.

Les indications léninistes concernant la prévision sociale—fondement de la politique marxiste-léniniste du Parti Communiste Roumain, guide de son entière ac-



tivité d'édification de la société communiste — sont confirmées par les succès d'importance historique obtenus par le peuple roumain dans le développement de notre pays, succès qui reflètent la compréhension dialectique du mécanisme du progrès social, des corrélations — dans leur dynamique — existant entre ces différents domaines de la vie du pays qui ont subi de profondes transformations qualitatives dans le processus de la construction de la société socialiste développée harmonieuse.



## V. I. LENIN ON THE RELATIONSHIP OF GENERAL LAWS AND SPECIFIC FEATURES IN THE BUILDING OF SOCIALISM

N. V. PILIPENKO  
USSR

Social forecasting and planning are based on the knowledge of objective general laws of social development which are not displayed in a "pure" form, but in specific, historically conditioned ones.

The demonstration of the optimal forms of operation of the general laws of social development is the basic task of a genuinely scientific sociology.

Lenin's theoretical legacy in the field of sociology, namely his treatment of the problem of the correlation of general laws and specific features in the building of socialism, is of paramount importance for understanding these processes.

### I.

Following Marx, Lenin treated the evolution of human society as a natural historical process of emergence, development and change of socio-economic formations, where the development of countries that have reached the same stage of social advancement, is governed by laws common to them all. The most salient feature of Marxism is that it has studied not only the change but also the genesis and development of any socio-economic formation.

In the foreword to the first volume of *Capital* Karl Marx said that he illustrated his theoretical conclusions about the main features and laws of the origin and development of the capitalist mode of production mainly by British examples, Britain being the classical capitalist country of that period. But if the German reader were to claim that these features and laws did not apply to Germany, he could be answered: "Do te fabula narratur!"<sup>1</sup>

The main features and laws of development of the capitalist mode of production in Britain did, in fact, recur, in specific forms, in all other countries that later took to the capitalist road of development. Among these common features and laws were political power of the bourgeoisie, capitalist private ownership of means of production which conflicts with their social character, a system of exploitation of working people, economic crises, unemployment, etc.

<sup>1</sup> K. Marx. *Capital*. Progress Publishers. Moscow, 1965, p. 8.



General features and regularities inherent in capitalism are similar everywhere, whatever the specific features of emergence and development of capitalism in a given country, states the CPSU Programme.<sup>2</sup>

Socialism, as the first stage of the communist formation, also has its own inherent general (fundamental) laws that determine its emergence and development. The Programme of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union says that "the processes of the socialist revolution and socialist construction are based on a number of fundamental laws inherent in all the countries who take the socialist road."<sup>3</sup>

These laws, formulated and scientifically grounded by Lenin, and later elaborated in the programme documents of Marxist-Leninist parties and the international communist movement, encompass all spheres of social life — political, economic, ideological, etc.

In the *political sphere*, these fundamental laws are: the establishment of some form of the dictatorship of the proletariat, i. e., state guidance of socialist construction exercised by the working class led by the Marxist-Leninist party; the alliance of the working class with the peasant masses and all other strata of the working people; the abolition of the exploiting classes and national oppression, and the establishment of equality and friendship among the nations; the perfection of socialist democracy by the drawing of the millions strong masses into the administration of economic and cultural construction, of all public affairs; the consolidation of the socialist state and the defence of socialist achievements from the encroachments of external and internal enemies; the alliance with other socialist countries and progressive forces of the world in the struggle against imperialism, for socialism.

In the *economic sphere*, the fundamental laws include: socialization of the means of production and the consolidation of socialist productional relations and other social relations in town and countryside; planned development of the socialist economy; maximum improvement of living standards and well-being of the working people.

In the *ideological sphere*, the fundamental laws comprise: the carrying out of a cultural revolution aimed at advancement of public education, the creation of new, socialist culture and of numerous intelligentsia that is devoted to the working people, to the cause of socialism; the inculcation of scientific, communist outlook and morals among the masses of the people, the education of the masses in the spirit of socialist patriotism and proletarian internationalism; the tireless fight against bourgeois ideology and the overcoming of petty-bourgeoisie views and morals.

Naturally, a socialist society, like any other society, is a single, integral functioning organism, in which the political, ideological and economic spheres are closely interrelated. The singling out of the general laws of any of these spheres is of a purely methodological character. Depending on specific national and historical conditions, a certain field (political, economic or ideological) can become the leading one in society but, in the long run, the economic sphere remains the determining factor in relation to other social spheres.

These laws were borne out for the first time in history by the October Revolution and the building of a developed socialist society in the USSR, and later by the

<sup>2</sup> The Road to Communism. Documents of the 22nd CPSU Congress. Moscow, 1961, p. 451.

<sup>3</sup> Ibid., p. 465.



practice of socialist revolutions and socialist changes in other socialist countries. The universal character of the general laws of the emergence and development of socialism in different countries stems from objective causes. Socialist societies in different countries emerged in the course of socialist revolutions, as a result of the defeat of the capitalists and landlords; the building of socialism in these countries is part of a uniform revolutionary process of transition from capitalism to socialism taking place on an international scale; all socialist countries put into practice the general principles of the new social system more or less simultaneously; many of them had almost identical class structures; in the past, the same types of economic bases and superstructures.

## II.

Socialism, as a new social system, develops a simultaneous dialectic interaction of the general laws of socialist construction with the specific national features of a given country. In the same way as the general is revealed in the particular and by means of the particular, the general laws of socialist transformation of society are refracted through specific conditions and national distinctions of individual countries. Conversely, the latter can only be correctly controlled if the building of socialism is based on the general laws. The specific features of socialist construction in a country are actually an expression of the general laws of this process.

To determine correctly its political and tactical line every Communist Party, according to Lenin, must proceed from the knowledge of its country's objective reality at the same time taking into account the concrete historical conditions and by no means neglecting the general laws of the revolutionary process. "The unity of the international tactics of the communist working-class movement in all countries demands, not the elimination of variety or the suppression of national distinctions (which is a pipe dream at present), but the application of the *fundamental* principles of communism. . . , which will *correctly modify* these principles in certain *particulars*, correctly adapt and apply them to national and national-state distinctions."<sup>4</sup> Generally known is Lenin's proposition to the effect that all nations will inevitably arrive at socialism, but all will do so in not exactly the same way, each will contribute something of its own to some form of democracy, to some variety of the dictatorship of the proletariat, to the varying rate of socialist transformations of different aspects of social life.<sup>5</sup>

This is largely explained by the objective situations of different countries and nations who embark upon socialist construction in specific historical conditions, having different economic, political and cultural backgrounds, certain distinctions in the structure of social relations, specific national features, different correlations of class forces; unequal international statuses.

Demanding that both the general and the specific features, which predetermine the peculiarity of forms of transition to socialism, should be taken into account in the socio-economic and political development of individual countries, Lenin at the same time believed that the specific national features of this process can apply

<sup>4</sup> V. I. Lenin. Coll. Works. Moscow, v. 31, p. 92.  
<sup>5</sup> Ibid., v. 23, pp. 69-70.



only to what is of lesser importance and not to fundamental aspects, such as the general laws of the building of a new social system.<sup>6</sup>

Historical experience has shown that the building of socialism in different countries based on the general laws proceeds in different forms, involving the application of different methods and ways fitted to the concrete historical conditions and national distinctions of these countries, and in keeping with the international balance of forces.

In the USSR, for example, the dictatorship of the proletariat took the form of Soviets, in the East European countries the form of people's democracies. The socialization of the basic means of production, the cooperation of agriculture proceeded by various ways and means in the countries that entered the road of socialist development. In the Soviet Union, all enterprises belonging to the big and middle bourgeoisie and even to small proprietors were already nationalized in the first years of the socialist revolution. In the majority of the East European countries, only the property that had belonged to war criminals, traitors and the monopoly bourgeoisie was nationalized at the stage of the antifascist, national-democratic revolution. At the stage of the socialist revolution the nationalization was extended to enterprises belonging to the middle bourgeoisie because of the hostile attitude it had taken towards the system of people's democracy. As regards handicraft enterprises and small business (Hungary and Poland) and even the enterprises of the middle capitalists (GDR), they were not confiscated. In the USSR, the land is nationalized, it is the property of the whole of the people; in the European socialist countries, land was turned over directly to those who tilled it in the course of the land reform.

Lenin's cooperative plan was implemented in the Soviet Union by gradual transition from individual peasant farms to collective forms of agricultural production, and passed through the stage of selling and production cooperatives. In the process of the socialist transformation of the countryside the kulaks were abolished as a class. In a number of socialist countries, the cooperation of agriculture was marked by the fact that for a certain period the peasants were paid rent for the land and the implements which they had turned over to the farm cooperatives. In the Hungarian and Mongolian People's Republics, in the German Democratic and the Korean People's Democratic Republics, the kulaks were permitted to join farm cooperatives. In the Polish People's Republic, self-governed agricultural groups, which provide a framework for the peasants to organize some form of collective enterprise, have become widespread along with farm cooperatives.

These facts throw light upon the slanderous nature of the allegations of the bourgeois, right-wing socialist ideologists and revisionists to the effect that the USSR imposes its own method of passing over to the new social system, its own means and ways of building socialism on all countries who are building socialism, that it attempts to canonize uniformity.

The Marxists-Leninists are convinced that the future will bring a still greater variety of ways of transition to socialism, of methods of socialist construction, but only within the limits defined by the general laws of the new socio-economic formation. Marxist sociologists criticize both sociologists who deny the general laws and those who neglect the specific national features in the building of socialism. They agree

<sup>6</sup> V. I. Lenin. Coll. Works. Moscow, v. 30, p. 180.



with the Marxist-Leninist parties which hold that when determining the ways of transition to socialism for a country, the specific historical conditions and national distinctions as well as the general laws of building socialism confirmed by international experience should be taken into account. The International Meeting of Communist and Workers' Parties (1969) emphasized that "each party guided by the principles of Marxism-Leninism and in keeping with concrete national conditions, fully independently elaborates its own policy, determines the directions, forms and methods of struggle and, depending on the circumstances, chooses the peaceful or non-peaceful way of transition to socialism, and also the forms and methods of building socialism in its own country."

The study of the forms of manifestation of the general laws of socialist construction opens up a wide road for sociologists, because it is only on the basis of studying and comparing real facts with the objective requirements of social development that these forms can be modified by programming and planning.

The study of the possibilities of regulation and control of the forms for the purpose of creating conditions for a more free manifestations of the general laws is a basic task of Marxist-Leninist sociology.

Lenin's understanding of the correlation of general laws and specific national features in the building of socialism leads to the conclusion that it is necessary to distinguish between different levels in the sociological inquiry into the nature of new society.

When it is a question of enquiry into the general laws of the emergence and development of socialism as a new social system, then, it seems to us, we are concerned with the highest theoretical level of sociological knowledge; when we study the laws of functioning and development of specific systems of social relations, we deal with the medium level of sociological knowledge; but when the specific conditions of different countries are investigated, this is done at the empirical level of sociological knowledge, at the level of empirical generalizations.

### III.

The various differences that exist along with the fundamental common principles are made manifest not only in the forms and methods of socialist construction, but also in the distinctive features of socialist societies built up in different countries.

Socialist countries along with many common features have certain distinctions relating to their social-class and economic structure, the state-political system, the correlation of the forms of property (the property of the whole people and cooperative property), the forms of economic management, the methods of work of the party and state apparatus.

In some socialist countries the state-political system is based on the alliance of the Communist and other parties which form the backbone of patriotic associations such as the popular unity front, the national front and the patriotic front. These associations of all the progressive and democratic forces recognize the leading role of the working-class parties, because the working class is the vanguard force in the building of the new society, the carrier of the socialist mode of production and socialist ideology. The socialist countries of Eastern Europe have peculi-



arities in their election system, in their solution of the nationality question, in the work of the people's committees or councils.

Certain distinctive features are also to be found in the organization and administration of economic development. A variety of forms is used to enable the working people to take an active part in the management of production. In the USSR, there are permanent production conferences, Poland has workers' self-administration with conferences as administrative bodies, Bulgaria has economic committees, etc.

But although each socialist country has enriched practical experience with many specific features and peculiarities deriving from various stages of their development, these distinctions cannot be considered autonomously, divorced from the fundamental laws of the emergence and development of socialism as a uniform social system.

The socialist countries have the same principles, the same fundamental features in common. "They are," said L. I. Brezhnev, General Secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, in his report 'Lenin's Cause Lives on and Triumphs', "the power of the working people with the vanguard role exercised by the working class, and the leadership of social development provided by the Marxist-Leninist Party; public ownership of the means of production and, on its basis, the planned development of the national economy on the highest technological level for the benefit of the whole people, the implementation of the principle 'from each according to his ability, to each according to his work'; the education of the whole people in the spirit of the ideology of scientific communism, in a spirit of friendship with the peoples of the fraternal socialist countries and the working people of the whole world; and lastly, a foreign policy founded on the principles of proletarian, socialist internationalism." Without these features there can be no socialism.

The creative use of the general laws of socialist construction in individual countries with due regard to their specific national features contributes to the continued progress of the world socialist system as a whole and of every country in the system.

Standing on the hard ground of facts, one cannot deny today the great achievements made by the countries of the socialist camp. The share of the socialist community in the world industrial output grew from 20 per cent in 1959 to 40 per cent in 1969. The CMEA countries made especially good progress. In the past 10 years their national income grew by 93 per cent whereas in the developed capitalist countries it rose only by 63 per cent. The CMEA countries which occupy today 18 per cent of the world's area and comprise 10 per cent of the world's population, produced 31 per cent of the world industrial output. The level of production increased in these countries in 1970 as compared with 1950 by 6.8 times, whereas for the advanced capitalist countries this value is 2.8 only.

The socialist countries which have a homogeneous socio-economic system are linked together by their common destiny. They have one goal before them — to build a communist society, one ideology — Marxism-Leninism, one enemy — imperialism. They are interested in the mutual development of political, economic and cultural cooperation based on the principles of proletarian internationalism.

Political cooperation of the socialist countries guarantees to them national independence and state sovereignty, and provides the most favourable conditions for a successful realization of peaceful socialist construction plans, a further improvement and steady expansion of socialist democracy in every country.



Economic cooperation of these countries enables them to use most efficiently and fully both their natural resources and productive forces and the great advantages inherent in the world socialist system, thereby strengthening their economic might. This is largely achieved by coordination of their national economic plans, specialization and cooperation of production, socialist integration within the framework of the CMEA, a better utilization of the achievements of the contemporary scientific and technological revolution.

The cultural cooperation of the socialist countries enriches the spiritual life of their peoples, contributes to the rapid and all-round development of national cultures, science and technology, fosters the education of the working people in the spirit of a scientific Marxist-Leninist general outlook.

To change the balance of forces in the world arena, now growing in favour of socialism, the imperialists and their ideologists try to estrange the socialist countries and the countries leaning toward socialism. All means of ideological subversion are used in the attempt to whip up nationalistic sentiments and to bring into conflict the interests of different countries. In these subversive activities, great hope is set on the conception of "national models of socialism".

Of course, the modelling of social phenomena is quite a legitimate method of social study.

In contemporary science the concept "model" denotes a system of relationships of different aspects, features, functions, etc. of a phenomenon or a process, expressed in an abstract theoretical or a mathematical form. If this concept is applied to socialism as a relatively extended phase of communist society, it can be used as an operational instrument for realizing the common goals that society is faced with — the building of communism with due regard to the distinctive features of a given country.

Revisionists use the concept "model of socialism" in the meaning of a theoretical scheme, a model, on the basis of which one can subjectively alter social relations.

With the help of the conception of "national models of socialism" some western ideologists and revisionists attempt to justify the theory of pluralism, of the "plurality" of socialism, which implies that every country must allegedly have its own "national socialism" that differs in its form of realization from the scientific socialism of Marx, Engels and Lenin.

The advocates of the division of socialism into various national "models" try to persuade the communist parties that they should guide themselves in revolutionary struggle by limited national principles, that they should refuse to recognize the general laws and ignore the experience of the USSR and the other countries in the building of socialism. It can easily be seen that the reduction of socialist transformations merely to the national distinctions of development of individual countries is contrary to the objective requirements of development of socialism in the world and to the national interest of these countries, and eventually leads to nationalism. This is done to divert the communist and working-class movement from the revolutionary road and to turn it to the road of class cooperation with the bourgeoisie and reformism. The so-called models of "democratic socialism", "market socialism", "humane socialism", "cybernetic socialism" and so forth, have nothing in common with socialism since they are actually directed against the new social system, theoretically supporting either the restoration of capitalism



in the socialist countries or the "eternal" preservation of capitalism, the passing off from capitalism to socialism as is done by the Labour Party in Britain and the Social Democrats in Sweden. Neither nationalism, in whatever form, nor national nihilism are compatible with socialism. There can be no "national socialism", whether Russian, Chinese, British, Yugoslav, French, Italian, Czechoslovak, or any other.

All true Marxist-Leninists resolutely set their face against attempts to "divide" socialism, to distort Lenin's principle of correlation of the international and the national aspects. The Communist and Workers' Parties take the view that international and universal elements do not contradict distinctive national elements, but are actually linked up with each other.

"Each Communist Party is responsible for its activities to its working class and the people and at the same time to the international working class," said the International Communist Conference, "the national and international responsibilities of every Communist and Workers' Party are inseparable. The Marxists-Leninists are at once patriots and internationalists, they reject national narrow-mindedness, the denial or underestimation of national interests and the tendency for hegemonism."

Lenin's understanding of the problem of the relationship of general laws and specific features in the building of socialism can be of great practical value for developing countries, and first of all, for countries which have taken the non-capitalist road of development, which gives them their chance to abolish backwardness inherited from the colonial past and to create conditions for a transition to socialist society.



## V. I. LENIN ON SCIENTIFIC ADMINISTRATION OF SOCIALIST SOCIETY

V. G. AFANASIEV

USSR

Much has been said of Lenin, mainly he has been spoken of as outstanding political thinker and revolutionary, as the architect of a new socialist society. In this report we would like to show his importance as a theoretician and practician of *organization* and *administration*.

\*

It is hardly necessary to say how prominent problems of industrial management and public administration have become today. This is due to several causes: the increased complexity of production, of public life in general, the unprecedented growth of the amount of information needed for finding one's bearings in the modern world, for influencing it in accordance with one's interests. Among these causes the foremost is the modern *scientific-technological* revolution.

The scientific-technological revolution has aggravated the differentiation of production into branches specialized in the production of certain kinds of goods. In the face of this differentiation and an ever increasing number of branches there also mounts the role of interbranch communication, organization and coordination of the functions and the development of individual branches. This can be provided by centralized management of the national economy. Moreover, the scientific-technological revolution has brought to life such branches of industry, science and technology (atomic energetics, rocket technology, space research and so on) that can only be organized and developed by integration and concentration on a national and even on an international levels of the necessary technologic means and raw materials which should require the joint efforts of large teams of scientists, engineers, technicians and organizers. The scale, complexity, intensity and pace of technological advance are constantly growing. The same is true of the rhythm of production and the development and frequency of industrial communications. The volume of information grows beyond precedent; time needed for its processing and utilization is reduced; greater demands are made on economic decisions; scientific validity, timing and precision become more important. Unity of technological development policy, management of science, education, the mass media, the armed forces all call, as well, for centralized action.

The scientific-technological revolution has deep and varied social and political implications which place a greater demand in social control. On the socio-



political level the scientific-technological revolution implies transformation of human relations, new complexity and variety of human contact, displacement of large masses of people, changes in occupational structure, in labour, in everyday life, in ways of thinking, in demands and interests. New occupations keep emerging, old ones die off, present ones get changed, the skill of workers gets more refined, and greater demands are made on their specialized and general training. Administrative bodies are called upon to take account of the socio-political implications of the scientific-technological revolution. And it is no accident, therefore, that governments of developed capitalist countries turn to state-monopolistic programming, to regulating the national economy, which is closely connected with socio-political regulation, with control over people's behaviour and way of thinking.

The tendency towards state-political planning and regulation was revealed by V. I. Lenin at the end of the last century. "The socialization of labour by capital," he wrote, "has advanced so far that even bourgeois literature loudly proclaims the necessity of the planned organization of the national economy."<sup>1</sup> At the same time Lenin stressed that truly scientific, all-embracing planning even on the level of a trust or a branch of industry let alone on that of the general system of production, is not even worth mentioning under conditions of capitalism. Later Lenin fought against attempts to equate capitalism with socialism, to prove that capitalism can grow into socialism on grounds that it concentrates property and practises partial planning and regulation of the national economy. Lenin rejected as inadmissible the assertion that state-monopolistic capitalism was already something different from capitalism, that it was in fact "state socialism" and so on. Despite the mentioned peculiarities of imperialism, "we still remain under *capitalism* — at its new stage it is true, but still capitalism, without a doubt," wrote V. I. Lenin.<sup>2</sup>

The intervention of the modern capitalist state in economic matters is always conducted on a level and in forms that answer the economic and socio-political purposes of monopolistic capital. Quite naturally this intervention doesn't change the nature of society, on the contrary, it is aimed at preserving and consolidating it. This intervention is incapable of containing the spontaneous forces of market competition, but can only hasten or hold up these spontaneous processes.

Almost none of the capitalist states managed to avoid after the Second World War considerable fluctuations of the business cycle and slumps in the economy; high rates of growth of production in different countries are at certain periods followed by low rates, and even by decrease of production. Chronic undercapacity operation of industry, mass unemployment, acute financial and currency crises, all this befalls separate countries and whole groups of countries. As regards socio-political regulation, plans of organizing "human relations", in a society of "free enterprise", they failed to live up to their promise; the struggle of working people against the monopolies is still on the rise, so is the national liberation movement.

Capitalism is incapable of organizing scientific management of the national economy as a whole, or scientific administration of society as a whole. The cause lies in the economic and socio-political organization of capitalism, which is based on private ownership. The latter constantly gives rise to the spontaneous forces of the market, which are not to be controlled even by means of the most perfect social institutions.

<sup>1</sup> V. I. Lenin. Coll. Works, vol. I, p. 446, Moscow, 1963-1969.

<sup>2</sup> Ibid., vol. 25, p. 443.



\*

"Socialism alone," wrote V. I. Lenin, "will make possible the wide expansion of social production and distribution on scientific lines and their actual subordination to the aim of easing the lives of the working people and of improving their welfare as much as possible."<sup>3</sup>

In a socialist society owing to the dominance of public ownership, the spontaneous forces of the market, anarchy and competition, which is the main regulator of the economy and of public life in general under capitalism, cease to play a decisive role, which is played instead by the *subjective factor* — the conscious and planned activities of people, of the system of governmental and public organizations led by the communist party. The spontaneous forces of the market, anarchy and competition are replaced by scientific, planned and organized management. No, this doesn't at all mean that the market under socialism has completely lost its regulating role. But here market relations are used within the framework of planned management. One of the most important objectives of the economic reform, being carried out in the USSR and other socialist countries, is precisely the one of using the market and commodity relations more effectively in the management of the economy.

The objective basis for the scientific administration of a socialist society is provided by public socialist ownership (property). It called into being the law of the planned and proportional advance (movement) of the economy of society as a whole, which enables administrative bodies to coordinate the operations of all the parts of the socialist organism, to mobilize the masses for action, to concentrate enormous material, labour and financial resources for the achievement of goals set by society. And this planned and proportional movement is not confined to the economy but extends to the totality of social relations. "... We now," wrote V. I. Lenin, "have an opportunity which rarely occurs in history of ascertaining the period necessary for bringing about radical social changes. . ."<sup>4</sup> Socialism thus enlarges the boundaries of scientific administration to the dimensions of a whole society. They include administration of all spheres of public life — the production, socio-political, spiritual — of society as a whole.

Following K. Marx, Lenin insisted on marking a distinction between technico-organizational and socio-economic aspects (they are often called functions) of industrial management, and administration of society divided into classes. The technico-organizational aspect ensues from the very nature of all social labour, which is a general form of human interaction with nature with the purpose of winning means for living. This aspect of management is more or less rigidly "anchored" to engineering and technology, which directly determine the quantity and quality of labour operations, their combination (their coordination and sequence in each specific kind of work, the quantity and quality of people, performing these operations, the placement of these people, their interaction, communications between different departments of enterprises, between different branches of industry, between material and technical supplies as well as between production and transport and so on).

<sup>3</sup> V. I. Lenin. Coll. Works, vol. 27, p. 411.

<sup>4</sup> Ibid., vol. 33, p. 483.



The second aspect is concerned with the socio-economic side of administration. It indicates the economic basis, the property basis from which administration is carried out. It indicates the class (or classes) that implements the administration as well as methods used and interests pursued. Being determined by the level and character of technological development the technico-organizational aspect of administration depends substantially on the social and economic system of society. At the same time the technico-organizational aspect maintains a certain degree of independence. It is of a similar nature in opposing social systems; this makes possible an exchange of experience in this field, an adoption of useful foreign practices, of course, with their preliminary adaptation to the socio-political nature and goals of socialism.

V. I. Lenin gave classical illuminations of the scientific and at the same time of the class socio-political approach to capitalist systems of management, in particular to that of F. Taylor.

Lenin's assessment of this system is in fact his program for development of the management of socialist production, of the administration of a socialist society seen as a combination of the Soviet system and Soviet achievements in the science of management with those of foreign countries. V. I. Lenin recommended to borrow from capitalist experience in management provided it was stripped of its class, bourgeois nature and applied in accordance with the conditions of functioning and development of socialism.

"... The possibility of building socialism," wrote Lenin, "depends exactly upon our success in combining the Soviet power and the Soviet organization of administration with the up-to-date achievements of capitalism."<sup>5</sup>

The most important part of scientific administration is the administration of people, of human collectives. People are the main component of social systems at any level of organization. The development of society is essentially made up of the actions of millions and millions of people, depending on the degree to which they are trained, well placed and capable of effective cooperation. It is worth noting that administration in a socialist society should not be confused with a control function executed by private owners over working people; it takes the form, primarily, of a rational organization of economic activities, human labour, social activities, of inculcation of the lofty ideals of the new society. Administration in a class society is in essence socio-political. This kind of administration controls relations between various human groupings (classes, social groups, nations, national minorities, collectives and so on), as well as relations within these groupings.

Under conditions of socialism the guided social development of labour collectives acquires particular importance. This is because the success of the cause, the fulfilment of plans of social development depends to a great extent on the improvement of relations within collectives, on how health "the social microclimate" in labour collectives is.

The object of the socio-political administration of a socialist society is the overcoming of social differences, the attainment of social homogeneity, the transformation of state administration into public communist self-government.

<sup>5</sup> V. I. Lenin. Coll. Works, vol. 27, p. 259.



...<sup>\*</sup>

V. I. Lenin is legitimately regarded as the founder of the theory and the scientific system of guided construction of socialism, of administration of a socialist society, of communist construction. He worked out the principles for scientific administration: democratic centralism, that makes possible the combination of centralized, planned administration with democracy in the broadest sense; the principle of objectivity, that demands taking into account the objective laws of administration and progressive tendencies of social development; the principle of concreteness, that demands taking into account the concrete historical situation, actual opportunities; the principle of stimulation, the efficient use of which makes it possible to take account of and to integrate the interests of different classes and social groups, of society, of the collective and the individual and others.

The most important of Lenin's principles for administration is that of *democratic centralism*. This principle implies intergration of democratism, i. e., the power of the working people, their widely spread initiative and responsibility, the electivity of administrative bodies and leading administrators, their accountability to the masses, with centralized control executed from a single centre; it implies the subordination of the minority to the majority, strict discipline.

Democratic centralism makes possible the combination of the administration of society as a whole with the administration of separate parts of the social system—various spheres of public life, districts, enterprises, collectives and so on.

Decisive in the relations of centralism and democracy is democracy, due regard to local conditions, which, according to Lenin, is the rational basis of social work, the development of mass initiative, extensive use of the experience of the masses. "...There can be no victorious socialism," wrote Lenin, "that doesn't practise full democracy."<sup>6</sup>

V. I. Lenin is the founder of the administrative system of socialist society, its socio-political organization—the most democratic system that has ever been known in the history of mankind.

Representatives of the former ruling classes always preached the idea that workers and peasants are incapable of administering the State, that administration is the business of a select few, that only a society of "free enterprise" is capable of controlling social processes.

Historical experience, however, has born out how deeply right Lenin was when he wrote: "We achieved victory with the aid of light cavalry, but we also have heavy artillery. We achieved victory by means of suppression, we shall be able to achieve victory also by methods of administration."<sup>7</sup> For this Lenin thought it was necessary to teach administration to millions and millions of workers.

The Soviet socialist system of administration provides for the broad participation of the masses in the administration of the State, of society. It changes millions and millions of workers, peasants and intellectuals from passive objects of politics into active subjects, creators of politics, that solve crucial problems of social development.

<sup>6</sup> V. I. Lenin. Coll. Works, vol. 22, p. 144.

<sup>7</sup> Ibid., vol. 27, p. 247.



Millions of people actively assist in the drafting of laws and reforms and in the taking of the most important decisions. Tens of millions of people took part in the discussion of the directives of the five-year plan of the economic development of the USSR in 1966-1970. A nation-wide discussion preceded the passing of the Law on Marriage and Family, of the Land Law, of the Model Regulations of a Kolkhoz. Working people are entrusted with the control over the activities of Soviet, economic and public organizations. Bodies of Public Control are staffed by nearly 7 million people.

The highest degree of democracy in the Soviet Union finds its embodiment in the Soviets of Deputies of Working People. They comprise two million deputies, among whom a million and a quarter are workers and peasants. The Soviets are assisted in their work by 25 million activists, who on a social basis help administrative bodies to carry out the business of government. Mass social organizations, such as trade unions, the Komsomol and others, are taking a more and more active part in administration.

Socialist democracy is permanently developing and perfecting itself. The work of a commission that is to make alterations and additional amendments to the Soviet Constitution will soon be at an end. These alterations and additional amendments are aimed at developing the constitutional guaranties of the basic rights and liberties of the Soviet people, at improving the electoral system, and thereby enlarging the participation of working people, of collectives and public organizations in administration.

The development of socialist democracy will eventually lead to the transformation of State administration into public self-government. The Soviet will wither away. But this will only take place in developed communist society, which will take a lot of time and effort to build.



## LA PENSÉE POLITIQUE DE V. I. LÉNINE ET LA VIE SOCIALE CONTEMPORAINE

PETRU PÎNZARU  
ROUMANIE

L'œuvre, la vie et la personnalité de Lénine sont caractérisées par un trait distinctif, universellement reconnu: c'est *la création, l'esprit novateur*.

Tout acte de création, d'autant plus s'il est profondément révolutionnaire, suppose un triple rapport à établir: face aux valeurs héritées des prédécesseurs, face aux données précises de la réalité contemporaine, face à l'avenir.

Lénine a adopté à l'égard de l'œuvre de ses grands prédécesseurs et inspirateurs, Marx et Engels, une attitude strictement scientifique, c'est-à-dire créatrice: „Nous ne tenons nullement la doctrine de Marx pour quelque chose d'achevé et d'intangible; au contraire, nous sommes persuadés qu'elle a seulement posé les pierres angulaires de la science que les socialistes *doivent* faire progresser dans toutes les directions s'ils ne veulent pas retarder sur la vie.“<sup>1</sup>

La réalité sociale dans laquelle il vécut fut le principal facteur dynamique ayant propulsé la pensée créatrice de Lénine; cette réalité avait revêtu des caractères distinctifs essentiellement nouveaux par rapport à l'époque où pensèrent et créèrent Marx et Engels. Le principe méthodologique fondamental qui a guidé Lénine tout au long de sa prodigieuse activité théorique et partique a été celui: „... tenir compte de la vie, des faits précis de la réalité, et non se cramponner à la théorie d'hier qui, comme toute théorie, est tout au plus capable d'indiquer l'essentiel, le général, de fournir une idée approchée de la complexité de la vie.“<sup>2</sup>

Dans l'œuvre théorique de Lénine, dans les positions idéologiques et politiques et dans les solutions qu'il a élaborées — en respectant l'esprit de la pensée et de la méthode dialectique de Marx et d'Engels, — on sent vibrer la vie et les événements de l'époque où il a vécu, travaillé et lutté; on y trouve cristallisés en une synthèse originale aussi bien les éléments dérivant des lois générales de la révolution et de l'édification socialiste, que ceux qui reflètent les particularités spécifiques au cadre social-historique, idéologique et culturel de la période respective.

Un exemple des plus stimulants est offert par la manière dont Lénine a su étudier et synthétiser successivement sous le rapport théorique — avec la lucidité et le sens-critique d'un véritable homme de science et d'un vrai révolutionnaire — les réalités sociales concrètes de son époque dans leurs dimensions contradictoires, l'influence de la technique, de la science, de l'art, de la culture, exercée sur la dynamique

<sup>1</sup> V. I. Lénine. Oeuvres. Paris — Moscou, 1958, IV, p. 217—218.

<sup>2</sup> Ibid., XXIV, p. 35.



sociale, l'expérience des luttes de classe, des mouvements socio-politiques et des courants idéologiques de son temps. Tout comme Marx, Lénine n'a pas hésité à abandonner des thèses qui ont été dépassées par la vie, en les remplaçant par d'autres thèses nouvelles, capables de refléter, d'expliquer et de prévoir les transformations essentielles de la société.

Lénine a contribué à l'évolution de la théorie du socialisme scientifique, théorie en son essence critique et révolutionnaire, et qui porte à juste titre le nom de *marxisme-léninisme*. Par leur contenu théorique et politique révolutionnaire, par leur capacité de généraliser les données de la réalité sociale en perpétuelle évolution et d'orienter de façon prospective l'activité pratique des communistes, le marxisme et le léninisme — qui constituent un tout indissoluble — revêtent un caractère profondément universel, une importance internationale.

Le centième anniversaire de la naissance de Lénine a présenté une bonne occasion pour examiner dans un esprit marxiste-léniniste les réalités sociales et politiques contemporaines qui sont d'une complexité et d'un dynamisme incontestablement inconnus durant les premières décennies de notre siècle.

A l'heure actuelle la conception sociologique marxiste-léniniste s'impose comme principale force motrice d'une vision dynamique, qualitative, révolutionnaire sur les changements sociaux contemporains non seulement sous le rapport théorique et méthodologique, mais aussi sous l'aspect d'une expérience social pratique, diversifiée et significative. La base théorique et méthodologique stable et inépuisable d'une telle vision se trouve représentée par la pensée matérialiste-dialectique et historique, située à une période d'activité créatrice impérieuse sous le rapport de l'expérience et des connaissances si richement accumulées ces dernières décennies, mais surtout face aux nouvelles réalités économiques sociales, politiques, technico-scientifiques et culturelles qui offrent un tableau et un répertoire de problèmes totalement inédits.

L'un des éléments essentiels définissant le tableau du monde contemporain est constitué par le fait que non moins de 14 pays du monde, où vit un tiers de la population de trois continents, se sont engagés dans une nouvelle voie — la voie du socialisme et du communisme, que les tâches d'édification du nouveau régime s'accomplissent dans les conditions d'une grande diversité et dans des formes variées, qui correspondent au stade de développement et aux particularités de chacun des différents pays. Dans le monde de nos jours, la classe ouvrière a vu grossir ses rangs et elle a acquis un rôle toujours plus important dans le développement social: les détachements d'avant-garde du prolétariat — les partis communistes et ouvriers — ont considérablement augmenté leur influence politique. Le mouvement communiste et ouvrier s'est enrichi de nouvelles formes et méthodes de lutte révolutionnaire. Un gigantesque mouvement de réveil national des peuples s'est déclenché; le système colonial de l'impérialisme s'est désagrégé sous les coups des mouvements de libération nationale; des dizaines d'Etats nouveaux ont surgi sur les ruines des anciens empires coloniaux. De profondes mutations se sont également produites dans la structure sociale, dans le rôle de l'Etat, dans les rapports de classes. De nouvelles forces sociales — la paysannerie, les couches moyennes de la population, de larges milieux de l'intelligentsia, les femmes, la jeune génération — se sont engagées dans la lutte contre les monopoles et l'impérialisme, pour le progrès et la défense de la paix. Ainsi sont créées de nouvelles prémisses objectives pour la liquidation de la société capitaliste et la construction d'un type moderne de société socialiste.



Il convient de signaler aussi que la révolution scientifique et technique mondiale, l'impressionnant progrès des connaissances humaines ont d'amples implications dans tous les domaines de l'existence matérielle et spirituelle de l'humanité.

C'est pourquoi, dans les conditions du monde contemporain, la qualité de marxiste-léniniste implique plus que jamais le désir et la capacité d'aborder avec courage, sans idées préconçues, les nouvelles réalités et tirer toutes les conclusions qui s'en dégagent pour la lutte révolutionnaire. Ainsi seulement les parties communistes pourront tirer profit de la doctrine marxiste pour résoudre les tâches historiques qui leur incombent. Ainsi seulement on pourra surmonter les tendances à la stagnation, stimuler la pensée révolutionnaire, assurer, dans les conditions actuelles, le développement du marxisme-léninisme afin qu'il s'affirme comme la véritable force motrice de la transformation de la société.<sup>3</sup>

Pour les penseurs marxistes, la compréhension et l'explication scientifique des réalités socio-politiques, économiques, culturelles, scientifiques du monde contemporain ne constituent pas un simple divertissement intellectuel ou une chose facultative, mais bien une obligation et une nécessité vitales, tant d'ordre scientifique, idéologique et politique, que pratique en vue de l'élaboration de la stratégie et de la tactique révolutionnaires. Les valeurs inestimables de la conception générale marxiste-léniniste ne sont décelées qu'en la présence d'une pensée dialectique, lucide et responsable qui, ne se considérant pas en elle-même comme infaillible, ne s'attribue pas par anticipation des fonctions apologetiques de conjoncture ou pragmatiques d'„emphasis“ idéologique, mais s'engage avec fermeté à accomplir ce qu'il a d'essentiel dans la théorie et l'action révolutionnaires: la création, la promotion, la défense avec conviction des valeurs théoriques, politiques, idéologiques, philosophiques et éthiques qui puissent servir directement à la victoire de la classe ouvrière, du socialisme et du communisme, à la défaite des forces de l'impérialisme et de la réaction.

En partant d'une part de la complexité et de la richesse des thèmes envisagés par la pensée marxiste-léniniste contemporaine et, d'autre part, du fait historique fondamental — que le socialisme est devenu de nos jours non seulement un projet théorique mais aussi une réalité sociale concrète irréversible — bien qu'évidemment perfectible, — on aboutit à la conclusion que le développement incessant de la théorie révolutionnaire ne peut être que le fruit de la pensée collective du mouvement communiste et ouvrier dans son ensemble, de la généralisation de l'expérience des peuples de tous les pays socialistes, des masses laborieuses, des forces anti-impérialistes de partout, des penseurs progressistes de tous les coins du monde.

La seule voie qui peut faire découvrir, développer et confirmer les vérités du marxisme-léninisme, c'est la pratique sociale révolutionnaire des masses, c'est la stimulation et l'ample déroulement des discussions scientifiques, idéologiques de principe. Dans le mouvement communiste et ouvrier, les débats se déployant dans un climat d'estime et de respect réciproque offrent la possibilité d'une confrontation ouverte des points de vue, de la connaissance réciproque d'expérience dans l'activité politique, pratique et théorique, de la réalisation de l'unité d'action.

En même temps, la force de l'influence qu'exerce le marxisme-léninisme, l'affirmation de sa supériorité idéologique sont réalisées par le contact étroit avec la

<sup>3</sup> Nicolae Ceaușescu. L'édification de la société socialiste, article paru dans «La nouvelle revue internationale — Problèmes de la paix et du socialisme», No. 6, 1970.



vie spirituelle contemporaine, par le continuel développement du dialogue avec divers courants d'idées, par la critique incisive des idées réactionnaires, fidéistes, anticommunistes. L'activité entière des classiques a démontré que tout enkystement ou isolement théorique sont étrangers à l'esprit vraiment scientifique du marxisme-léninisme. Dans le contexte, il nous faut faire une distinction nette entre les idéologues anticommunistes, représentant des cercles impérialistes agressifs, et les idéologues non-marxistes, aux conceptions progressistes, démocratiques même si celles-ci expriment certaines opinions avec lesquelles nous ne pouvons être d'accord et que nous devons combattre. Une telle attitude différenciée dans le cadre de la lutte idéologique contemporaine peut contribuer à l'encouragement des forces progressistes, à leur rapprochement des idées du marxisme-léninisme et à la transformation de ces forces en alliés contre les forces impérialistes et anticommunistes. Certes, le dialogue fertile et ample de la théorie marxiste-léniniste avec les autres courants idéologiques actuels ne saurait conduire à des concessions envers la pensée bourgeoise, à la tolérance à l'égard de l'anticommunisme. L'essence et le but de ce dialogue résident dans une affirmation encore plus prononcée de l'esprit combatif, de l'esprit de parti de notre idéologie, de son caractère militant, dans une action persévérante continue, visant à démasquer et à vaincre au point de vue idéologique les courants anticommunistes. Il s'impose que de tels objectifs, destinés aussi bien à combattre les théories anticommunistes qu'à éclaircir les problèmes soulevés par les penseurs progressistes non-marxistes, soient réalisés par la voie d'une riche argumentation théorique et pratique qui puisse mettre en relief d'une manière convaincante que seul le marxisme-léninisme est en mesure de guider l'humanité dans la solution des problèmes fondamentaux de la société.

Le champ de la pensée politique de Lénine renferme tout un ensemble de problèmes et de catégories essentielles des sciences sociales et politiques; ce sont les organisations et les institutions auxquelles revient le rôle prépondérant de l'activité politique, à savoir: *les parties politiques* et *les Etats nationaux* en relation inséparable avec la structure économique, sociale et de classe qui engendre et conditionne leur évolution et leur destin historique, avec les valeurs et les normes idéologiques, politiques, juridiques, philosophiques et éthiques qu'ils affirment; les formes de communauté humaine essentielles du type de *la nation* ayant des caractéristiques, des intérêts, des attributs et des fonctions sociales et culturelles spécifiques; des formes d'association socio-professionnelle (syndicats, organisations publiques ne relevant pas de l'Etat, etc.); les problèmes des alliés de la classe ouvrière dans la révolution et la construction socialiste; les formes de participation active, démocratique des masses à la direction de la vie sociale.

En avertissant contre toute confusion de la dialectique matérialiste-historique avec l'éclectisme „mort et dénué de contenu“, avec le relativisme sceptique ayant sa source dans „le penchant vers une pratique étroite et l'ignorance à l'égard de la théorie“, Lénine a recommandé avec insistance de prendre toujours en considération l'interaction dialectique entre objectif et subjectif, économique et politique, spontané et organisé, idéologique et psychologique. C'est d'une manière tout à fait particulière que Lénine a insisté sur la nécessité qu'il y a, dans l'abord et la solution théorique et pratique des problèmes de la révolution et de la construction du socialisme, que les communistes se guident selon le principe de l'unité dialectique objective entre général et particulier, entre le côté national et le côté international de la lutte de classe du prolétariat, sans rendre métaphysiquement absolue ou subor-



donnée, d'après des critères pragmatiques, l'une de ces catégories essentielles de la science et de la pratique politique marxiste-léniniste.

Lénine a conçu d'une manière profonde et il a affirmé en toute clarté que le général n'existe que dans le particulier, par le particulier; tout particulier est (d'une manière ou d'une autre) général. Il a compris que les particularités nationales, économiques, socio-politiques, culturelles, psychologiques représentent, dans le processus de la révolution et de la construction socialiste, non pas un simple „détail“, un „pli“ ou une „charpie“ dans le tissu des événements historiques, mais la forme vivante, concrète, authentique dans laquelle *s'incorporent, se manifestent et en même temps s'enrichissent* les lois générales, objectives du développement social.

Les divers stades du développement socio-économique d'où sont partis les pays socialistes, leurs nombreuses particularités spécifiques ont engendré une grande variété dans les voies d'accomplissement des tâches de la révolution et de l'édification socialiste. On a pu vérifier par l'expérience d'un grand nombre d'Etats que dans la révolution et la construction socialiste *le général et le particulier constituent une unité dialectique indestructible.*

Il y a de même une unité dialectique et une interdépendance organique entre les intérêts nationaux et les intérêts internationaux de la classe ouvrière, de socialisme, intérêts qu'on ne peut en aucun cas opposer les uns aux autres. L'unique perspective et la solution juste vraiment marxiste-léniniste de ce problème, est la promotion de l'*unité, l'association harmonieuse* entre les intérêts nationaux et les intérêts internationaux de la classe ouvrière, le respect ferme des principes concernant les relations entre les pays socialistes, entre les partis communistes et ouvriers, tels que: l'égalité en droits, l'indépendance et la souveraineté, la non-ingérence dans les affaires intérieures, la solidarité internationaliste.

L'unité entre le national et l'international devient un facteur décisif pour le développement avec plein succès de l'édification du socialisme et du communisme. En se libérant soi-même, en devenant la classe dirigeante de la société, la classe ouvrière délivre de l'exploitation et de l'oppression toutes les catégories sociales, elle devient le représentant de la nation entière. Dans ces circonstances, le parti communiste, en remplissant le rôle de force dirigeante de la société, représente de la manière la plus fidèle les intérêts de la nation socialiste.

Ouvrant à l'édification avec plein succès du socialisme en Roumanie, en apportant sa contribution au renforcement de l'unité et à l'accroissement du prestige du système mondial socialiste en son ensemble, le Parti communiste roumain associe dans son entière activité les intérêts nationaux du peuple roumain à l'internationalisme prolétarien, il remplit aussi bien ses devoirs nationaux que le devoir international.

Au centre de l'activité théorique, politique, pratique, idéologique et d'éducation en Roumanie, se trouve l'objectif du perfectionnement des relations socialistes de production, de l'organisation et de la direction de la vie sociale dans son ensemble, et des relations existant entre les gens.

En établissant, sur la base d'une analyse profonde et au cours de débats publics, l'objectif de la création de la société socialiste de façon multilatérale et complète, le X<sup>e</sup> Congrès du P. C. R. (1969) est parti de la prémisse léniniste selon laquelle le nouveau système social ne pourrait naître ni se constituer *d'un coup*, sous une forme *parachevée*, mais que „le socialisme cache en soi de gigantesques forces“, représentant



réellement „un nouveau stade de développement qui offre de très brillantes possibilités“.<sup>4</sup> La réalisation *intégrale* de ces possibilités, de tous les aspects particuliers qui définissent la société socialiste et peuvent en faire un système social à *tous points de vue* supérieur à la société capitaliste, représente objectivement un processus dont les étapes à parcourir réclament de gros efforts matériels et spirituels, d'organisation et d'éducation, imposent de surmonter maintes difficultés et contradictions inhérentes, ainsi que d'éliminer les conséquences de certaines erreurs ayant un caractère subjectif.

Autant inopérantes sont — croyons-nous — les images sur la société socialiste contemporaine qui simplifient, qui rendent idyllique ou qui sont vulgairement apologétiques, autant stérile s'avère le renoncement aux critères que le marxisme même a introduits dans l'appréciation de l'essence d'un régime social.

Nous sommes d'avis que dans un contexte social-historique bien déterminé, le concept de société socialiste développée de façon multilatérale et l'action créatrice pour accomplir pas à pas ses objectifs économiques, politiques, sociaux et humains, répondent positivement et d'une manière constructive à des problèmes majeurs avec lesquels sont confrontés dans le monde contemporain la théorie et la pratique politique marxiste-léniniste. Le *perfectionnement* de toute la vie sociale dans la société socialiste fait partie intégrante de ce concept et de cette action.

Dans notre pays la caractéristique essentielle de ce processus consiste dans le fait que l'action de perfectionnement n'est pas partielle ou fragmentaire, mais elle embrasse le *système social dans son ensemble*, tous les éléments de la base et de la superstructure, elle est accomplie avec la participation toujours plus large de toutes les catégories de citoyens et en base de la mise en valeur tant des conquêtes scientifiques modernes que de l'expérience propre et de celle acquise sur le plan international. Par exemple, le perfectionnement de la planification, de la direction et de l'organisation de l'économie nationale (dont les orientations fondamentales furent établies après une large consultation avec les spécialistes et les masses, par la Conférence Nationale du P. C. R. de 1967 et par le X<sup>e</sup> Congrès) n'a pas le caractère de conjoncture, mais „il s'encadre dans un processus permanent impliquant l'étude systématique des phénomènes nouveaux qui surgissent en économie, l'examen critique de l'expérience propre ainsi que la connaissance de l'expérience d'autres pays socialistes, l'assimilation des conquêtes acquises sur le plan mondial dans le domaine de la science et de la technique, de la direction et de l'organisation“<sup>5</sup>.

Parmi les éléments essentiels constitutifs du processus de réalisation des objectifs spécifiques de la société socialiste harmonieusement développée s'inscrit la transformation des masses productrices, objet de l'acte de direction, en sujet-participant à l'œuvre de décision et de gestion à tous les niveaux nationaux — central et local. Un tel processus comporte une double détermination, à savoir: 1) la situation nouvelle du producteur qui, en plus de la qualité d'engagé détient aussi celle de possesseur des moyens de production, de co-participant aux responsabilités visant la gestion des biens; 2) les lois internes de la société socialiste permettant l'auto-développement et l'auto-perfectionnement sur la voie de la valorisation intégrale du potentiel humain d'intelligence, d'habileté, de puissance de création, d'initiative, de dévouement, de discipline, sur la voie de l'*association* du co-intéressement ma-

<sup>4</sup> V. I. Lénine. Oeuvres choisies. III, p. 811.

<sup>5</sup> Le X<sup>e</sup> Congrès du P. C. R., Ed. Politica, Bucarest, 1969, p. 114.



tériel avec les stimulants moraux, des intérêts personnels avec les intérêts sociaux, de l'exercice tant du contrôle social d'en haut que du contrôle social d'en bas. On poursuit d'une manière de plus en plus conséquente qu'une pareille caractéristique fondamentale du nouveau système social puisse se manifester concrètement dans le mode entier d'organisation et de déroulement de la vie économique, en assurant des conditions toujours meilleures pour que les citoyens puissent exprimer sans entraves leur avis sur la manière dont sont conduites les affaires du pays, critiquer les défauts, rendre responsables ceux qui font preuve de négligence, d'insouciance et d'incapacité dans l'administration des biens publics.

Dans le problème fondamental de la participation, la société socialiste peut affirmer sa profonde originalité.

En Roumanie, il est donné un cours décisif au développement de la démocratie économique, on fait participer de plus en plus activement les masses à l'élaboration et à l'application des décisions et des mesures les plus importantes. On a ainsi constitué dans les entreprises des comités de direction — organes de gestion collective dont font partie aussi bien des cadres dirigeants que des délégués des syndicats et des représentants élus des salariés; on a institué l'assemblée générale du personnel des entreprises, en tant que forum collectif où sont débattus et analysés les problèmes économiques, et devant lequel la direction de l'unité est tenue de présenter périodiquement des comptes rendus de son activité, de répondre du mode dont elle assure le développement de la production, ainsi que le bon emploi des fonds matériels et des ressources financières.

La lutte contre les phénomènes de bureaucratie, de stagnation, d'irresponsabilité et de manque d'initiative que peut engendrer le centralisme excessif est partie intégrante des efforts déployés pour perfectionner l'activité de direction de l'économie et de toute la vie sociale. On a adopté et on adopte encore des mesures tendant à assurer une organisation judicieuse et à améliorer le style de travail de l'appareil d'Etat, à rapprocher les organismes centraux de l'activité économique, à rationaliser le travail de direction et de gestion, à renforcer le contrôle de l'opinion publique sur l'activité des organes d'Etat à tous les niveaux.

En plaçant au centre de ses préoccupations le perfectionnement de tout l'ensemble d'institutions, de relations et d'activités qui constituent le contenu essentiel de notre régime social, notre Parti œuvre dans l'esprit des idées toujours vivantes de Lénine, assurant ainsi le caractère irréversible de la construction du socialisme en Roumanie, l'accélération du rythme de son développement — dans le cadre de la famille des peuples socialistes frères — sur la voie du communisme



## REALIZATION OF LENIN'S IDEA ABOUT MONGOLIA'S TRANSITION TO SOCIALISM BY-PASSING CAPITALISM

CH. DJUGDER  
MONGOLIA

Karl Marx and Friedrich Engels previsioned the possibility of an accelerated non-capitalist development of economically backward nations after the victory of the socialist revolution in the developed part in the world.<sup>1</sup>

V. I. Lenin creatively explored this idea with reference to specific historical conditions of different countries and characterized the various forms of this transition. The non-capitalist development derives its forms from the specific combinations of external and internal conditions of the revolutionary process in given countries. While, in the external aspect, aid to backward nations which have entered upon the high road of revolutionary renovation by a country where socialism has triumphed is an imperative condition, the purposeful activity of the revolutionary government and the revolutionary democratic parties intent on the formation of new social relations must be an indispensable internal prerequisite for choosing, and later successfully advancing along, a non-capitalist road.

In this connection we should look to the remarks Lenin made during his talk in 1921 with a delegation of the Mongolian People's Republic. At that time Mongolia was virtually at the feudal stage of development, there was almost no working class, and the arats (peasants) made up an overwhelming majority of the population. Lenin believed that Mongolia could embark upon a non-capitalist road of development in the absence of the guiding role of the proletariat and its Communist Party, provided the Soviet Union rendered her assistance.

In Mongolia, said Lenin, the main condition of following a non-capitalist road of development was "hard work on the part of the People's Revolutionary Party and the Government, so that this work and the increased influence of the number of co-operatives, in the introduction of new forms of economic activity and national culture, would rally the arats behind the Party and the Government in the interests of the country's economic and cultural development. It was only from the islets of the new economic way of life created by the efforts of the Party and the Government that the new non-capitalist economic system of arat Mongolia would take shape."<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> K. Marx and F. Engels. *The Communist Manifesto. Principles of Communism*, Modern Reader Paperbacks. N.Y. and London, 1968, p. 78; K. Marx and F. Engels. *On Colonialism*. Moscow. Progress Publishers, 1965, p. 73-74.

<sup>2</sup> V. I. Lenin. *Coll. Works*. V. 42, p. 361.



The non-capitalist road of development is a transient stage, a step from feudal backwardness to socialist construction.

During the non-capitalist period of development, said Lenin, "the revolutionaries will have to put in a good deal of work in developing state, economic and cultural activities before the herdsman elements become a proletarian mass, which may eventually help to "transform the People's Revolutionary Party into a Communist Party."

Lenin thought that the transition from the non-capitalist stage to socialist construction was possible only under the conditions of the dictatorship of the proletariat and its revolutionary, in substance Communist, party.

It must be noted that Lenin mentioned a "new non-capitalist economic system" in Mongolia. The non-capitalist period in Mongolia was preparing the socialist stage of revolutionary changes by creating objective and subjective conditions for passing over to socialism, embracing a fairly long span of time in the history of development of the Mongolian revolution.

Lenin saw the historical mission of the non-capitalist road of development in the fact that for the backward nations in our epoch this path was the alternative to capitalism, that the non-capitalist period in the history of the revolutionary development of these nations was creating material and spiritual prerequisites for their forthcoming transition to socialism, the prerequisites which capitalism had created in the West. The non-capitalist road was a special accelerated new form of historical progress of the backward colonial and dependent countries which include the majority of the world's population.

The historical experience of Mongolia and other countries has confirmed the validity of the theory of non-capitalist road of development for formerly backward nations.

After winning political independence the People's Revolutionary Party and the Government were confronted with a difficult and complex problem: what path should be followed in developing further the revolution?

The people's state inherited from old Mongolia an extremely backward and ruined economy with extensive nomadic animal husbandry as its main branch. Predatory foreign capital which dominated the Mongolian market and economy had a pernicious effect on the growth of the productive forces in the country. The secular and ecclesiastical overlords who possessed a substantial portion of the national wealth, livestock, and enjoyed hereditary rights and privileges, continued to exploit the arats. Apart from political and economic enslavement, the masses of the people suffered from ignorance and lack of culture and were strongly influenced by the Lamaist religion.

From its first days the people's government took measures to carry out revolutionary reforms in order to destroy the political and economic foundations of feudalism. The feudal rights and privileges were abolished, serfdom and the feudal tax system were cancelled, the debts to foreign merchants and usurers were annulled, a state control system was introduced in commerce and finance.

A major revolutionary change that made for the growth of political activity of the working people was the abolition of local feudal administration and its replacement by democratic organs elected by the people. The people's khurals (assemblies) that came into being in the course of the revolution were a variety of Soviets of the peasants, Soviets of the exploited, the possibility and expediency of whose establishing in pre-capitalist countries was repeatedly stressed by Lenin.



As a result of the revolutionary reforms implemented during the first years of people's government Mongolia reached a frontier where the further path of national development had to be selected. Life put before us the question: which path should be followed further? Should we proceed along the old capitalist road with its constant concomitants — crises, unemployment, uncertainty of the future, a glaringly unequal distribution of wealth among members of society and political inequality? Or, should we march along a new way, without the "blood and filth, poverty and humiliation"?

Guided by the teaching of the great Lenin about the possibility of transition of backward nations to socialism by-passing the capitalist stage of development, Mongolia succeeded in formulating clearly and distinctly her position on the prospects of development of the revolution. The 3rd Congress of the Mongolian People's Revolutionary Party (MPRP) held in 1924 outlined the general policy of the party aimed at national development along the non-capitalist path. The 4th MPRP Congress (1925) elaborated the specific programme of work for the implementation of this party policy.

The main factor which made possible and expedient Mongolia's development along the non-capitalist lines was that the Mongolian people carried out their revolution under new historical conditions opened by the Great October Socialist Revolution, that they built up and consolidated the people's democratic state and relied in their struggle on the all-round aid and support of the USSR.

What is the essence of the processes that go to make the non-capitalist development of a country? In the economic field the main thing was to abolish the economic power of the feudal lords for the sake of the working arats and to eliminate the country's economic dependence on foreign capital. The characteristic features of the initial period were the development of private economic initiative of small-holding arats, while the emergent capitalist elements were restricted and pushed out, and also the development of the socialist way of life in the shape of state enterprises in industry, agriculture and transport and a state credit-financial and trading system.

In the political field, the Mongolian road of non-capitalist development meant the abolition of the feudal class, the emergence of the working class (new in Mongolia) and also of the people's intelligentsia, the strengthening of the people's state as a revolutionary-democratic dictatorship of the working peasantry and gradual outgrowth into organs of power performing the functions of the dictatorship of the proletariat, the development of a genuinely socialist democracy.

The spiritual life of society made progress according as the dominance of the Lamaist Church was undermined, the people were set free from religious prejudices, the cultural revolution which brought the achievements of contemporary science and culture within the reach of the broad masses of the working people was launched, and socialist ideology was being spread among the working people.

Outside capital represented by rapacious foreign traders and users was a serious obstacle to the development of the productive forces of the country. At the democratic stage of the revolution it was therefore restricted at first and then pushed out entirely from the national economy. Of great importance in the struggle against outside capital was the establishment of a state monopoly on foreign trade. A decisive role in the conquest and strengthening of economic independence of people's Mongolia was played by the organization, with Soviet aid, of consum-



ers' cooperatives, a state finance-credit and commercial system, the introduction of a national currency, the building-up and development of a state-owned and cooperative industry, of modern transport and communications. The concentration of key economic positions in the hands of the state created conditions for undermining the economic power of the feudal lords, and also for restricting and pushing out the emerging capitalist elements. A major conquest of the popular revolution was the opening of a broad access to culture and science for the working people, the establishment and development of public education and health, revolutionary literature and art.

The MPRP conducted a sustained and difficult fight against the dominance of the Lamaist Church in the economic and spiritual life of society. Having proclaimed the disestablishment of the church and freedom of religion, the party has, since the first years of the revolution, implemented a system of major measures to attract all working people (irrespective of their religious beliefs) to the construction of a new life, to isolate the counter-revolutionary upper crust of the clergy from its lower and middle strata, to undermine the forces and influence of the church. Thanks to the flexible and consistent party policy, the popularization of scientific knowledge and a steady development of economy and culture, the clergy, in essence a parasitic institution, broke up organizationally whereas the basic mass of lamas who comprised nearly a half of the male population of the country left the lamaseries and joined in socially useful work. This fact had a great positive effect upon the subsequent development of the country.

The accomplishment of far-reaching socio-economic reforms brought about crucial changes in the class structure of society. The abolition of serfdom and feudal practices converted the emancipated arat herdsmen into free commodity producers. The overwhelming majority of them gradually reached the status of middle peasants owing to the fact that the party pursued a class policy with respect to the different strata of the arats rendering aid and support, first and foremost, to farm hands and poor arats, and also because it encouraged private economic initiative of the arats in order to help them overcome the subsistence economy level and become commodity producers. On the basis of consistent anti-feudal measures which ended up with the expropriation of feudal property, the feudal class was finally wiped out. In the course of the establishment and development of new economy and culture there emerged a working class and people's intelligentsia. The working class and the working arat masses formed an alliance thereby providing the political basis for a people's democracy. The revolutionary-democratic state of the working people of Mongolia, a variety of the revolutionary-democratic dictatorship of the working class and peasantry, gradually grew over into the working-class dictatorship.

By 1940 Mongolia had completed the first stage of the people's revolution in the main and entered a period of gradual development of the democratic revolution into socialist. At the socialist stage of the revolution the Mongolian people consolidated the socialist way of life that came into being at the democratic stage, the state and cooperative economic sectors, their development on the basis of long-range planning and the use of economic laws of socialism. The industrialization of the key branches of production, the building up of new sectors of socialist industry and their steadfast growth, the development of modern transportation and communication facilities, all these measures taken with the decisive economic and



technical assistance of the Soviet Union in collaboration with other socialist countries served to convert Mongolia from an agrarian into an agrarian-industrial country.

The Mongolian People's Republic successfully solved a most difficult and complex task of socialist upbuilding the cooperation of arat farms on the socialist lines. Conditions for the victory of socialism in the countryside were prepared by the formidable efforts of the party to develop farm co-operatives, to provide them with new equipment, to support the endeavour of the arat farms to increase the head of livestock, and also by rendering state aid to farm co-operatives and by forcing out the exploiting elements. The change over of agriculture to the socialist principles of economy culminated at the end of the '50s with massive voluntary joining of the arats in farm co-operatives. It must be noted that the cooperation was carried out without dispossessing the exploiting rural elements who voluntarily became members of the farm co-operatives. The socialist remodeling of agriculture accelerated the development of its productive forces and provided a firm basis for a rapid rise of culture and living standards among rural workers.

With the successful completion of the cooperation of arat farms the multi-structural economy was finally brought to an end and a single socialist national economic system established. The socialist relations of production triumphed in all sectors of the national economy, and the socialist ownership of the means of production became a firm economic basis of society.

The far-reaching economic changes were attended by a great cultural advancement of the working people. The development of public health service and the steady rise of the material and cultural welfare of the people have opened the way to a constant improvement of people's health, a growth of the birth rate and average length of life.

The triumph of socialist relations of production in the economy fully eliminated intrinsic socio-economic condition for the restoration of exploiting society and put an end forever to the causes which give rise to the exploitation of man by man. Mongolian society today consists of two friendly classes: the working class, the leading force of society and the cooperated peasantry, and it also includes the people's intelligentsia. The community of the two forms of socialist ownership raised the alliance between the working class and the cooperated peasantry to a new level and led to a moral and political consolidation of the whole people.

Socialist ideology has become the mainstay of the Mongolian people's spiritual life; the unswerving growth of socialist consciousness among the working people generates extensive labour activity, creative initiative and mass emulation.

Socialism has brought true democracy which ensures to the working people, regardless of their social position and nationality, the right of taking an active part in running the state, in solving all matters of state, economic and cultural construction. The socialist state not only proclaims political freedoms and social rights of the working people but also guarantees their practical realization.

Mongolia has accomplished the historical transition from feudalism by-passing capitalism. The essence of all the changes that have taken place on the Mongolian soil is that socialism has become here a reality, that it has triumphed completely and forever, we did not allow capitalism to our land closing the door of our country to it for good.



Mongolian experience has brilliantly confirmed in practice the truth of the Marxist-Leninist teaching about the possibility for backward countries to pass over to socialism by-passing the capitalist stage of development. It is only following this path that the peoples who have thrown off the colonial yoke can most rapidly and painlessly overcome their age-old backwardness and poverty and perform the switch-over to democracy and socialism. The preparation of conditions to ensure the transition from feudalism to socialism is impossible without implementing deep-going anti-feudal and anti-capitalist socio-economic reforms. Some of the most important prerequisites of non-capitalist development are the strengthening of national independence and the ensurance of economic independence of the country by forcing out predatory foreign capital, building up and developing modern industry and transport, and the state and cooperative economic sectors, and also the restriction and pushing out of emergent capitalist elements, the formation of the working class and the people's intelligentsia, and the carrying out of the cultural revolution.

The experience of non-capitalist development of the Mongolian People's Republic, where under the guidance of the Marxist-Leninist party the democratic stage of the revolution developed into the socialist stage, has shown that the general laws of the socialist revolution and socialist construction also operate in the formerly backward countries. But in each country which is moving over to socialism from pre-capitalist socio-economic formations, these laws are manifested peculiarly, in keeping with the specific conditions of its development.

Mongolian experience has demonstrated that the tasks of national and social liberation of the nations can be successfully solved only in a close alliance with the international working-class movement under the conditions of fraternal solidarity of the working people of all the countries. Friendship and all-round cooperation with the first socialist country, its versatile assistance proved to be the decisive factor in winning and strengthening the freedom and independence of the Mongolian people, in overcoming the centuries-old backwardness of the country and building up a new life.

The history of the Mongolian People's Republic shows that nationalism and nationalist vestiges were the main ideological root of distortions of the general party line and attacks upon its unity at the different stages of the revolution. If the party had not waged a determined struggle against the influences of this reactionary ideology, the latter could have led to the weakening and disruption of Mongolia's contacts with international socialism and hence to the loss of revolutionary conquests.

The experience of the Mongolian People's Revolutionary Party testifies that in the underdeveloped countries the revolutionary-democratic parties of the peasantry and the intelligentsia that is associated with it can, in close contact and cooperation with the international communist movement, grasp the ideas of scientific socialism and become a Marxist-Leninist vanguard of the working people in the fight for socialism.

The Mongolian People's Revolutionary Party has brought the Mongolian people to historic victories owing to its selfless loyalty to Marxism-Leninism and creative application of its theses to the specific conditions of Mongolia, thanks to its irreconcilable struggle against any manifestations of views alien to Marxism-Leninism and the education of the working people in the spirit of communist ideas, in the spirit of socialist patriotism and proletarian internationalism.



## LA DOCTRINE LÉNINISTE DE L'IMPÉRIALISME EN TANT QUE CONCEPTION SOCIOLOGIQUE D'ENSEMBLE DU DÉVELOPPEMENT DE LA SOCIÉTÉ

TONTCHO TRENDAFILOV  
BULGARIE

Le léninisme est le marxisme du vingtième siècle. Et malgré cela nous ne pouvons pas imaginer le marxisme révolutionnaire de notre siècle, nous ne pouvons pas nous orienter dans les phénomènes et les processus complexes caractérisant la dynamique des systèmes sociaux rivalisant entre eux et les perspectives de leur développement, sans la connaissance de l'analyse léniniste de l'impérialisme en tant que stade particulier du développement du capitalisme. Ayant assimilé l'esprit révolutionnaire et non pas la lettre du marxisme, Vladimir Ilitch Lénine avait réussi comme aucun autre à créer, sur la base d'un immense matériel statistique et une critique précise de tout ce qui existe dans la littérature sur les problèmes de l'impérialisme, dans le véritable sens du mot un nouveau chapitre du „Capital“ de Marx, chapitre dans lequel il continue à analyser brillamment le capitalisme conformément aux conditions du vingtième siècle et en plein accord avec l'esprit et la méthode de Marx et Engels.

La théorie de l'impérialisme a élevé à un niveau beaucoup plus haut toute la théorie marxiste de la nature, des conformités et des tendances du développement du capitalisme contemporain. Ce n'est pas un ordinaire schéma économique scientifique privé, ni même une „conception purement économique“ limitée, mais bien une *doctrine totale de l'époque de l'impérialisme*, élaborée entièrement dans l'esprit du système largement répandu aujourd'hui de comportement dans la sociologie.

Personne autre que Lénine n'a pas traité dans notre siècle la question de la spécificité des relations sociales dans les conditions de l'impérialisme, entièrement dans l'esprit du comportement systématique propre au marxisme. Tous ceux qui connaissent bien la nature et l'évolution du marxisme comprennent très bien que les bases de la méthode systématique et structurale sont posées par les classiques du marxisme. En se conformant à l'esprit des traditions marxistes-engélistes, Lénine rejeta successivement la sociologisation étroite et bornée à partir des positions de la métaphysique et de l'antihistorisme. Déjà dans un de ses premiers ouvrages, tels que „Qu'est-ce que représentent les „amis du peuple“ et comment combattent-ils contre les social-démocrates“ Lénine défendait, en accord avec la méthode systématique, la conception marxiste dialectico-matérialiste du processus historique. Il montrait de manière convaincante comment Marx avait élaboré la théorie stric-



tement scientifique de la société, en „liquidant les conceptions de la société en tant qu'agrégat mécanique d'individus“<sup>1</sup>.

Avec l'aide de la formation socio-économique, signifiant „un ensemble de rapports de production déterminés“ pris en unité organique avec la „superstructure bourgeoise. . . avec les relations familiales bourgeoises“, etc., Lénine développe en pratique et de manière autonome les fondements de l'analyse sociologique du processus socio-historique à partir des positions de la conception marxiste du rôle des rapports de production en tant que „squelette“ de toute „la structure sociale“ — conceptions devenus élémentaires dans la science sociologique contemporaine, mais utilisées pour la première fois dans l'analyse scientifique par les classiques du marxisme-léninisme et surtout par Lénine dans son analyse des changements intervenus dans la structure de la société capitaliste à la fin du siècle dernier et le début de notre siècle.

Dans un autre ouvrage — „Le contenu économique du populisme“ — Lénine écrit: „Tout système de rapports de production est, selon la théorie de Marx, un organisme social particulier, possédant ses propres lois spécifiques, son propre fonctionnement et transition vers une forme supérieure, la transformation en un autre organisme social.“<sup>2</sup> C'est justement ici que Lénine emploie à plus d'une reprise et dans le sens pleinement contemporaine du mot, les notions „structure économique“ et „superstructure politique“, en soulignant immuablement la nécessité d'un comportement plural et sociologique envers les phénomènes sociaux, les dégâts causés par la schématisation, la simplification et la métaphysique. Et c'est précisément ce comportement envers le développement de la société que Lénine applique en suivant la méthode de Marx et Engels dans le „Développement du capitalisme en Russie“, afin d'illustrer, d'après ses propres paroles, „le processus de développement du capitalisme en Russie dans son intégrité“.

Il est intéressant, que c'est justement cet aspect de la méthode marxiste-léniniste pour l'analyse de la vie sociale qui fut oubliée et intentionnellement sous-estimée par des marxistes et des non-marxistes dans une telle mesure, que c'est seulement après la parution du livre de Louis Althusser et Balibar „En lisant le „Capital“<sup>3</sup> que l'on commença subitement à dire que ce livre découvre le comportement systématique de Marx! . . .

Vladimir Ilitch Lénine ne connaissait pas seulement, il défendait aussi et enrichissait brillamment et de manière créatrice le comportement systématique en tant qu'appartenant à la méthode marxiste de penser. Il soulignait „la condition inconditionnelle de la théorie marxiste lors de l'analyse de n'importe quelle question sociale, son examen dans un cadre historique *déterminé* (souligné par Lénine — T. T.), après quoi, s'il est question d'un pays déterminé — on analyse des particularités distinguant ce pays des autres dans le *cadre d'une même époque historique*“<sup>4</sup> (souligné par moi — T. T.).

C'est justement le comportement sociologique envers les processus et les phénomènes du développement de la société qui a conduit Lénine à la compréhension de l'immense importance gnoséologique et pratique immédiate de la question des

<sup>1</sup> В. И. Ленин. Полн. собр. соч. Т. 1. с. 429.

<sup>2</sup> Ibid.

<sup>3</sup> L. Althusser, J. Balibar. Lire le «Capital».

<sup>4</sup> В. И. Ленин. ПСС. Т. 25. с. 263—264.



traits et des particularités de l'époque. Il utilise largement *la notion époque* et élucide pleinement son importance cognitivo-théorique, méthodologique et pratique.

La notion d'époque, dans l'idée que Lénine lui donne, a une importance spécifique abstraite et logique, omnithéorique et richement concrète-pratique et fonctionnelle-sociologique. Lénine voit en général dans l'époque la caractéristique d'une étape historique déterminée dans le développement de la société en tant qu'ensemble, qui se distingue par une disposition déterminée des forces de classe, une certaine intensité donnée des contradictions extérieures (exogènes) et intérieures (endogènes), sous l'influence desquelles se développe le processus socio-historique et chacun de ses sous-systèmes. „L'époque, écrit Lénine, est appelée ainsi, parce qu'elle englobe un ensemble de divers phénomènes et de guerres, tant typiques, aussi bien grandes que petites, propres aux pays avancés qu'aux pays arriérés.“<sup>5</sup>

Examinée dans un tel vaste plan, l'époque s'avère être dans son ensemble la définition fonctionnelle et structurale de l'ambiance dans laquelle on résout l'une ou l'autre question. C'est justement dans ce sens que le terme d'époque s'avère être beaucoup plus vaste que la formation socio-économique et considérablement plus riche qu'elle. De cela découle aussi sa grande importance cognitive et révolutionnaire-pratique. Ce n'est pas un fait fortuit que c'est justement des positions de la connaissance profondément scientifique des traits et des particularités caractéristiques de l'époque de l'impérialisme, que Lénine édifia la nouvelle théorie de la révolution socialiste et prouva de manière scientifique la possibilité pour le socialisme de vaincre dans un pays donné.

La doctrine de l'époque donne le cadre concret-historique, les contours les plus généraux du processus historique, pris dans son ensemble, en tant que processus mondial-historique et de toute l'humanité. Elle est complétée favorablement par l'attitude sociologique envers le processus et les phénomènes qui s'opèrent au sein de la société concrète. Cette analyse est l'autre face du comportement systématique de Lénine. Elle combine brillamment l'analyse organique de la dynamique de la formation socio-économique avec celle de l'époque. Les ouvrages de Lénine attestent la maîtrise de la perception de la dynamique des processus sociaux, le désir de leur donner la classification et la périodisation les plus précises, tant dans le cadre de la formation qu'en tenant compte des particularités de l'époque. Dans tout cela il n'y a pas un gramme d'utopisme, de réformisme affecté ou de „systématique“ de fin à soi, que Lénine ironise et raille caustiquement.<sup>6</sup>

Par la théorie de l'impérialisme Vladimir Ilitch établit un comportement philosophico-économique et pansociologique envers la dynamique interne du système capitaliste, qui exclut la „haute théorie“ de fin à soi, la pose affectée avec la phrase hautement scientifique et les termes piquants. Il établit la clarté dans le style et la présentation des problèmes et raille caustiquement la coquetterie avec le „langage des volailles“ (en utilisant le terme que Herzen donne à ce genre de „style scientifique“). En citant la définition de Souvorov, selon laquelle „les forces productrices des gens forment une graduation génétique“, Lénine énumère encore toute une série de „truismes“ pour terminer son commentaire ainsi: „Cela n'est pas l'exposé de Marx, mais la pollution du marxisme par des incroyables ordures

<sup>5</sup> В. И. Ленин. ПСС. Т. 30. с. 86—87.

<sup>6</sup> Ibid., t. 28. p. 31, 49, 300.



verbales.<sup>7</sup> Et pourtant ces ordures verbales se sont tellement accrues à notre époque? Elles sont devenues un tel danger pour la science! . . .

Le critère léniniste de la grande érudition de Mikhaïlovski et de Kovalevski est parfaitement applicable aussi aux engouements à la mode pour le „scientisme“, surtout pour quelques-unes des ses formes caricaturales, que nous trouvons dans les ouvrages, par exemple, de Parsons et de quelques-uns de ses disciples. On connaît les appréciations du feu Wright-Mills du style de Parsons en tant que „magnifique labyrinthe qui attire justement par la très fréquente superbe absence de sens“. Après une analyse détaillée des textes de Parsons, Wright-Mills aboutit à la conclusion: „Près de la moitié de la „haute théorie“ n'est qu'une vaine accumulation de mots, dont 40% empruntés aux manuels de sociologie et seulement 10% peuvent trouver, bien que de façon assez nébuleuse, une certaine application idéologique.“<sup>8</sup>

L'analyse concrète sociologique des changements intervenus au sein de la société capitaliste et l'étude attentive des plus récents processus et phénomènes de l'économie capitaliste des années de la Première Guerre mondiale ont permis à Lénine d'édifier une conception d'ensemble de l'évolution de la structure capitaliste et de ses particularités. En prouvant bien avant les économistes bourgeois la banqueroute de la concurrence libre et sa transformation en son opposé — le monopole, Lénine a élucidé le plus pleinement possible la nature du capitalisme monopoliste, les tendances de son développement et sa substance politique et idéologique. Il rejette résolument l'opinion que la révolution représente une certaine sortie du système de l'état d'équilibre. Selon Lénine, préparée par tout le développement précédent du système capitaliste, la révolution socialiste est la forme naturelle pour la solution des contradictions de ce système, en tant qu'acte conforme de la transition de la société d'un état qualitatif à l'autre. C'est justement pour cela que l'analyse systématique de l'impérialisme est examinée par Lénine en tant que critique généralisée de la réalité capitaliste — critique basée sur les positions de l'analyse strictement scientifique, et non pas par les moyens du réformisme intentionnel. L'esprit critique et le caractère polémique de l'économie politique, de la sociologie et de la gnoséologie sont expliqués par Lénine par des raisons venant de la logique interne de ces sciences et non pas par le „caractère polémique“ de la réalité sociale elle-même, de la vie elle-même.

Novatrice et progressivement scientifique, la théorie léniniste de l'impérialisme généralise tous les phénomènes d'une certaine importance de la structure capitaliste du début du siècle. Elle donne la réponse aux questions fondamentales que la banqueroute de la concurrence libre et l'aggravation de la crise du système capitaliste — sortie par les lois de son propre développement de l'état de l'équilibre spontané, soutenu par les moyens du mécanisme du marché, posent dans des formes fortement simplifiées à l'esprit de l'homme à la pensée critique. Cette théorie bat cruellement toutes les formes libéralo-réformistes et quasi-marxistes d'idéalisation de l'impérialisme.

Personne autre au début du siècle n'avait réussi à élucider les racines de classe et gnoseologiques du „passage généralisé de toutes les classes aisées du côté de l'impérialisme“ et de „son embellissement le plus divers“<sup>9</sup>, sa défense sans appel, non

<sup>7</sup> В. И. Ленин. ПСС. Т. 18, с. 3.

<sup>8</sup> C. Wright-Mills. *Sociological Imagination*. N. Y. 1951, p. 26, 27, 49.

<sup>9</sup> В. И. Ленин. ПСС. Т. 27, с. 407.



pas seulement par les théoriciens directement liés au capital **monopoliste**, mais aussi par des „marxistes orthodoxes“ tels que Hilferding et Kautsky. . . En analysant en détails les aspects des changements structureaux introduits par la transition de la concurrence libre vers le capitalisme monopoliste, Lénine avait prévu plusieurs dizaines d'années à l'avance les nouvelles formes de la défense idéologique de l'impérialisme, défense au cours de laquelle l'idéalisation du système est liée à des projets tels que la surveillance policière sur les trusts et les banques. Lénine souligne la rareté des „impérialistes cyniques, sincères, qui ont le courage de reconnaître l'absurdité de la pensée visant la réforme des propriétés fondamentales de l'impérialisme“<sup>10</sup>. A notre époque ce trait de l'idéologie de l'impérialisme est tellement développé que l'idéalisation de l'impérialisme est déjà camouflée par le „semi-marxisme“, la „renovation et le développement“ du marxisme par la „pluralisation“ du marxisme, par le „dédéologisation“ et même par la recherche opiniâtre de „nouveaux modèles de socialisme“.

Combien contemporaines sont aujourd'hui les pensées de Lénine, selon lesquelles si la principale „particularité politique de l'impérialisme signifiait la réaction sur toutes les lignes“<sup>11</sup>, sa défense s'opère toujours et en même temps sous des prétextes spéciaux de hauts idéaux humanitaires. Pour cette raison il considèrerait que la question: est-il possible de réformer les propriétés fondamentales de l'impérialisme „est une question fondamentale de la critique de l'impérialisme“<sup>12</sup>. Or, cette question n'est-elle pas au fond de toutes les conceptions contemporaines de l'évolution de la société? Est-ce que les représentants de la théorie de „la société industrielle unifiée“ ne subordonnent pas tous leurs efforts à l'idée de la fusion de toutes les sociétés en une seule „société industrielle“, dont l'aspect sera déterminé par certains „impératifs d'organisation et techniques omnipotents“<sup>13</sup>? Est-ce que les théoriciens de la convergence ne subordonnent pas leurs recherches à l'idée de la transformation spontanée de l'impérialisme en une société convergente? Les théoriciens de la société „programmée“ ou „post-industrielle“ ne font-ils pas la même chose?

En fin de compte toutes ces conceptions de l'évolution de la société contemporaine cherchent à imposer la même réponse concernant la future société. Selon elles cette société naît de l'industrialisation et son aspect est conditionné par des „impératifs d'organisation et de technique“ et non pas de symboles idéologiques. En réalité, ici on confond sciemment ou inconsciemment deux côtés différents du développement social: l'évolution de la base matérielle et technique de la société et l'évolution de sa structure socio-économique.

La base matérielle et technique englobe les éléments matériels des forces productrices d'une société donnée. Dans cette base se cristallise, se matérialise l'expérience accumulée, l'aptitude de produire, l'utilisation de la science, etc. Dans ce sens elle est le critère, l'indice du degré du développement économique et culturel d'un pays donné. Pourtant, la base matérielle et technique ne modifie pas par elle la nature sociale, ne forme pas de nouveaux rapports sociaux dans le processus de la production.

Les rapports sociaux croissent sur une forme déterminée de propriété des moyens de la production. C'est précisément la forme de propriété sur les moyens de pro-

<sup>10</sup> В. И. Ленин. ПСС. Т. 27, с. 407.

<sup>11</sup> Ibid., p. 408.

<sup>12</sup> Ibid.

<sup>13</sup> J. K. Golbcaith. The New Industrial State. 1967, p. 7—8.



duction qui détermine d'avance le mode de répartition des biens en présence et le caractère du travail humain. Car, avant de répartir les biens, on déjà fait la répartition des moyens de production et des ressources en travail dans des proportions déterminées par branches en conformité stricte avec la forme de propriété sur les moyens de production. Dans l'entreprise capitaliste l'ouvrier n'a pas d'autres prétentions que la prétention de recevoir l'équivalent de la valeur de sa force de travail, c.-à-d. le salaire établi dans le contrat du travail. Le capitaliste (sans égard s'il est question d'une firme familiale ou d'une corporation) est de plein droit propriétaire de tous les biens produits.

Evidemment, une corrélation étroite existe entre la base matérielle-technique et la structure sociale. Les changements intervenus dans la base technique de la production engendrent de changements respectifs aussi dans l'organisation de la production, du caractère du travail, etc. Et le contraire — les nouvelles formes effectives de l'organisation de la production et du travail accélèrent le progrès technique et préparent la base de nouveaux changements techniques qui, à leur tour, exigent de nouveaux changements dans tout le système de rapports sociaux.

Pourtant, dans ce domaine il y a un moment critique. Les changements de la structure socio-économique ou du processus de son adaptation aux exigences de la base matérielle-technique rénovée s'opèrent durant un certain temps dans le cadre et sur la base de la forme prédominante de propriété. Ces changements ont incontestablement un caractère structural. Ils apportent qualitativement de nouveaux moments dans les rapports sociaux, mais se réalisent immuablement dans le cadre de la propriété fondamentale du système prédominant. Ainsi, par exemple, la firme familiale se transforme en corporation, à son tour cette dernière se transforme dans des conditions déterminées en capitalisme monopoliste d'Etat (la corporation se fusionne avec l'Etat de manière à former un mécanisme gigantesque pour contrôler la production et la répartition, contrôle dans lequel l'Etat agit en tant que „capitaliste associé idéal“ (Marx) dans l'intérêt de la classe et non pas dans celui de telle ou telle firme). Ces changements ont un caractère qualitatif. Pourtant, ils ne modifient pas le fondement du système: il reste de propriété privée et suppose, par conséquent, la division de la société en ouvriers et capitalistes.

Lénine a analysé le premier les changements du système capitaliste, motivés par l'industrialisation accélérée à la fin du siècle dernier et le début de notre siècle, et a prouvé de façon scientifique la transition du capitalisme de la libre concurrence vers la phase monopoliste du capitalisme. Il a élucidé la nature du capital monopoliste et a montré l'inévitable transformation du capitalisme monopoliste en capitalisme monopoliste d'Etat.

En se basant sur l'appréciation sociologique d'ensemble de la nature du capitalisme monopoliste, Lénine a également examiné le rapport existant entre le système capitaliste (respectivement son mécanisme fonctionnel) et la conformité. A la différence de l'ancien capitalisme de la libre concurrence, où „le nécessaire et le raisonnable sont le résultat du jeu spontané de l'occasion aveugle“ (Marx),<sup>14</sup> le capitalisme monopoliste se distingue par des „éléments de conformité“. De plus — la transformation du capitalisme monopoliste en capitalisme monopoliste d'Etat est examinée par Lénine en tant que développement du stade impérialiste, au cours duquel „la socialisation généralisée de la production incorpore, pour ainsi dire et

<sup>14</sup> К. Маркс. Капиталът. Т. III, изд. БКП.



malgré leur volonté et conscience, les capitalistes dans un nouvel ordre social, ordre transitaire entre la pleine liberté de la concurrence et la nationalisation totale<sup>15</sup>.

Or, ce genre de socialisation, dans laquelle l'accroissement des „éléments de conformité“ (de la planification de la firme jusqu'à la planification de l'Etat monopoliste) ne donne pas encore et ne peut donner „la pleine conformité“ et ne fait que préparer les prémisses matérielles de cette dernière. C'est justement en ceci que réside la différence fondamentale entre les marxistes et les non-marxistes sur la question de l'avenir du capitalisme. En règle générale, les non-marxistes nient la nécessité et l'inévitabilité de la révolution socialiste et résolvent la question de l'avenir du capitalisme soit sur la base de la théorie de la convergence, soit à partir des positions d'un certain néoréformisme aboutissant même à la reconnaissance de différents „modèles de socialisme“ du type suédois, des positions qui s'avèrent être dans la pratique une autre forme d'idéalisation du capitalisme et de négation de la perspective socialiste de développement. A ces conceptions Lénine oppose sa conception de „l'affinité“ entre le capitalisme monopoliste et le socialisme. Pour lui cette „affinité“ est la preuve de la „facilité de réalisation et l'urgence de la révolution socialiste et non pas un argument nous forçant à supporter la négation de la révolution et l'embellissement du capitalisme, avec lesquels s'occupent les réformistes“<sup>16</sup>.

<sup>15</sup> В. И Ленин. ПСС. Т. 27. с. 320—321.

<sup>16</sup> Ibid., t. 33. p. 68.



## LA PENSÉE DE LÉNINE ET LA PRÉVISION SCIENTIFIQUE

ELIT NIKOLOV  
BULGARIE

Les appréciations de D. Bell (dans son rapport diffusé entre nous) sur la société moderne, sur Lénine et sur Marx, sur les „horreurs du communisme“ inquiètent surtout la pensée sociologique. La sociologie semble être peu soucieuse de son prestige quand elle permet une si évidente manifestation de partialité à l'égard de la vérité historique. Tout le monde sait par exemple que la planification sociale constitue, depuis plusieurs décennies, un élément constant dans la politique des pays du monde socialiste, tandis que D. Bell nous la présente, avec un retard de près d'un demi-siècle (et non sans enthousiasme) comme une tendance „nouvelle“ ou comme un des présages de la „société post-industrielle“. Ne sait-il pas par hasard combien de tonnes de papiers ont été abîmées et combien d'énergie de propagande a été dépensée par ses prédécesseurs pour discréditer les efforts faits en U. R. S. S. pendant les premiers plans quinquennaux en vue d'une planification scientifique du développement social?

Mais les quinquennats, c'est de la planification sociale communiste. Or, D. Bell ne veut pas donner raison au communisme. Ses conceptions de classe ne lui permettent pas de voir le progrès social réalisé en U. R. S. S. et le font qualifier d'anachronismes tout ce qu'il y a d'attirant dans la théorie et dans la pratique du socialisme.

Cette attitude de notre collègue nous fait involontairement penser à un des héros d'André Maurois — le savant uranien A. E. 17, qui refuse de reconnaître l'intelligence chez les hommes terrestres. Une citation tirée du récit du grand écrivain français pourrait non seulement nous distraire, mais aussi nous aider à comprendre la ressemblance entre les deux attitudes.

A. E. 17: „L'étrange mode s'est établie, parmi nos jeunes naturalistes, d'attribuer à ces moisissures terrestres (N. B. Il s'agit des êtres humains) une intelligence de même nature que celle de l'Uranien. . .

Je demandai à mes élèves de me couper en deux des nids (N. B. des maisons) afin de séparer le mâle de sa femelle sans les blesser ni l'un ni l'autre, puis de recoller une moitié A avec une moitié B et de voir si les petits animaux s'apercevraient de ce changement. . .

Fait presque incroyable: dès la première heure, les deux femelles donnèrent leurs soins à la nichée étrangère, sans montrer horreur ni dégoût. Elles étaient évidemment incapables de reconnaître qu'il ne s'agissait pas de leurs petits. . .



Tel est ce singulier intellect dans lequel il est de mode aujourd'hui de voir une réplique de la raison uranienne!" Ce sont les propos de l'astrosociologue imaginé A. E. 17.

Et qu'est-ce que nous trouvons dans l'exposé de D. Bell?

... Lénine était, selon, lui, un technocrate parce qu'il. . . n'aimait pas du tout Dostoevski et parce qu'il. . . organisait pédantiquement son temps pendant la journée. . .

...Excellent théoricien et praticien du pouvoir il (Lénine) n'aurait aucune idée déployée du socialisme, de ses lois et tendances de développement. Les écrits de Lénine à ce sujet se limiteraient à son ouvrage „L'Etat et la Révolution“, où le pouvoir peut être confié à n'importe quel cordonnier. . .

La troisième constatation concerne Marx qui, selon D. Bell, n'avait pas non plus une idée suffisamment complète de la société communiste. La seule déclaration concrète de Marx à ce sujet serait son affirmation que dans la société communiste la division du travail disparaîtra. Bref, pour Marx „les objectifs de l'histoire ne sont pas élucidés“.

Mais laissons de côté cette étrange suite de faux jugements. La sociologie étudie la société et les hommes qui la constituent. Aussi quand il est question des hommes eux-mêmes les savants doivent-ils parler sérieusement.

Le cas D. Bell ne suscite l'intérêt que par un seul point — il démontre une fois de plus que la sociologie, surtout à son niveau conceptuel, ne sera jamais exempte du point de vue de classe, quand le sociologue appartient, lui-même, à telle ou telle classe sociale. Et s'il y a des sociologues qui cherchent à cacher cette vérité ou bien à détourner l'attention des gens de cette vérité par des expressions amusantes, c'est que le point de vue de classe exprimé dans leurs théories n'est pas à révéler.

Ainsi nous touchons à la seconde particularité de la vérité sociologique — son lien organique avec la justice sociale. L'histoire des sociétés et de la pensée humaine nous fournit d'innombrables preuves que la vérité sur la société peut naître seulement dans une atmosphère d'humanisme et que la seule chose qui puisse encourager l'injustice sociale ce sont les points de vue de classe présentés sous une forme „scientifique“. Un exemple typique en est la théorie de la „société post-industrielle“, la théorie de la convergence, etc.

Lénine est un grand savant entre autre par le fait qu'il a pris sans réserve la défense de la justice sociale et, unissant l'objectivité rigoureuse dans l'appréciation des faits isolés aux idéaux suprêmes de son époque, il a créé des œuvres que tout sociologue, avant ou après lui, pourrait envier. Trente quatre mille pages de pensée sociologique de Lénine (dont quatorze mille écrites après „L'Etat et la Révolution“) reflètent fidèlement une des époques historiques les plus intéressantes pour la science sociologique. C'est une époque où les événements objectifs de l'histoire, animés par la gigantesque énergie subjectifs de millions d'individus se sont naturellement transformés en un laboratoire de vérification de bien des rêves séculaires de l'humanité, de nombreuses hypothèses et de diverses théories — durables ou éphémères. Toute la pensée sociologique, ancienne ou moderne a été soumise à une minutieuse vérification dans la pratique des marxistes révolutionnaires russes et des travailleurs soviétiques. Ainsi l'œuvre scientifique et politique de Lénine, reflétant comme dans un miroir cette époque, doit-elle être considérée comme une contribution précieuse à la pensée sociologique. Maintes idées des grands penseurs ont agité pendant des siècles l'âme humaine. Cependant beaucoup



de ces idées, étant irréalisables, ne sont restées que dans la conscience des hommes. L'époque où vivait Lénine a écarté les illusions et a présenté aux hommes, à l'état concentré, tout ce qu'il y avait de plus rationnel dans ces idées. Il y a plus: l'approche réaliste des gens de leur propre condition sociale a été largement encouragée à cette époque. Les contradictions du capitalisme sont apparues plus nettement. Faisant ses premiers pas, avec le mélange complexe mais naturel du romanesque et du prosaïque, le régime socialiste pénétrait déjà dans la vie quotidienne des gens. Avec sa participation active à ce processus historique, ainsi qu'avec son œuvre, Lénine a fait voir de manière très nette la transition des anciennes structures sociales aux nouvelles structures.

Mais dans son œuvre d'édification socialiste il s'appuyait non seulement sur ceux qui aspiraient à la rénovation, mais aussi sur l'intégrité des sociologues savants. Car la pensée sociologique ne peut pas, à proprement parler, être qualifiée de scientifique, si elle plane au-dessus de la réalité sociale. La pratique est non seulement la base et le critère de la vérité, mais aussi son objet. La pure curiosité scientifique, l'effort théorique qui ne trouve son apaisement que dans des expressions littéraires piquantes ou bien cousues peut, à la rigueur, justifier son existence seulement dans certains domaines abstraits de l'esprit humain, mais non pas dans la sociologie. Celle-ci porte dans toutes ses manifestations et dans tous ses domaines une grande charge pratique. La sociologie, en tant que science sociale, est l'encouragement même à la rénovation et au perfectionnement; elle pousse tout naturellement à l'action sociale. Si l'on est à même de bien comprendre tout cela, on ne pourrait ne pas admettre Lénine dans les rangs des sociologues. Bien plus: n'était son œuvre la vraie science sociologique de nos jours présenterait de graves lacunes.

Une des nombreuses illustrations en est la théorie de Lénine sur l'impérialisme, théorie dont l'importance ne cesse pas de croître. Sans doute, la réalité sociale et économique en 1916 n'est pas celle d'aujourd'hui. Cependant, la tendance à la fusion du capitalisme et du pouvoir, découverte par Lénine, se manifeste aujourd'hui non seulement dans les processus réels, mais aussi dans la défense spéculative du capitalisme. Le phénomène de l'exploitation collective et de la concentration du capital privé, à tous les échelons, que certains auteurs appellent par l'euphémisme „capitalisme de masse“, en est un bon exemple. S'il est vrai que le nombre des actionnaires de General Motors était en 1966 environ 1 300 000, c'est-à-dire deux fois plus que les ouvriers et les spécialistes qui y étaient embauchés, il n'en est pas moins vrai que ce fait n'a supprimé ni la concentration du capital, avec toutes les conséquences qui en découlent, ni l'exploitation de l'homme par l'homme. Cette forme d'exploitation s'étend même sur la majeure partie des actionnaires, bien que l'apparente égalité les transforme en serviteurs bénévoles des plus forts. Les actionnaires sont nombreux mais le conseil administratif de la firme ne compte que 28 personnes qui, „au nom“ de tous les autres déterminent la politique et la stratégie à suivre par la firme.

Quant aux savants, leur rôle consiste surtout à élaborer des propositions et des plans concernant l'équipement de l'entreprise. Dans la structure de General Motors ce sont seulement les laboratoires et les équipes de recherches qui leur sont confiés. En général, la grande variété de concentration du capital, trait essentiel du capitalisme moderne, a ceci d'original que le fouet de l'esclavage est remplacé par le doping financier; on rend ainsi plus acceptable le rythme accéléré de l'exploitation capitaliste.



Raymond Aron a récemment attiré l'attention sur quelques problèmes de l'économie capitaliste multinationale. Et il a eu peut-être raison de le faire, car ce genre de problèmes dans les cadres du système capitaliste sont de plus en plus nombreux et pressants. On oublie cependant que ce thème „nouveau“ de discussion a déjà été traité et vérifié dans la pratique par l'Etat soviétique multinationale. Par conséquent, dans ce domaine encore la sociologie a intérêt à consulter l'œuvre de Lénine qui a montré, et dans la théorie et dans la pratique, comment on peut surmonter les contradictions dans le système de l'économie capitaliste multinationale.

La prévision scientifique chez Lénine — „le technocrate“, allait si loin qu'elle surprenait même un auteur de roman fantastique qui l'a appelé le grand fantaisiste de Kremlin. En effet, dans son entretien avec l'écrivain Wells, Lénine a exprimé l'idée suivante: dès que l'homme deviendra un être cosmique, les lois de développement social agiront tout autrement. Il est sans doute risqué de vouloir deviner exactement ce que Lénine voulait dire. Mais nous connaissons très bien le réalisme de Vladimir Ilitch. Il n'avait certainement pas en vue les conflits imaginaires que les auteurs de contes et de romans fantastiques de cette époque décrivaient. Il faisait probablement allusion à l'action des lois sociales sur les êtres humains de la Terre — le berceau où est née la possibilité de l'extension cosmique des hommes.

Aujourd'hui l'homme est devenu un être cosmique. Malgré le petit nombre de ceux qui ont pu quitter la Terre pour effectuer des vols dans le cosmos, il existe déjà des conditions sociales — matérielles ou même spirituelles, d'une extension spaciale des hommes. On voit apparaître aussi les symptômes des nouveaux problèmes sociaux, étroitement liés aux progrès réalisés par les sciences techniques. Le premier exemple à cet égard c'est le rôle particulier de la révolution scientifique et technique dans le développement social. Le cosmos fait naître aussi des problèmes concernant le Droit international. Et ces problèmes sont tellement insolites que, pour expliciter les intérêts de leur pays ou de leur classe, les juristes sont obligés de recourir à des critères entièrement nouveaux. En général, l'ère cosmique qui s'ouvre devant l'humanité pose, dès maintenant, des problèmes faisant de l'idée exprimée dans la phrase laconique de Lénine un des thèmes les plus actuels et les plus féconds pour la sociologie. Cette idée suffit, à elle seule, pour faire voir combien prétentieuse est l'attitude de ceux qui se hâtent de nier la valeur de la pensée sociologique de Lénine.



## CO-DETERMINATION — PARTICIPATION OR WORKERS' CONTROL<sup>1</sup>

JOHANNES HENRICH VON HEISELER

GFR

In Western Germany the demand for co-determination — the German term is "Mitbestimmung" — is one of the most important demands of the trade-union movement. The reformist tendency within the labour movement was the first to develop concepts of co-determination. But this must not mean, and in the given case I will try to show that this does not mean, that the demand for co-determination is only a part of reformist ideology. On the other hand, within the context of this problem, syndicalist ideas of decentralized self-management appear and spread and in some cases amalgamate with streams of some sort of reformist-socialdemocratic lines of thought. Finally, when one looks at the sociological literature, there are masses of books, articles, etc. written on the subject and quite a lot of empirical research on the problem of co-determination or "Mitbestimmung" has been undertaken by West-German sociologists. But nearly all the existing West-German sociological literature on the subject of "Mitbestimmung" is written either from an openly confessed or a hidden bourgeois outlook.<sup>2</sup> This is evident, when one recognizes the fact that the basic concept that West-German sociology has used in dealing with the problem of "Mitbestimmung" is not an enlargement of the rights and opportunities of workers to defend their class-interests, but a concept of "participation", that is, a concept where workers' representatives are to share responsibility for a policy structured by the capitalist profit-system.

<sup>1</sup> The study of our institute is by now published under the title: *Mitbestimmung als Kampfaufgabe. Grundlagen — Möglichkeiten — Zielrichtungen. Eine theoretische, ideologie-kritische und empirische Untersuchung zur Mitbestimmungsfrage in der Bundesrepublik.* Band 2 der Beiträge des Instituts für Marxistische Studien und Forschungen (IMSF). Hrsg. v. Institut für Marxistische Studien und Forschungen (IMSF) Frankfurt/Main. Redaktion: Dr. Johannes Henrich v. Heiseler, Dr. Heinz Jung, Prof. Dr. Josef Schleifstein, Dr. Kurt Steinhilber, 348 p., Köln 1971.

Some of the most important results of this rather lengthy volume one can find in my article: *Heiseler. Probleme des Kampfes um die Durchsetzung von Mitbestimmung der westdeutschen Arbeiterklasse. Ergebnisse einer empirischen Untersuchung in drei industriellen Großbetrieben.* In: *Das Argument. Zeitschrift für Philosophie und Sozialwissenschaften.* Nr. 62., 12. Jahrgang Dezember 1970, Heft 11/12, Karlsruhe 1970, Seite 845—872.

<sup>2</sup> One of the few exceptions is: *Kritik der Mitbestimmung. Partnerschaft oder Klassenkampf? Eine Studie von Frank Deppe, Jutta von Freyberg, Christof Kievenheim, Regine Meyer und Frank Werkmeister.* Edition Suhrkamp, 358. Frankfurt am Main 1969. 278 pages.



So, from a political point of view as well as from the point of view of the development of scientific Marxist sociology it has become very urgent to define a Marxist conception relating to the problem of "Mitbestimmung". Such a Marxist concept of "Mitbestimmung" has to be in opposition to the reformist and openly pro-capitalist concepts of workers' participation in capitalist management, as well as to the neo-syndicalist models of decentralized self-managing units. Willingly or unwillingly reformist as well as neo-syndicalist conceptions fail to take into account the existing capitalist power structure.

When we began to work on the subject last year we found, that in Lenin's writings, especially in his articles and works dealing with the demand for workers' control, there were given conceptual tools for working out a consistent sociological concept.

Lenin's writings on workers' control begin in April 1917. The problem is deeply connected with the theory of imperialism as the monopolist stage of capitalism, as it was worked out in Lenin's famous book written in 1916. The problem of workers' control relates to the central question: how can capitalist power be overthrown in a highly centralized and monopolized society?

Already in his book on imperialism Lenin analyzed the system of control exercised by the big monopolies over all the rest of society including their non-monopolist class brethren. This system of monopolist control works, as Lenin has shown, at different levels. There are more or less direct forms of control of a smaller capital by a monopoly, as there are market pressures, ownership of a part of the capital, control of the information of the internal business policies, complete control exercised by the monopoly over the smaller capital, etc. There are various ways by which monopolist control is exercised over the whole of the national economy through the employers' associations. Finally, there are the means of monopolist control of the whole of economy though the first intervention is but now more and more continuously controlling power of the bourgeois state apparatus. Taking into account this rapidly developing system of monopolist control, Lenin showed that those concepts of workers' control, that were developed on the basis of a syndicalist outlook, were more inadequate than ever.

Lenin not only criticized the syndicalist concepts, but he developed the Marxist conception of workers' control. The main features of this Marxist conception of workers' control that were worked out by Lenin are: the class struggle will only develop when the political forces and the organizations of the working class will be able to attack, to intervene and finally to control more and more the profit sphere of capital. Connected with, or rather an essential element of real workers' control is the direct mobilization of the working masses. Finally, at the stage, when the political power of the bourgeoisie is overthrown, workers' control as a central way of organizing the working class together with Soviets and political institutions under the leadership of the party lay the foundations of proletarian state power. At the Petrograd conference in June 1917 Lenin repeated these fundamental ideas in a more detailed and more explicit form and these ideas became an essential part of the Bolshevik programme.

Again in the period of reaction after the demonstration in July, when the Bolsheviks were again driven into illegality and the risk of a counterrevolutionary reversal of the events of February was growing, Lenin in his article "The Imminent Catastrophe" took up the concept of workers' control. Once more he showed



the failure of syndicalist models and demonstrated that the alternative consisted in either reactionary, bureaucratic control by monopoly capital and its political agents, or democratic and workers' control based on the initiative of the working masses themselves and carried out at different levels by the organs of the working class. So in this context the concept of workers' control becomes an integral part of the alternative to the whole of the existing capitalist society. I will not dwell further now on Lenin's writings, but try to show how we used the principal idea worked out by Lenin to develop a concept of "Mitbestimmung" from a Marxist standpoint.

It is very clear that it is impossible to identify too simply the demand for "Mitbestimmung" and the concept of workers' control. The concept of workers' control was developed by Lenin in the half year just before the Great October revolution and after it. Certainly there is nothing like a revolutionary or even a prerevolutionary situation in Western Germany today. Even less can the trade union struggle of the working class aim directly at the overthrow of the capitalist system. The trade union struggle is essentially building up positions of counter-power, in order to defend the working class from the consequences of the capitalist system as much as their relative strength allows. But precisely this is the reason why this struggle continuously reaches the limits of the system. The struggle for the immediate economic, political and social demands is not only a prerequisite, but in its total historical context it is at the same time an integral element for overcoming capital rule.

Demands for "Mitbestimmung" have therefore to be seen as a special and as yet undeveloped form of the more general and far-reaching demand for democratic and workers' control; only in periods when the class-struggle sharpens can they be expressed in their deep and complex form. Therefore the struggle for the rights of "Mitbestimmung" must neither be limited to problems of the work place, nor must it be limited to questions of the rules of the factory or the company. Being an integral part of the overall struggle of classes, the problem of "Mitbestimmung" assumes various forms according to the given relation of power and the aspirations of the labour movement at the time. Separated from the total strategy of the workers' movement and isolated from the system of developing antagonisms of capitalist society, demands for "Mitbestimmung" are in danger of becoming the starting point of a policy of class collaboration.

Demands for "Mitbestimmung" have to aim therefore not only to change the forms by which capital rules, but to strike at the very essence of capitalist rule. If the labour movement is not able to develop these dialectics, isolated demands for "Mitbestimmung" will only give rise to a sort of reformation and modernization of the forms of rule, a modernization that is necessary from the standpoint of capital, as Mr. Odaka in his report on employee participation in Japanese industries, delivered in the research committee on the sociology of work and organization at this congress, has very overtly pointed out. As to this point, there is a striking resemblance between the syndicalist models and the newest system worked out by the sociological advisors of employers' organizations, like F. Fürstenberg in Western Germany and K. Odaka in Japan. This newest system of integrationist participation is the system of autonomous work teams, which gives to the workers the illusion of real control without touching the real power structure.



The central problem of the struggle for "Mitbestimmung" consists in connecting the struggle for the direct interests of the masses of workers and employees with their historical class interests. As a not yet developed and special form of the demand for workers' control the struggle for "Mitbestimmung" aims in the historical long run at the control of all centres of capitalist power at every level; ranging from the work place, the factory, the company up to the totality of the economy and the state. Connecting the struggle for the direct interests of the working class with their historical class interests is only possible by attacking the capitalist profit sphere. Demands for "Mitbestimmung" must take this into account. But they can never replace an active wages policy and even less the aim of the nationalization of industry.

"Mitbestimmung" as a process of developing the power of the working class is based upon the initiative of the masses. Without the activity of the working masses the gaining of real "Mitbestimmung" is impossible. Participation of workers' and employees' representatives in carrying out capital function — a characteristic trait of integrationist concepts — does not change relative power. The movement connected with and developing with the struggle for real "Mitbestimmung" is therefore an integral element of the newly gained positions.

The necessity to develop mass movements and the necessity to direct the initiative of the workers against the real centres of capitalist class rule is connected with the exposure of power distribution and power processes. Without enlarging the information basis of the working class even the beginning of real shifts in the relative power in partial sectors of society is unthinkable. But enlargement of the information basis of the working class is identical with the enlargement of the information basis of workers' and employees' representatives only when the representatives are able to use the gained informations for mobilizing the masses of workers and employees and when they really do so.

As long as the historical process of conquest of rule by the working class and the classes allied with it is not yet completed, power positions of the working class are positions of counter power against the capital. But also in a situation, where the working class will not even be for a long time to come in the forefield of the direct struggle for conquering rule, its strength lies not so much and not primarily in its representation within given institutions but in its ability to develop power. This ability depends on the general distribution of relative economic and political forces; it depends on the strength of its organizations and on the relations between masses, organization and leadership viewed from the stand point how strongly the interests of the class can be put forward. The ability of developing power is expressed by the preparedness of the working class to fight for and defend its interests.

By applying some of the essential ideas of Lenin on the problem of "Mitbestimmung" we have arrived at four criteria for judging different models and concepts of "Mitbestimmung". These criteria are:

- 1) Does the given concept help to develop mass initiative or does it hinder it?
- 2) Does the given concept direct the impetus against the centres of capitalist power or does it deviate toward some sort of modernization of *forms* of capitalist rule?
- 3) Does the given concept aim at the enlargement of the information basis of the working class or does it not?



4) Does the given concept give rise to positions of counter power or does it not?

Having worked out these criteria, we could proceed to a critical analysis of the different trends of thought and tendencies existing at the moment in West German trade unions; we could proceed to a critique of the concepts put forward by the employers' organizations and their scientific servants; we could proceed to an empirical analysis of the legal and the real rights and opportunities of the workers and employees in three big West German factories.

Lenin's ideas must be used not as a mere manner of speech but as conceptual tools for sociological studies.



## THE RELATION OF LENIN'S PRINCIPLE OF PARTIINOST TO THE METHOD OF SOCIOLOGY

JOHN SOMMERVILLE

USA

At the outset it may be useful, in the interest of those who do not know the Russian language, to say something about the word "partiinnost", for which there is no exact equivalent in English usage. It is somewhat misleading to translate it as "partisanship", for it has a more specific root than "partisan", namely, "party", in the sense of political party. In Russian the ending "nost" added to a word means exactly what "ness" means in English, when added to a word. The Russian word for "party" is "partiiia"; hence, the Russian "partiinnost" would be the exact equivalent of the English word "party-ness", if there were such a word. In English, "party-ness" would immediately and correctly suggest as its meaning, or part of its meaning, relationship to parties, as "holyness" suggests relationship to saints. But, as English usage does not yet include any such word as "party-ness", we will here use the Russian word, simply transliterated.

Shortly after the revolution of 1905 Lenin wrote, for a periodical called *Novaya zhizn* (New Life), a short article which he entitled "The Socialist Party and Non-Party Revolutionism". In it, Lenin gives a very significant and challenging explanation of his principle of partiinnost, a principle that has very important sociological bearings, which have been widely misunderstood. So far as I know, this article has never been translated into English. I would like to begin by translating an excerpt from it which I think brings out much that is central to Lenin's concept. Incidentally, we should bear in mind that by "Socialist Party" Lenin means his own party. The term "Communist Party" was not adopted until later. Lenin says:\* "In a society at whose basis there are no class divisions, the struggle between the antagonistic classes invariably becomes, at a certain point in its development, a political struggle. The most developed, purposeful and fullest manifestation of the political struggle of classes is the struggle of parties. A non-party attitude means indifference to the struggle of parties. But this indifference cannot be equated with neutrality, with removal from the struggle, for in the struggle of classes it is impossible to be neutral; it is impossible in a capitalist society to "remove oneself" from the exchange of products and of labor power. But this exchange is what unavoidably gives rise to economic struggles, and then to political struggles."

\* Translation of this quotation as it is translated by Progress Publishers is given at the end of the papers, see "Editor's Footnote".



"Consequently, indifference to these struggles is, in fact, far from being above the battle, or neutral. Indifference is silent support of that which is in force, that which rules. Whoever in Russia was indifferent to the autocracy before its breakdown at the time of the October revolution (of 1905, J. S.) was a silent supporter of autocracy. Whoever in contemporary Europe is indifferent to the rule of the bourgeoisie is a silent supporter of the bourgeoisie. Whoever is indifferent to the bourgeois character of the struggle for freedom is a silent supporter of the bourgeois domination of that struggle, of bourgeois domination in the free Russia that is coming to birth."

"Political indifference is political sateity. One who has 'no interest' in a piece of bread, who feels 'indifferent' toward it, is one who is full-up. One who is famished always has a 'party' attitude to the question of a piece of bread. Indifference and lack of interest in the piece of bread does not signify that the person does not need bread, but rather that he is always sure of his bread, that he never lacks bread, that he is a solid member of the full-up 'party'. A non-party stand in bourgeois society is only a hypocritical masked, passive way of belonging to the full-up party, the ruling party, the exploiting party."

"Non-partiinost is a bourgeois idea. Partiinost is a socialist idea. This is the case in general and as a whole in every bourgeois society. Of course, it is necessary to know how to apply this general truth to a specific question or a concrete case. But to forget this truth when bourgeois society as a whole is rising against serfdom and autocracy means in practice to give up completely the socialist critique of bourgeois society."<sup>1</sup>

When Lenin says that it is impossible in capitalist society to be neutral about the class struggle because it is impossible to remove oneself from that exchange of products and labor power which generates the struggle, he is assuming the distinction between what we may call subjective and objective neutrality. That is, a person may feel that he is not taking sides, that he is neutral in relation to some conflict, that he is doing nothing to affect its outcome, whereas his daily socio-economic behavior is actually adding to the strength of one side or the other, making it more likely for one side or the other to win. Subjectively he feels neutral, but objectively he is not. Everyone will agree that it is the objective condition which counts, and this is what Lenin is talking about. If the conflict is about the present economic system, and there is one political party which holds it should be radically changed, while another party holds it should not, the actual fact is that everyone who lives in that society is objectively a supporter of one or the other.

This result comes about, as Lenin indicates, because it is impossible to go on living within a given economic system without participating in it, which, under capitalism, means buying, selling, paying taxes, rent or interest, making profits or wages, receiving dividends and the like. This keeps the system going, supports it in practice. If a person daily carries on such objective activities, and for one reason or another does not carry on any oppositional activities, such as speaking out against the system, writing against it, campaigning against it, voting against it, working against it within associations, unions, parties or other organization committed to replacing it with a different system, such a person is not neutral in fact, only

<sup>1</sup> V. I. Lenin. *Polnoe sobranie sochinenii*, t. 12, c. 137-138. Moskva, 1960.



in imagination. President Nixon is right: the silent majority is with him, as long as they remain silent, and he remains president.

Expressed as a definition, the partiinost of any action, or decision not to act, is its objective effect in relation to the struggle of parties. Just as a person objectively has a certain physical weight whether or not he is conscious of it, so his actions objectively have a certain political weight whether or not he is conscious of it. The fact that our actions and decisions have partiinost is something about which we have no choice, just as we have no choice about the fact that our bodies have weight. But, just as we do have some choices about how much weight our bodies shall have, so also we have some choices about how much and what kind of partiinost our actions shall have.

Now, what is the relation of all this to sociology? The relation begins with the choice of problems, which is a choice each sociologist must make. After all, problems don't choose sociologists; sociologists choose problems. Needless to say, this is a very important decision which the sociologist (or any intellectual worker) must make. It is naive (but apparently quite usual among scientists) to think that it makes no real difference, except in terms of psychological interest, what problems you select to work upon. The general feeling is that there are no significant scientific standards that are binding in the selection of problems; serious scientific standards come into play only as you try to solve the problem. In this view, as naive empirically and analytically as it is crude morally, science is considered simply as a truth-finding enterprise, in which it is assumed that all truth not yet found is worth looking for, and that it is good to look for truth not because some truths add to man's power of control over the given subject-matter, but just because truth is truth. If some truths yield greater power of control than others, that is just a happy accident, to which the scientist, as scientist, need pay no attention. In other words, to be a genuine scientist is to seek the truth alone, and to let the power chips fall where they may. If the truth found is of a kind that significantly increases human power, so be it; if it is not what of it? To science, it is held, this is a matter of indifference.

This naive view is usually innocent of the history of science, and does not take in the fact that a field of study becomes accepted as a genuine science not in proportion to the quantity of new truth it accumulates, but in proportion to the degree of new power that is yielded by the new truths it finds. This means that any field of study which wishes to develop into a genuine science must seek not simply new truth about its subject-matter, but the kind of new truth that yields new power. What kind of new power? The power to predict, which always leads to the power to control, to utilize for human purposes. This is what Auguste Comte, the father of sociology as a separate discipline, saw so clearly in relation to science in general and sociology in particular when he expressed so neatly the essence of the method of all the established sciences, which must also be developed in sociology if that field is ever to become an established science. Comte put it in a sort of equation, which was also a prescription: "Voir, c'est savoir; savoir, c'est prévoir; prévoir, c'est pouvoir." (To see means to know; to know means to foresee; to foresee means to gain power over.)

Science all goes back to observation, yes; but not any observation, rather, just those observations which will lead to new power to predict. Here we see the criterion for the selection of problems in all the established sciences: a problem is



scientifically significant as a problem to the extent that its solution will yield new power to predict. This is why science is so much occupied with finding the truth about causes and laws, we know in advance that such truth leads to tremendous increase in the power to predict and control. The truth about the cause of cancer, when we find it, will be no more *true* than the truth we already know about the height, weight, occupation, nationality, etc., of millions who die from it. The difference in scientific significance is measured in the amount of prediction yielded by the respective truths.

Prediction is the methodological link between theory and practice. At the theoretical level, prediction is the basis of scientific explanation; at the practical level, it is the precondition of control. This is the same as saying that prediction is the link between pure and applied science; it is at once the criterion of significant scientific knowledge, and the key to the increasing of human power. This alone is what gives depth and measurable meaning to the Baconian aphorism: "Knowledge is power."<sup>2</sup>

Very well, one may say; but where does *partiinost* enter into this? It enters where power enters. As power to predict becomes power to control, so power to control becomes power to rule, which brings *partiinost* into being. *Partiinost* is a concept that expresses basic aspects of the dynamics and structure of power in a society where persons and groups have different degrees of power over one another. Now we are back again at Lenin's starting point in the passage we quoted: "In a society at whose basis there are class divisions. . ."

Like every Marxist, Lenin means by the term "class" an economic grouping, a group of people having a common relationship to the means of production, a relationship such that it brings the group into inevitable economic conflict with some other group that has a different relationship to the means of production. We are all familiar with the type of society in which it is possible for one group, relatively small, to live well by owning the means of production without working on them, while another group, relatively large, lives badly by working on the means of production without owning them. The chief source of income of the first group is called profits, and this group always wants greater profits; the chief source of income of the second is called wages, and this group always wants higher wages. These relationships are a recipe for bitter, life-long struggle, a class struggle, since both profits and wages must come out of the same sum of money, the total financial returns brought in by the enterprise, or, expressed differently, the total economic values created by the labor force of the enterprise. What percentage of this sum shall go to wages for working? What percentage shall go to profits for owning? These are the questions that create *partiinost*, the questions no one can avoid in actual practice, the questions about which no one can be objectively neutral.

In contemporary society we are all familiar with poverty, and with the manifold social evils to which it leads, with racism and its consequences in terms of human suffering, with colonialism, imperialism, and worst of all, international and global war, which, because of the technical developments in thermonuclear and other weaponry, now threatens the very continuity of the human race and its planetary habitation, threatens to put an end, once and for all, to the whole story of mankind.

<sup>2</sup> Francis Bacon. *Novum Organum*, Aphorism 2.



In the world where we find these human problems, and many others, we also find sociology trying to deal with the field of subject-matter in which all this is located — human society. As we have pointed out above, and as we see from all the past history of empirical sciences — astronomical, physical, chemical, biological, psychological — the first requirement of scientific method is to formulate just such problems about its subject-matter as will, upon being solved, materially increase our ability to predict. This is what the creators of the modern scientific tradition understood and put into operation, as we see in the work of figures like Copernicus, Galileo, Newton, Lavoisier and Darwin. It is what creative philosophers of science like Bacon and Comte (and we must remember that no distinction was drawn between philosophy and science until the end of the eighteenth century) expressed with sharp logical clarity which drew a clear line between doing science and merely collecting facts, between scientifically significant truths and scientifically insignificant truths, between solving scientifically significant problems and solving scientifically insignificant problems.

But none of these great pioneers appears to have brought to consciousness a further dimension, a further aspect of this whole scientific process. This aspect emerges when we put to ourselves the following questions: Acknowledging that, as scientists, we wish to solve problems which, if solved, will materially increase human power to predict and to control, on what basis shall we choose among problems of that kind? Does it make any important difference which problems of that kind are selected to work upon? Are there any obligations we ought to recognize in regard to making this high-level selection? It is this aspect of the matter that Lenin is dealing with through the concept of *partiinnost*? It is interesting to note, by the way, that it was not only Lenin and the Marxists who singled out this aspect and emphasized its importance. A nineteenth-century Russian philosopher like Chernyshevsky, for example, brings it to the fore in an interesting and challenging manner.<sup>3</sup> The specific problem emerges more directly and sharply in the social sciences than it does in philosophy or the natural sciences. For example, studies in the sociology of racism could build up scientifically significant knowledge either about how to get racial minorities to obey the law, no matter what the law is, or about how minority rebellions against unjust laws can be carried out successfully. A given sociologist could choose to work on one of these two problems, on both simultaneously, or on neither one. These three different decisions would make for different results not only in relation to the growth of sociological knowledge, but in relation to the outcome of political struggles over the issue of racism. The same applies to scientifically significant knowledge about labor unions and corporations, war and peace, revolutions, social unrest, youth protests, civil rights, civil disobedience, and the whole range of social problems. These are conflicts and new, scientifically significant knowledge is always new power. The point is that this new power, in the nature of the case, is always injected into a concrete socio-historical situation that has its own specific structure and relationships of forces — political, economic, military and so on. This is always the case, but people generally tend to notice it and to become conscious of the factor of *partiinnost* only when the social context is

<sup>3</sup> N. G. Chernyshevsky. *The Anthropological Principle in Philosophy*, p. 50, 51. In his *Selected Philosophical Essays*. Moscow. Foreign Languages Publishing House. 1953. (English, Four Continents Books, New York.)



unusually dramatic or is given unusual publicity. If, for example, during the Nazi period in Germany, a proposal had been made for an extensive socio-historical study of the crimes of Jews against children who were not Jews, probably most sociologists would have refused to take part, and would have been against publishing the results of such a study in Nazi Germany, not on the ground that what would be published would necessarily be untrue, but because, even if true, the researching and publication of that particular truth under the particular socio-political conditions of that time would give increased power to the forces of social injustice.

Another way of putting the central point is to say that science can never be value-free, except in the very restricted and self-evident sense of being free from empirical and analytical errors that might be caused by moral preferences or biases operating in the wrong place, free, in other words, from methodological errors caused by value factors playing a role where they have no right to play a role. Cases of this kind I call fallacies of misplaced value function. But values that do not cause errors are built into science from the very start, preferring truth that leads to new prediction over truth that does not;<sup>4</sup> that is not a misplaced value function, it is a deliberate choice made long ago, a choice which defines the special nature of science, as distinguished from other levels of knowledge, and objectively commits science to a power value, whether the scientist is conscious of it or not; to him it may be unconscious, but in his work it is not misplaced. So also, when the scientist, sociologist or other, chooses a specific problem to work upon, he is exercising an additional but equally inescapable value function, whether he is conscious of it or not, in the sense he is aiming at a specific objective which, if attained, will increase the specific power of a specific social group, relative to other. Partiinost is one way of trying to express the nature and measure the effect of that inescapable value function. Human society is such that there is no way of working for man except through working for some social group. But it does not follow that working for any social group means working for man. In any case, there can be no operative sociological method without selecting problems to work upon, and there can be no selection of problems without exercising a value function, which means exercising partiinost. So partiinost turns out to be as inescapable as values, being but a name for the struggle of social values, or at least for a central aspect of the struggle of values, which in turn is a central aspect of the struggle of classes.

Looked at in terms of methodology, it is clear from the past history of science that, as technology and business are institutionalized between theory and practice in natural science, so politics and parties are institutionalized links between theory and practice in social science. There must be institutionalized link. Science cannot apply itself; it must be applied by men, and men cannot apply science to human life except through and by means of social institutions. To try to ignore the role of politics in these processes is not a mark of scientific purity, any more than it is a mark of scientific purity to try to ignore the role of sex in the processes of love; it is a mark of scientific narrowness which prevents full understanding. At best it is a form of juvenile romanticism, at worst a form of failure of nerve. One who sincerely does

<sup>4</sup> See John Somerville. "Problematics, a Methodological Aspect of Philosophy of Science", Proceedings of XIth International Congress of Philosophy. V. VI. North Holland Pub. Co., Amsterdam, 1953. See also John Somerville, "Methodology in Social Science", International Congress for the Unity of Science, Pub. in Philosophy of Science, Jan. 1941 (USA).



not wish "to get involved in politics" is like one who sincerely does not wish to get involved in sex. A scientist who says he does not want to mix science and politics is like a person who says he does not want to mix love and sex. Of course, there are any number of wrong ways of mixing science and politics, just as there are any number of wrong ways of mixing love and sex. But the greatest error of all is to think we can do justice to either the one or the other by ignoring their interrelations, by trying to deal with either one as if it were independent of the other.

Partiinost, then, is not something regrettable, something only unfortunate people are afflicted with, something we can choose to have or not have. We all have it; the differences among us are, first, in regard to such qualities of partiinost as conscious or unconscious, overt or covert, consistent or inconsistent, effective or ineffective; and second, in regard to direction, that is, right, left or center, remembering that the center is not neutral, any more than the right or the left.

One further point: Lenin's partiinost was of course a leftist one, which he recognized as a value choice. And, like Marxists in general, Lenin held that human value choices could in the end be proved rationally, scientifically, to be right or wrong, good or bad; in other words, that values are neither mystical nor arbitrary, and that there can be a science of values, which would naturally include anything like partiinost.<sup>5</sup> On this general point the Marxists are neither original nor alone. They are a distinctive contemporary manifestation of the whole tradition of naturalistic, rational ethics, a tradition that goes back to Aristotle and includes figures like Bacon, Spinoza, Diderot, D'Holbach, Bentham, Mill, Chernishevsky, Adler and Dewey, to mention only a few among many who had, as we all know, important differences apart from the common ground they shared. But even if ethical values were entirely arbitrary, it would still be true that the presence and important role of partiinost would have to be acknowledged in order for the scientist, and first of all the sociologist, to understand what he is doing, both scientifically and morally.

**Editor's footnote:** "In a society based upon class divisions, the struggle between the hostile classes is bound, at a certain stage of its development, to become a political struggle. The most purposeful, most comprehensive and specific expression of the political struggle of classes is the struggle of parties. The non-party principle means indifference to the struggle of parties. But this indifference is not equivalent to neutrality, to abstention from the struggle, for in the class struggle there can be no neutrals; in capitalist society, it is impossible to "abstain" from taking part in the exchange of commodities or labour-power. And exchange inevitably gives rise to economic and then to political struggle. Hence, in practice, indifference to the struggle does not at all mean standing aloof from the struggle, abstaining from it, or being neutral. Indifference is tacit support of the strong, of those who rule. In Russia, those who were indifferent towards the autocracy prior to its fall during the October revolution tacitly supported the autocracy. In present-day Europe, those who are indifferent towards the rule of the bourgeoisie tacitly support the bourgeoisie. Those who are indifferent towards the idea that the struggle for liberty is of a bourgeois nature tacitly support the domination of the bourgeoisie

<sup>5</sup> See John Somerville. "The Value Problem and Marxist Social Theory", in *Journal of Value Inquiry*. Spring, 1968. (USA) Second Conference on Value Inquiry.



in this struggle, in the free Russia now in the making. Political unconcern is political satiety. A well-fed man is "unconcerned with", "indifferent to", a crust of bread; a hungry man, however, will always take a "partisan" stand on the question of a crust of bread. A person's "unconcern" and "indifference" with regard to a crust of bread does not mean that he does not need bread, but that he is always sure of his bread, that he is never in want of bread and that he has firmly attached himself to the "party" of well-fed. The non-party principle in bourgeois society is merely a hypocritical, disguised passing expression of adherence to the party of the well-fed, of the rulers, of the exploiters.

The non-party idea is a bourgeois idea, the party idea is a socialist idea. This thesis, in general and as a whole, is applicable to all the bourgeois society. One must of course, be able to adapt this general truth to particular questions and particular cases; but to forget truth at a time when the whole of bourgeois society is rising in revolt against feudalism and autocracy means in practice completely to renounce socialism of bourgeois society.<sup>6</sup>

<sup>6</sup> V. I. Lenin. Coll. Works. M., 1960, pp. 79-80.



## THE SOCIAL FUNCTION OF VIOLENCE IN LENIN\*

FRANCO FERRAROTTI  
ITALY

In his *Critique of Gotha Program* Marx states accurately the idea of revolutionary proletarian dictatorship: the passage from capitalist to communist society is not painless, on the contrary, there "lies the period of the revolutionary transformation of the one into the other. . . a political transition period in which the state can be nothing but the revolutionary dictatorship of the proletariat."<sup>1</sup>

The State, contrary to what the authors of the Gotha program think, or to what will be written afterwards by Bernstein or by various modern democratic socialists, is not the sheer organization of civil society which, if developed towards a form of democracy, may come to contradict the social productive basis itself. It is instead a complex reality, an emanation and an essential component of this economic basis, or rather of the social productive relations.

If exploitation is violence, just as the process of accelerated development of capitalism described in the *Capital* has been violence, the state is far from being unrelated to this process. On the contrary, it sets itself as the legitimate realization of violence. It gives social relations legitimate form, transforming the worker into an abstract citizen and thus carries the mechanisms of exploitation in a "philosophical", "juridical" sphere. It gives them a legal, official appearance, hardly hidden by the pretense of equality before the law, which also has an essential historical function — that of allowing a regular competitive sale of the labour forces.

K. Marx wrote: "Through the emancipation of private property from the community the State has become a separate entity, beside and outside civil society; but it is nothing more than the form of organization which the bourgeois necessarily adopt both for internal and external purposes, for the mutual guarantee of their property and interests. State is the form in which the individuals of a ruling class assert their common interests, and in which the whole civil society of an epoch is epitomised. . ."<sup>2</sup>

\* With the author's permissions granted to the edition, the latter gives quotations used in the paper from K. Marx, F. Engels and V. I. Lenin as they are translated into English by Progress Publishers (K. Marx and F. Engels. Selected Works. M., 1970. K. Marx and F. Engels. The German Ideology. Moscow, 1964. V. I. Lenin. Collected Works. Moscow, 1960).

<sup>1</sup> Karl Marx and Frederick Engels. Selected Works. Progress Publishers. Moscow, 1970. p. 327.

<sup>2</sup> Karl Marx and Frederick Engels. The German Ideology. Progress Publishers. Moscow, 1964. p. 78.



On this basis it becomes logically impossible to think that in order to change the State establishment it is enough to change its managers and directors, possibly by means of what Marx called the "democratic litany" of universal suffrage. The problem is different and its solution lies in opposing the oppressed classes' revolutionary violence to the hidden violence of old institutions, thus breaking not the mere management of capitalistic machine and of bourgeois mystification (the "*capitalistic appearance*"), but the machine itself, through a revolutionary process which cannot but entail a continuous set of deep breaks. If what is written in some passages of Marx is true — that revolutions are the engines of history, — what the representatives of Student Movement of Milan say is also true: "The bourgeois state can be thrown down, not changed."

Only in the light of this, I think, it is possible to understand and to study the function of violence in Lenin's thought, the use which he makes of this idea and his proposing it again, substantially, as a tool of political struggle.

Here we are not in front of a theorization of violence as the only and favourite means of political struggle, emphasizing its existentialist and irrational, more or less anarchical or reactionary aspects. Lenin gives us a deep analysis of social structure and of political situations, even *contingent* ones, to which answer is given by the elaboration of the necessary means and political proposals and not by the call to demiurgical and violent means of struggle, almost as though the discriminating factor between communists and democratic socialists were at the level of the way of struggle (even though there often is a real coincidence between the reactionary reformist political proposals and the non-violent mediatory means, and this coincidence cannot always be considered merely fortuitous).

For this reason it seems suitable to us not to consider in detail all Lenin's propositions on violence but rather to follow, briefly enough, the relations between this idea and the political proposals elaborated during the October Revolution. We will try to touch, on the one hand, on the aspects concerning the conquest of power (and thus the differences which come to be established with the marxism of the Second International), on the other hand, on the aspects concerning the preservation of revolutionary power once it has been attained (and thus the differences with some critique from the "left"). But in both instances it is necessary:

a) to free oneself from such an interpretation of *State and Revolution* and other Leninist texts, which wants to reduce the analysis of Lenin's thought to revolutionary archaeology following false historicism which brings to the annulment of political suggestions through an interpretation of the situation of capitalism and state which today is deeply different from the marxist one (and this is true for Khrushchev's *State of the whole people* as well as for the intermediate democratic state prefigured in Italy possibly through the mediation of the regions);

b) to avoid the assumption, as a rule for interpretation of Stalin's thesis according to which Lenin's proposals (which is not only the party of *What to Do?* but also the soviets of *State and Revolution* and the Commune of Paris) "was born on the ground of an incomplete and insufficient elaboration of some general thesis of the marxist doctrine on the state" "for this thesis is reduced to a kind of theorization of the "punctualis" assault to the Winter Palace.

c) to be able to catch the political substance of concepts like proletarian dictatorship (and hegemony) and of particular political decisions like the militant com-



munism or the NEP, which are not to be considered in general, but must be seen for what they have been historically and to what demands they answered.

It is clear that Lenin's way of analysis is quite different from that of Bernstein<sup>3</sup> or that of the late Engels, and takes the shape of a continuous research not only of the class basis of the state, but also of the methods for its destruction, and for the construction of a society where it will be extinguished.

While everybody, more or less, including the Second International left and possibly even Rosa Luxemburg — though in thoroughly different ways — let themselves be guided by the spontaneity of historical processes, trusting in the potential discrepancy between the democratic structure of the state, the development of which by now cannot be stopped, and the economical basis going through a crisis; while Kautsky in his *“Way to Power”* criticizes Bernstein, asserting nevertheless once more, with the principle of separation between economical and political struggle, the substance of these positions, Lenin, pondering over revolutionary experiences in Russia and other countries of the last years, completely overturns the traditional position and proposes once again:

- a) the idea of violent revolution;
- b) the idea of proletarian dictatorship.

Reading again, critically, the experience of the *Commune*, which is the first political verification of Marx's analysis of the state, Lenin builds up an accurate definition of the bourgeois state: The state is not judge of peace between the social classes, as the new interpreters of Marx maintain, but it is “an organ of class rule, an organ for the oppression of one class by another; it is the creation of “order”, which legalizes and perpetuates this oppression by moderating the conflict between the classes.”<sup>4</sup>

Only one solution is possible: if the state is the product of the irreconcilability of class antagonisms, if it is a power standing above society and “alienating” itself more and more from it, it is obvious that the liberation of the oppressed class is impossible not only without a violent revolution, but also without the destruction of the apparatus of state power which was created by the ruling class and is an embodiment of this “alienation”.<sup>5</sup>

Revolution must not be violent for itself since “Marxism differs from all primitive forms of socialism by not finding the movement to any particular form of struggle. It recognises the most varied forms of struggle; and it does not “concoct” them but only generalizes, organizes.”<sup>6</sup> But because *violence means destruction of the bourgeois state machine, that is destruction of the capitalist separation between state and civil society*. Right here, in a controversial position as regards the interpretation of *State and Revolution* by democratic socialists and Stalinists, is the central point of *State and Revolution* and the evaluation of the *soviets*, as strict mani-

<sup>3</sup> Cf. “The state is not only the instrument of oppression and the delegated manager of proprietors... the idea which has gained ground is that of a popular state... the character of which is determined by great majority of the people through universal suffrage, equal for all... for the state as political and administrative body, on the contrary, it (the workers' movement) has already become a factor of its strength and it protects and supports it from inside against the particular interests of influent economical groups and of other profiteering social coalitions.”

<sup>4</sup> V. I. Lenin. Coll. Works. Moscow, 1960, V. 25, p. 387.

<sup>5</sup> Ibid., v. 25, p. 388.

<sup>6</sup> Ibid., v. 11, p. 213.



festation of the proletarian dictatorship, is the more exhausted. Just, as for Marx, the proletarian dictatorship does not appear like a mere revolutionary justification of violence, but as a "scientific definition of political power" as stated by Gerratana, which, far from being a denial of freedom, is its highest exaltation. (And in this meaning it seems to us that if Rosa Luxemburg's criticisms to Lenin are questionable, however justified by what was really happening in Russia, Lukacs' answers on freedom in socialism are wrong and in a Stalinist view, emphasizing only the authoritarian element of Leninism in *What to Do?* as opposed to the democratic element of *State and Revolution*: "just like socialization, even freedom cannot represent a value in itself. It must serve the purpose of proletarian rule and not vice versa. Only a revolutionary party (and here we have the same logical leap which years of Stalinism have by now made almost imperceptible to us) as that of the Bolsheviks is able to realize frontal changes, very often unexpected. . . maintaining unaltered what really matters: the rule of the proletariat".)

It is not by chance that immediately after the discussion of the destruction of the bourgeois apparatus Lenin introduces the idea of proletarian dictatorship, speaking of the *Commune* of Paris.

Violence is not the stalinist exaltation of the party's hardness. It is class violence in defence of the proletarian power, which at this stage does not pass from one ruling group to another but directly in the hands of the people.

The socialist revolution, only as it breaks the machine of the state, begins to further its process of extinction. The police itself shall thus have to disappear: "What kind of militia do we need, the proletariat, all the toiling people? A genuine people's militia, i. e., one that, first, consists of the *entire* population, of all adult citizens of both sexes, and, second, one that combines the functions of a people's army with policy functions, with the functions of the chief and fundamental organ of public order and public administration."<sup>7</sup>

And slowly begins a process of amputation of that social excrescence, the state, from the body of the civil society with a return of the political power to the latter.

The immediate revocability of the mandate of any leader, the reduction of public wages to worker level, the disappearance of the general interests opposite to that of the individuals, all these show that *the Commune is the form, at last uncovered, of the proletarian revolution*, that the *soviet* is not only the instrument of the breaking, but also the first means of what must replace the broken machine. Thus democracy and socialism, democracy and revolutionary violence are not at all antithetical. On the contrary, the development of the former, at this stage of transition — *and not before* — is a necessary condition for the development of the latter.

In the idea of proletarian dictatorship one must not emphasize the side of repressive violence against the individuals who oppose themselves to it—for here the passage to stalinism is immediate — but the violence of class, that is the institution of new forms of power which at the same time, in the period of transition, for Lenin has never believed in a punctual and palingenetic revolution, but has always acknowledged the viscosity of the social phenomena — are able to break the old organizing the new. In this sense Lenin's criticism of representative democracy, even though restricted, not only has nothing in common with the irrationalistic critique, but as a recovering of Marx's critique of the representative state and a

<sup>7</sup> V. I. Lenin, Coll. Works, Moscow, 1960, v. 25, p. 327.



defense of proletarian dictatorship as class democracy "a million times more democratic than any bourgeois democracy"<sup>8</sup> it maintains a great interest of its own at the moment, which cannot be blurred by any theory on the change of character of the state. Certainly, the state now is more than the business committee of the bourgeoisie, its organizer and sometimes also its technical manager, but for all this it has not changed its class structure, its natural violence, open or hidden, public or institutionalized, and neither does the necessity of the political answer, in terms which will not forget *State and Revolution*, substantially change.

But this is exactly what makes of the recovering of Lenin's analysis on violence, and in this direction these notes are nothing but a hint, a matter of political necessity, beyond that of theoretical analysis, just at the moment in which we see the return of old positions and old theses, anarchical and primitive-socialist, which, catching the positive and eversive character of Lenin's analysis, afterwards neglect all its other aspects and fall in dangerous forms of apology of abstract destruction which in fact become a convenient alibi to be exploited by the organized repression of the State. Violence in Lenin is not the Asiatic fury which, as Stalin said, serves at the moment of the crash with the bourgeois power and then is used as a repressive means. It is the revolutionary process, historically determined by the necessity to oppose an armed people (and not an army of the proletariat, as *State and Revolution* is different from *What to Do?*) to the repression of the state, to the bourgeois violence, as a toilsome process of transition to socialism and of enlargement of democracy, this time to the proletariat, in view of an extinction of the state which certainly cannot be realized with the excesses of bureaucracy of the stalinist period; but neither can it be with the expectation and the preparation of a single explosion which takes the same theoretical flimsiness as the "state of the whole people". There is still much to do in this direction and certainly the task is not helped by the non-critical reproposals of Lenin which have characterized the whole centenary (only think of the thesis on Lenin of the Soviet Union Central Committee, in which he is made a kind of advocate of restricted sovereignty) or by the more recent and skilful remarks which, reading Lenin's democratic proposals in a key which aims to let the destruction of the state as a fact of violence be forgotten, try to bring it back certain western reformist theories. But we shall return to this some other time.

Now, to conclude, it is enough for us to assert once again that for Lenin, and we hope this may not seem a provocatory statement, violence and proletarian dictatorship mean substantially one only thing: the construction, already in practice, of that process which comes to conclusion only "when all the members of society will have themselves learned to manage the State".

<sup>8</sup> V. I. Lenin, Coll. Works, Moscow, 1960, v. 28, p. 249.



## CLASSE OUVRIÈRE, ALLIANCES DE CLASSES, RÉVOLUTION

GUY BESSE  
FRANCE

En France l'anniversaire de la naissance de Lénine a fait couler beaucoup d'encre. Les auteurs les plus divers ont rendu hommage à Lénine. Certains estiment toutefois que, si Lénine fut génial, le léninisme n'est pas notre contemporain. Le léninisme n'est donc plus révolutionnaire puisqu'il est révolu. Lénine? Un grand mort.

On sait qu'une thèse essentielle du léninisme consiste à souligner le rôle décisif de la classe ouvrière dans les transformations de la société moderne. Mais pendant de longues années, en France comme dans les autres pays capitalistes, les sociologues ont développé, sous des formes variées l'idée que le poids spécifique de la classe ouvrière dans la dynamique des rapports sociaux tend à s'affaiblir, et que son rôle économique, social, politique est en déclin.

Ces auteurs portaient l'accent sur les perspectives offertes désormais au secteur tertiaire, sur l'importance croissante des „couches nouvelles“. Certains pensaient même que ces couches étaient appelées à relayer la classe ouvrière dans l'histoire de la société française.

Parallèlement on a vu se répandre l'idée que la lutte de classes perdait peu à peu sa raison d'être, que des aménagements internes pouvaient, sans mettre en question l'existence des rapports de production capitalistes, résoudre les problèmes majeurs posés par le développement de notre pays.

On était ainsi enclin à conclure que le concept de „révolution“, tel qu'il a été élaboré par Marx et Engels, et développé par Lénine, perdait toute actualité.

Les auteurs marxistes ont critiqué ces conceptualisations. Ils considéraient qu'elles se fondent sur une étude superficielle et parcellaire du réel.

Or, nous constatons aujourd'hui même dans notre pays que le processus social ne se conforme pas aux prévisions de ceux qui croyaient à l'affaiblissement des luttes de classe et du rôle de la classe ouvrière. Nous voyons, au contraire, les effectifs de la classe ouvrière s'élever, sa place grandir dans la vie du pays. Ses organisations syndicales et politiques ont une audience renforcée. Et l'on peut dire désormais et — semble-t-il, — de plus en plus, que toutes les couches sociales déterminent leur attitude politique en fonction de la classe ouvrière. Le problème majeur posé à la grande bourgeoisie, qui dispose non seulement de la puissance économique, mais du pouvoir d'Etat, c'est de savoir s'il sera possible d'empêcher la classe ouvrière de rassembler autour d'elle les couches moyennes; s'il lui sera



possible, sur le plan politique, d'empêcher la réalisation d'un front coordonnant, avec les forces de la classe ouvrière, celles de toutes les couches non-monopolistes, y compris cette fraction de la bourgeoisie que constituent les petits et moyens entrepreneurs menacés dans leur existence par les monopoles.

Le tableau de la France aujourd'hui ne s'accorde pas avec les appréciations des auteurs qui pensent que les thèses de Lénine sur la place et le rôle de la classe ouvrière sont des thèses périmées.

De ce point de vue, l'étude des orientations du VI<sup>e</sup> Plan élaboré par les dirigeants de l'Etat et le grand patronat français est significative.

Le thème central du Plan, c'est la politique d'„industrialisation“. Les auteurs du Plan partent du fait que, dans le champ de la compétition internationale, la France est handicapée par un important retard industriel. Il convient donc, estiment-ils, de définir la politique économique de notre pays selon les normes d'un développement industriel plus rapide, plus sélectif, en donnant la priorité aux secteurs les plus rentables. On constate que les secteurs privilégiés par le VI<sup>e</sup> Plan sont en fait placés sous le contrôle des vingt plus grandes entreprises, groupées dans une association qui a le leadership de la Confédération nationale du Patronat français. Et le VI<sup>e</sup> Plan prévoit un soutien accentué de l'Etat à ces grosses firmes, au détriment d'autres branches de l'économie pourtant nécessaires à un développement harmonieux de la production française.

Mon propos n'est pas de traiter tous les problèmes posés par le VI<sup>e</sup> Plan. Ce que je voudrais souligner c'est simplement ceci: alors que, durant des années, la grande presse bourgeoise parlait abondamment de la classe ouvrière comme d'une classe en cours d'affaiblissement, alors que de nombreux sociologues portaient l'accent sur le rôle croissant du secteur tertiaire dans notre pays, voici que maintenant les milieux dirigeants de l'économie française, ceux dans lesquels se recrutent les groupes de décision, déclarent qu'il est temps d'admettre, dans le cadre de la politique d'industrialisation, le rôle croissant des couches sociales créatrices de plus-value, le rôle croissant des travailleurs productifs, et de donner moins d'importance aux couches non-productives.

Ainsi c'est l'évolution même des rapports capitalistes de production, dans le contexte de la compétition internationale, qui conduit la grande bourgeoisie maîtresse du pouvoir à souligner elle-même la place et le rôle de la classe ouvrière.

C'est pour une bonne part, d'ailleurs, ce qui explique l'acuité des débats qui se déroulent en France sur l'enseignement technique et la formation professionnelle.

Quant aux luttes de classe dans notre pays, non seulement l'histoire de ces dernières années ne nous conduit pas à conclure qu'elles perdent leur signification, mais les événements de mai 1968 ont apporté un démenti spectaculaire à la thèse selon laquelle ce qui était bon du temps de Lénine est aujourd'hui caduc.

On a vu en mai 1968 des millions de travailleurs français, non seulement des ouvriers — au sens où Marx entend ce terme dans *le Capital*, — mais des employés, des travailleurs intellectuels, des techniciens, des ingénieurs soutenir une âpre lutte économique et sociale face à l'Etat des monopoles et au patronat.

Parmi les sociologues, ces événements ont donné lieu à des interprétations diverses. Certains ont estimé qu'il s'agissait là de phénomènes échappant aux prises d'une analyse de type marxiste. Ce fut notamment le cas de ceux qui tentèrent de les interpréter par le recours aux concepts de la psychanalyse (meurtre du père, refoulement, déplacement, etc.). Il n'est pas question de contester aux psychanaly-



stes le droit de s'interroger sur les transformations de la pratique sociale. Mais, si l'on se donne la peine d'étudier les revendications des travailleurs engagés dans le mouvement de mai 1968, on constate que ces revendications ont bien un caractère de classe. Ce sont des revendications qui ont pris leur forme et leur force dans le combat contre l'exploitation capitaliste, quoiqu'il en soit d'ailleurs du degré de conscience politique des diverses couches de travailleurs participant au mouvement. C'est précisément le cas de trois revendications majeures de mai 1968 : augmentation des salaires ; raccourcissement de la semaine de travail ; libre exercice de l'activité syndicale à l'entreprise. Ce sont des revendications de classe.

À notre avis, le mouvement étudiant et universitaire de mai 1968 ne contredit pas cette appréciation. Car ce mouvement est né de l'évolution des rapports de classes en France depuis une décennie. Un trait essentiel de cette évolution, c'est l'offensive de la grande bourgeoisie monopoliste contre les couches moyennes. Or, c'est dans ces couches que se recrute la grande majorité des étudiants et des universitaires français. Bien entendu, le mouvement étudiant a pris, en mai 1968, des aspects qui méritent une analyse différentielle. Mais le fond sur lequel doit se dessiner toute analyse qui veut maîtriser ces aspects originaux, c'est la situation objectivement faite par le capital monopoliste d'Etat aux couches moyennes : appauvries, angoissées devant leur propre avenir, écartées des centres de décision de la politique et de l'économie. De larges couches de la jeunesse sont particulièrement sensibles à cette situation : quelles perspectives leur offre le pouvoir des monopoles, réactionnaire et malthusien ?

La France est ce pays où 40% des étudiants doivent se livrer à une activité salariée pour pouvoir poursuivre des études supérieures. La France est ce pays où 3 étudiants sur 4 ne terminent pas leurs études. Et ceux qui obtiennent un diplôme ne sont pas toujours assurés de trouver un emploi.

Il nous semble que de telles réalités appellent une analyse qui non seulement ne récuse pas les catégories du matérialisme historique, mais ne peut s'effectuer sans leur concours.

Voilà qui me conduit à une autre observation.

On sait que Lénine attachait une importance décisive à la solution correcte des problèmes d'alliance entre la classe ouvrière et les couches sociales qui ont des intérêts communs avec cette classe.

Il y a près de soixante-dix ans, dans *Que faire?*, il expliquait que la classe ouvrière ne peut jouer son rôle révolutionnaire, dans la perspective du socialisme, que si elle sait se placer à la tête du combat démocratique ; que si elle sait repérer la position exacte et le mouvement de toutes les couches sociales. Lénine soulignait qu'un trait du socialisme scientifique, c'est d'apprendre au prolétariat à ne pas se replier sur lui-même, mais à se donner, par l'étude positive des rapports sociaux, une représentation adéquate des intérêts de toutes les couches sociales.

C'est ainsi seulement que le prolétariat peut nouer alliance avec les couches susceptibles de le rejoindre dans le combat pour la démocratie, combat qui, dans l'esprit de Lénine, est inséparable du combat pour la transformation révolutionnaire des rapports de production.

Il nous semble que ces analyses de *Que faire?* n'ont pas vieilli.

Que se passe-t-il, en France, dans le champ des rapports de classes ?

Non seulement la modernisation des processus de production et les premiers effets de la révolution scientifique et technique n'ont pas pour conséquence d'at-



ténuer la contradiction fondamentale entre la classe capitaliste et la classe ouvrière, mais elles ont pour conséquence d'accentuer cette contradiction.

La modernisation des équipements, la rationalisation des processus de gestion, de fabrication, de distribution n'a nullement pour effet d'alléger la journée de travail. Elle n'a nullement pour effet d'élever le niveau de vie des travailleurs. Dans les conditions de l'exploitation capitaliste, la révolution scientifique et technique sera pour les monopoles une source de profits. La force de travail produit plus, et plus vite; mais ce ne sont pas les travailleurs exploités qui tirent avantage de ces progrès. Il suffit de consulter la courbe du chômage. Le grand patronat n'emploie pas le mot, mais il prévoit l'extension du phénomène dans les années qui viennent.

Mais il est essentiel de remarquer que cette évolution ne concerne pas seulement la classe ouvrière. Elle menace bien d'autres couches sociales. Les ingénieurs et techniciens voient leur force de travail se dévaluer. Ils sont menacés de déqualification et le chômage touche déjà une partie d'entre eux. A la campagne, la petite exploitation est soumise à un impitoyable processus de destruction. Quant à la petite et à la moyenne bourgeoisies urbaines, elles voient grandir la distance entre elles et l'oligarchie qui détient le pouvoir économique et le pouvoir politique étroitement unis.

Ainsi se créent les conditions d'une alliance entre la classe ouvrière et ces diverses couches, contre les monopoles.

Je voudrais dire ici un mot des modifications qui s'effectuent en ce moment dans les couches d'intellectuels français.

Une certaine fraction d'intellectuels est organiquement solidaire de la bourgeoisie monopoliste; c'est le cas notamment des milieux technocratiques. Mais, dans leur grande masse, les travailleurs intellectuels français ont des intérêts incompatibles avec ceux de la grande bourgeoisie. On sait, par exemple, que l'importance des ingénieurs grandit dans le processus de production. Mais pour la plupart, ils sont des travailleurs salariés, soumis aux vicissitudes du système capitaliste. Ils constatent au demeurant que les décisions les plus importantes sont prises en dehors d'eux, au-dessus d'eux, souvent même à l'étranger, notamment aux Etats-Unis. Ils se sentent ainsi refoulés vers la classe ouvrière.

On pourrait considérer chacune des catégories d'intellectuels français selon la place qu'elle occupe dans le système des rapports sociaux: chercheurs scientifiques, enseignants, médecins, artistes, juristes, etc. Il y faudrait beaucoup de temps. Mais les études conduites en France depuis quelques années sur diverses catégories de travailleurs intellectuels permettent dès maintenant de comprendre pourquoi le socialisme scientifique fait, en ce moment même, de grand progrès parmi les intellectuels français.

Autrefois, quand un intellectuel devenait révolutionnaire, il avait le sentiment de franchir un abîme. Il rompait avec son milieu social pour prendre place dans le combat politique auprès du prolétariat révolutionnaire. C'était quelque chose comme une émigration. Mais aujourd'hui?

Dans notre pays, des milliers d'intellectuels prennent conscience que leurs intérêts propres, leurs intérêts spécifiques d'intellectuels, et leurs aspirations, les conduisent à s'allier au prolétariat, dans une solidarité fondamentale d'intérêts et d'aspirations, pour une transformation radicale des rapports sociaux.



Voilà pourquoi la plupart des intellectuels français qui rejoignent dans ces conditions nouvelles la lutte révolutionnaire n'ont pas le sentiment qu'en unissant leurs forces à celles de la classe ouvrière ils changent de planète. C'est en tant que travailleurs intellectuels qu'ils considèrent que leur place est aux côtés du prolétariat, face à un ennemi commun. C'est pourquoi l'intellectuel révolutionnaire n'est pas un intellectuel ouvrieriste. On sait ce que Lénine pensait des attitudes ouvrieristes. En mai 1968, elles se sont manifestées en France chez certains intellectuels qui avaient mauvaise conscience de ne pas être ouvriers, et qui s'identifiaient imaginairement à un prolétariat mythique.

Quant à la classe ouvrière, dans son rapport avec les intellectuels, on peut dire qu'un des signes de sa maturité révolutionnaire est de savoir reconnaître en quoi cet ingénieur, ce professeur, ce chercheur scientifique, ce médecin, cet écrivain trouvent dans leur propre pratique les motivations qui les conduisent à rejoindre le combat et les organisations révolutionnaires. Ainsi l'ouvrier et l'intellectuel révolutionnaires, dans la France de 1970, donnent une signification quotidienne aux analyses élaborées par Lénine, dans *Que faire?*, au début du siècle.

Ma dernière observation a trait aux problèmes de la révolution, traitée du point de vue léniniste.

Je ne m'étendrai pas sur l'utilisation qui a été faite durant la dernière période, en France, d'un concept comme celui de „révolution des superstructures“. Il y aurait beaucoup à dire là-dessus. L'usage d'un tel concept tend à masquer la nécessité historique d'une transformation socialiste des rapports de production.

On sait que Lénine a abordé les problèmes de la révolution à partir d'une analyse de l'impérialisme. Faut-il considérer que les conclusions de Lénine n'ont qu'un intérêt rétrospectif? Nous croyons qu'une étude de la situation française ne peut avoir prise sur la réalité que si elle s'inspire de la démarche de Lénine.

Le développement du capitalisme monopoliste d'Etat suscite en son sein, sur la base de la contradiction fondamentale de classe que je soulignais au début, un grand nombre de contradictions qui ne pourront être surmontées que par l'appropriation collective des grands moyens de production et d'échange.

On ne doit jamais oublier que la reproduction du capitalisme n'est pas la répétition mécanique d'un système. C'est une reproduction élargie. De telle sorte que, loin de s'atténuer, l'opposition entre les deux pôles de la société telle que Marx l'analysait dans *le Capital* devient plus aiguë. Le renforcement de la puissance des groupes qui occupent une situation de monopole a pour effet non seulement l'aggravation de la situation des travailleurs, mais l'affaiblissement des couches intermédiaires. Dans les conditions du capitalisme monopoliste d'Etat les divisions de la bourgeoisie, ses conflits internes s'aggravent. C'est justement cette évolution qui, en France, permet au prolétariat révolutionnaire de poser concrètement les problèmes d'alliance de classe en appropriant à notre pays la conception léniniste de la stratégie révolutionnaire.

C'est en prenant appui sur les contradictions aggravées du capitalisme que le mouvement ouvrier et démocratique peut isoler le pouvoir des monopoles en rassemblant toutes les couches intéressées à la lutte contre l'ennemi commun.

Mais dès lors on voit combien Lénine avait vu juste quand il soulignait, dans ses polémiques contre les théoriciens de l'ultraimpérialisme, que la victoire de la révolution socialiste suppose, non l'atténuation de la lutte de classe, mais son accentuation. La grande bourgeoisie nous offre elle-même la possibilité qu'il en est



bien ainsi. En France, dans la dernière période, elle a prodigué ses efforts pour entraîner les syndicats ouvriers dans la collaboration de classe. Et sur le plan politique elle s'est assigné l'objectif d'empêcher la réalisation d'une entente entre les diverses formations du mouvement ouvrier et démocratique. Cet objectif, elle l'atteindrait si elle parvenait à enfermer un certain nombre de ces formations, notamment le Parti socialiste, dans la pratique de la collaboration de classe avec la couche maîtresse du pouvoir.

Lutte de classe ou collaboration de classe, telle est la question posée. En étudier tous les aspects nous conduirait à traiter un grand nombre de problèmes, comme ceux que soulèvent les différentes formes de l'opportunisme, ceux que suscite la dynamique des rapports entre les différents partis politiques au sein du mouvement démocratique, ceux qui concernent la dialectique parti-syndicat, la dialectique revendication-révolution, etc.

Quel que soit le problème abordé, il nous paraît que la théorie et la pratique du léninisme sont seules susceptibles de les résoudre correctement dans les conditions de la France et du monde contemporains.

Il est périlleux en ces années de ne voir en Lénine qu'un grand mort. Lénine est grand, mais il n'est pas mort.



ON THE SOCIO-ECONOMIC CONDITIONALITY  
OF POWER STRUCTURES IN THE PROCESS OF SOCIAL  
DECISION

MANFRED LÖTSCH

GDR

If the object of planning is not considered as small and therefore easily surveyable subunits, but either as large social sub-systems or even society as a whole, it is evident from the beginning that the solution of planning problems involves a large number of difficulties. In order, for example, to make efficient planning of the national economy possible, the immense quantity of economic processes, which are interdependent in a manifold and complex manner, have to be registered in a system of exact data and to be assessed according to precisely defined criteria. If we, first, abstract from the fact that in general planning a system of social interests—of whatever kind—is always followed and realized and if we consider planning provisionally as a technical-organizational process, the problem seems to consist in the following: the more comprehensive the field to be planned and the longer the periods which are to be planned, the larger is the quantity of information to be processed and the more complex its structure. Or in other words: In the light of practical feasibility and practical control the problem of planning seems to be a problem of information processing.<sup>1</sup>

In bourgeois literature (but more in futurological than in sociological literature in the narrower sense) the problem, however, has largely assumed the form that it mainly or only concerns the gathering and processing of information. Karl Steinbuch, for example, who incidentally to the degree that he replaced the criticism of present capitalist society by an apologetic, for it became the leading futurologist of the West German Federal Republic, sees in it the basic problem in general: "The story of the building of the tower of Babel shows that a functioning technique of information is the prerequisite for a functioning society. Information is the beginning and foundation of society."<sup>2</sup>

Let us disregard the fact that even a fleeting glance at real history instead of referring to biblical-allegorical history would show that not information but mate-

<sup>1</sup> Marxist scientists also urgently point out the importance of formulating the question this way. Cf. Berg/Tschernjak. *Information und Leitung* (Information and Management). Dietz Verlag, Berlin, 1968.

<sup>2</sup> Karl Steinbuch. *Die informierte Gesellschaft* (The Informed Society). In: *Perspektiven für das letzte Drittel des 20 Jahrhunderts* (Perspectives for the Last Third of 20th Century). W. Kohlhammer Verlag, Stuttgart, (West) Berlin, Cologne, Mainz, 1968, p. 95.



rial production is the foundation of society, and follow Steinbuch's arguments a little further, simply because his ideas represent an entire direction of futurology and, in addition, an especially typical model of society.

If the functional proficiency of a society is determined by the efficiency of its information technique, it is only logical to consider defects in society as defects in the information system. Based on this prerequisite, the optimization of society, at least in principle, seems to be amazingly simple. It is only a question of establishing an efficient system of information. Or, put differently: In Steinbuch's view the problem of rational planning is reduced to a rational technique of information: "The information technique is a strong weapon against the irrationality of political actions."<sup>3</sup> In a similar but much more comprehensive sense Wiener and Kahn consider "the general control of society on the basis of cybernetics"<sup>4</sup> as one of the main characteristics of the so-called post-industrial society. Finally, it is Brzezinski who quite frankly expresses the final aim of this concept: In Socialist society computers and technical information systems should replace the Central Committee (i. e., the leading role of the party of the working class).<sup>5</sup>

To return to Steinbuch: What is first conspicuous about his argumentation is the absolute representation of information as the primary foundation of social system. It would go far beyond the scope of this contribution to explain from the point of view of a general theoretical system that the analysis of social systems requires a more comprehensive initial position integrating the structure-behaviour correlate and that the analysis of the structure of the flow of information is given the correct sense only within the framework of such a superordinate system of reference. From the beginning we formulate the problem more specifically and start from the fact that information cannot be the "beginning and foundation" of society, but acts as an instrument to it, as an intermediary process, the effective principles of which can only be understood on the basis of the general effective principles of society as a whole. Steinbuch seems to feel the illogic of his argumentation himself, for at the end information seems to change for him from the beginning and foundation of society into a dependent process which is a priori not understandable at all: "The value systems of the programmers are necessarily included in these processes (of information processing—M. L.). The enormous social effect of the perfect information systems will provide the value systems of the programmers with a hitherto unimaginable effect."<sup>6</sup>

Therefore we note that the concept of the "informed society", for which Steinbuch is only a typical representative, reduces the problem of the rationality of social planning to information technique. The conjuring up of data bands, perfect computers and other efficient instruments of information processing, however, is simply

<sup>3</sup> Geplante Zukunft? Aufgaben für Politik und Wissenschaft (Planned Future? Tasks for Politics and Science). Edited by Waldemar von Knoeringen. Verlag für Literatur und Zeitgeschehen. Hannover, 1968. p. 25.

<sup>4</sup> Herman Kahn/Anthony Wiener. Ihr werdet es erleben. Voraussagen der Wissenschaft bis zum Jahr 2000 (The year 2000). A Framework for Speculations on the Next Thirty-three Years, Verlag Fritz Molden, Vienna, Munich, Zürich, p. 175.

<sup>5</sup> Z. Brzezinski. Entspannungspolitik im Schatten Prags (The Policy of Relaxation in the Shadow of Prague). In: Das 198. Jahrzehnt. Eine Team-Prognose für 1970 bis 1980 (The 198th Decade. A Team Prognosis for 1970 to 1980), Cristian Wegner Verlag, Hamburg, 1969, p. 54.

<sup>6</sup> Karl Steinbuch. Op. cit., p. 116.



not suitable as an approach to the problem because information technique is not an autonomously operating mechanism, but a means of production, i. e., a means of production of a special kind, a means for producing information. Even the simple question of who the programmers are whose value systems obtain an unimaginable effect shows that in the above-described initial position the problem is hidden behind a smoke-screen rather than correctly formulated.

At a discussion of experts at the Executive Committee of the Social Democratic Party, Bahrtdt opposed Steinbuch's position as follows: "It must certainly be taken into consideration that the possession of information implies power, that to possess information and to withhold it from other groups is an interest of the various groups, that certain groups have these monopoly wishes and other groups other monopoly wishes and that in the final analysis, it does not rarely happen that certain groups prefer not to know anything about things closely associated with them, if their own non-knowledge also prevents others from knowing about it.

This means that the construction of large centralized information systems with all the technical trimmings is, from the very outset, embedded in many different power struggles by interest groups."<sup>7</sup> Indeed: Let us take a problem that may justly be called one of the basic problems of mankind today: the at present (and, in all probability, also in the future) increasing discrepancy between the growth of the world population and the increase in the production of food. It may be considered as proved that this is a manifestation of a non-functioning society, for from the point of view of natural science and technology, the problem can be solved with the prerequisites of today in the shortest possible time. But if, on the one hand, in the so-called highly developed countries of the West masses of food are destroyed and huge production capacities are laid fallow under the protection and with the economic promotion of the state, whereas, on the other hand, day by day thousands of people die of hunger, this is not the result of an inadequate information system, but the logical and consistent consequence of a society whose basic law is not human welfare but profit. And conversely: The problem cannot be solved by the construction of perfected information systems but only by a fundamental upheaval of the basic economic interest structures, and that can be done only in a revolutionary way.

Compared with the pseudo-cybernetic or, more precisely, technocratic, and carefully avoiding any way of looking at the concept of the "informed society" with any essential social reference, the statement of Bahrtdt is, no doubt, somewhat more realistic, not in the sense that answers the problem but, at best, insofar as it indicates the way of correctly stating the question. The manner, however, in which Bahrtdt continues his idea is rather unsatisfactory: "I think if democracy is not to be lost sight of in this development, then a balance of power between the various factors must be borne in mind, which need not necessarily look like that designed by Montesquieu, but which may be structured somewhat differently today."<sup>8</sup>

In my opinion, the offer of a "balance of power" is, in view of the real problems, too modest. To return to the above-mentioned problem: The basic defect in the relations between highly developed capitalist countries and the developing countries is not the insufficient developed "balance of power" or "equilibrium of

<sup>7</sup> Hans-Paul Bahrtdt. in: Geplante Zukunft. Op. cit., pp. 45 f.

<sup>8</sup> Bahrtdt. Op. cit., p. 46.



forces". Its essential content lies in the fact that, firstly, the ruling class of the developed capitalist industrial countries has no interest at all in the developing countries freeing themselves from their economic backwardness, and that, secondly, it employs all its might to prevent a development of the productive forces corresponding to the objective requirements. The essence of this conflict lies in the fundamental divergence of interests, and there is no progress if the behaviour of the monopoly bourgeoisie is paraphrased in a way which is as "free of value judgments" as possible. On the contrary, it is the theoretical task to throw light upon the economic and historical foundations as the basis of the essential social antagonisms in order and that is, after all, decisive — to reveal the way to overcoming them. This, however, presupposes a sociological conception which is on the side of social progress without reservation, i. e., a conception which is committed to the working class and all other progressive forces, very much in contrast to a sociology which claims to be neutral to value judgments, but which in reality is not so at all. The authors of non-Marxist literature start from the idea of pluralism whenever power structures in the present society are to be explained. We only want to mention Peter Drucker here as an example. He considers this idea even to be the decisive basis of social theory in general: "If a social theory is to be meaningful at all, it must start from the real factor of a pluralism of institutions. . . . A theory of the society of organizations would have to be based on the interdependence of the organizations."<sup>9</sup> Let us continue to follow the prerequisites and consequences of the pluralistic conception and first formulate the thesis that pluralism, firstly, with the prerequisite of power structures organized according to the division of labour assumes as given what is to be investigated and, secondly, that it from the beginning replaces critical analysis with a fundamental apologetic. But such an analysis, starting in this way, makes it necessary to go beyond the mechanism of planning and advance to its social content and nature. The nature of social planning is, in general, the formulation of development aims to be striven for and the stipulation of the means for reaching these aims. The question of the connection between power and planning is thus, for the time being, reduced to two questions:

Firstly: How do these aims come about?

Secondly: On what does the selection of the ways and means for reaching these aims depend?

At first, it is evident that social development aims are by nature multi-dimensional. The problem is always the selection from a more or less broad spectrum of possibilities: ideally, the optimum variant is to be found. Or, in other words: The basic problem of scientific planning is the problem of rationality, the securing of the optimum selection. Here, in this connection, the question of the efficiency of the modern methods of information processing has its sense, because from the view of the formal-technical mastery of planning processes the finding of the optimum variant depends, of course, on the fact that this variant first enters into the selection process. The modern methods of information processing decisively increase the wealth of information processing and thus constitute an essential basis of optimization. But, and this is of decisive importance, the information technique alone

<sup>9</sup> Peter Drucker. *Die Zukunft bewältigen (Coping with the Future)*, Econ Verlag, Düsseldorf, Vienna, 1969. pp. 224 f.



and without prerequisites does not guarantee optimization at all; it is at best a necessary but by no means sufficient condition.

To the extent that there are antagonistic interests in a society, the selection of the aims to be striven for is made via the struggle between the objective representatives of these interests: Within the framework of capitalist society the proletariat struggles against exploitation and oppression, for social security and a rising standard of living, whereas the monopoly bourgeoisie subordinates the selection of every concrete individual aim to its general aim of profit maximization.

Starting from this statement, which is as simple as it is incontestable, it is apparent that the given power structure of society is the basis of the planning process. If there is antagonistic opposition, rationality does not generally decide on the course of planning but the following connection: Those aims are selected which correspond to the interests of those groups which have the power to force a selection which corresponds to their interests. In class society the principle of rationality is subordinated to class interests. The concept of pluralism now understands the antagonism between the classes under the same system of reference as the conflict between two rival monopoly associations, and the general proposal of a "balance of power" is then to be valid in the same way for the relationship between state and monopolies as for the relations between the bourgeoisie and proletariat. Disregarding for the moment the fact that the reality of capitalist society has not so far proved the practicability of this proposal, let us consider the methodological prerequisites of this concept. The pluralistic concept in the final analysis amounts to saying that political power structures and conflicts are considered as given phenomena and are finally only described, but their fundamentals are not investigated. The decisive result, which ultimately counts, is the fundamental defence of the existing power structure of capitalist society, and any criticism of details is aimed only at a partial improvement.<sup>10</sup>

Let us return to the original starting point so that we can examine this problem somewhat more closely. The concept of the "informed society" shall be asked a question, which is as simple as it is far-reaching: In whose hands are the modern means of information processing and whose aims are included in the programs of the computers?

Nobody will be able to dispute that computers are, in the final analysis, nothing but specific means of production. Consequently, their programs are not simply made up, as Steinbuch inconsistently assumes, from the value conceptions of the programmers, but from the value conceptions of the owners who, in turn, program the programmers. That the ownership of the modern means of information processing (they are, no doubt, power-increasing factors) will not constitute a new kind of pluralism, follows again from the very simple consideration that only those who have the necessary financial potential come into possession of these means: the owners of the "traditional" means of production.

It follows that an analysis of power structures in the social planning process leads to insights into inner, essential connections only if the starting point is the connection between economic and political power. But even this statement, already in this form exposing important shortcomings of the pluralistic conception, is still insufficient: Economic power and political power do not stand alongside each other

<sup>10</sup> Cf. Drucker Op. cit., pp. 270 ff.



with the same rank, and they do not act towards each other as autonomous spheres. By nature, political power is nothing but an expression of economic power; the power of every ruling class is based on the ownership of the means of production. The example considered above proves this with sufficient clearness.

Now it is clear right from the outset that the aim, content and course of social planning processes are determined by the given power structures which are, in turn, an expression of economic relations. At first, the objective economic relations manifest themselves as interests, and it depends on the available power to which degree these interests can be pursued and realized. Whether in social planning processes social or egoistic group interests are pursued is therefore determined by whether and to what degree the interests of the ruling class coincide with the interests of the whole of society. It is conceivable, but so far has not been proved, that under conditions of the private ownership of the means of production social planning may be realized in such a way that society is the object of planning, thus it cannot be excluded from the outset that processes of the whole of society are included in the planning mechanisms of the capitalist state. But it would be utterly wrong to declare that this is social planning and to derive from it a tendency for capitalism and socialism that to converge for the decisive antagonism between the two systems is, so far as the problem of planning is concerned, not their mechanism but their content. From the fact that private ownership of necessity produces private interests and at the same time includes the power to pursue these interests, it inevitably follows that planning only pursues the interests of the private owners. Under such conditions society may well be the object but cannot, for fundamental reasons, be the aim and subject of planning.

Or, in other words: The extension of planning mechanisms to the whole of society simply does not constitute social planning, because the monopoly bourgeoisie for objective reasons is not in a position to behave otherwise than in accordance with its historical origin and its position in the system of social production. The pursuit of egoistic class aims, because of a given historical determination which is at the same time immanent to the system, is inseparably connected with the nature of this class—also and just when these egoistic aims are loudly and fraudulently altered into social requirements.

Today perhaps nobody seriously disputes the scientific finding that in the capitalist industrial countries important trends in the productive forces profoundly collide with social needs: Technically perfected visions of the future are in flagrant contradiction to unsolved social problems; huge quantities of food are destructed in the presence of threatening starvation; a number of "modern big cities" have already today reached the margin of uninhabitableness, e. g., from air pollution; a leading American biologist recently stated that the destruction of the environment will reach the "point of no return" in about 25 or 50 years; since 1946, the USA has spent four billion dollars for armament whereas in the country itself millions of people are living below the subsistence minimum; the whole bourgeois futurology is fascinated by the efficiency of the technology of the future, but does not know how to answer the question of man's role in a society largely based on far-reaching automation. This is only an enumeration of a few conflicts from a host of really existing conflicts.<sup>11</sup> A striking example of the conflict between monopoly capital-

<sup>11</sup> Cf. Ritt a u f d e m Tiger (Ride on the Tiger). In: Der Spiegel. Berlin Edition, 5 January 1970, pp. 34 ff.



ist objectives and the modern productive forces is the "prognosis" of Professor Holste, the development head of the Volkswagen Works: The producing and sale of cars will continue even if the federal citizens are already hemmed in bumper to bumper on the autobahns.<sup>12</sup> But, and this is important, such objectives are not simply absurd: on the contrary, they are perfectly logical within the framework of way of thinking oriented only on the realization of profit. The deeper sense of the whole problem is the historically inseparable connection of the bourgeoisie with an economic system based on the private ownership of the means of production and regulated and determined by corresponding objectives. Critical and reasonable scientists conjure up the necessity of a completely new way of thinking as the only basis for coping with the future, but this amounts, strictly speaking, to squaring the circle, i. e., to the demand that the bourgeoisie based on private property should produce a way of thinking contrary to private property. This means demanding, that a bourgeoisie behave otherwise than as a bourgeoisie.

The way out usually offered, that scientists and experts would therefore have to take over the direction of society, is in reality a false way: As social power has its deeper roots in economic power, Daniel Bell's "practicians of the new intellectual technology" are, by nature, nothing but executive organs of the ruling class. "Again and again we return to the question "Who has the power?" said one of the "technocrats" of the American General Electric Trust.<sup>13</sup>

Certainly, the concept of pluralism may be conceded to reflect a real problem: the increasing complexity of power structures in present capitalist society. Under the conditions of the scientific and technological revolution the ruling class cannot but continue the division of labour in the exercise of power. We leave out of account the problems it may cause for the ruling class itself; here we only want to point out that pluralism is subject to the fallacy of the theory of cognition that takes the manifestation for the essence of the matter. It is a matter of fact that the significance of science and management in the process of social decision is growing; but in order to give a real explanation of the power structure of present capitalist society, pluralism would have to prove that science and management replace economic power. The simple and incontestable fact that objectives, apparently meaningful and necessary from a scientific point of view, can never assert themselves if they run counter to the interest of monopoly capitalism is a perfect rebuttal. The access to the question "Who has the power?" is not opened up by the description of external manifestations. The exponential growth of scientific manpower in present-day society may be somewhat attractive, but to the degree to which it is played up as the essence of the matter, real access is barred: the analysis of the economic power structure of society.

To sum up what has been said: If the concept of pluralism turns out to be unsuitable even with respect to capitalist society, it is all the more so when speaking of socialist society. The general ground for this statement is that a socio-economically uniform basis of necessity produces an isomorphic power structure: The social ownership of the means of production inevitably corresponds to the political power of the working class and the working people allied with it.

<sup>12</sup> Cf. Ritt auf dem Tiger (Ride on the Tiger). In: Der Spiegel. Berlin Edition, January 1970, p. 42.

<sup>13</sup> Ibid. p. 46.



These two characteristic features of socialist society are the decisive prerequisites for the fact that the aims pursued in the planning process completely coincide with the interests of the whole of society. Only in this way is society at the same time object, subject and aim of planning, i. e., planning is directed at the whole of society in the sense that there are no subspheres which are purposefully organized, but the complexity of society as a system, and in the sense that the aims pursued are aims of the whole society.

From the fundamental dependence of the content and the mechanisms of planning on social relations it follows that the problems faced by socialist society are qualitatively different from those of capitalist society. Whereas the West German employers and employers' associations, for example, do their utmost to refuse the demands of the trade unions for co-determination and whereas the trade unions in this struggle so far have not scored any substantial success we face a completely contrary problem: of including all working people as extensively as possible in planning and management.

The general situation of the problem is as follows: It is in the nature of social planning that in its execution social aims and interests as a whole are worked out and realized. From this it follows that the safeguarding of the will of the whole of society must be connected organically with the participation of all working people in planning and management.

Technocratic concepts with respect to socialist society — of whatever type — assume that this problem cannot be solved in principle. It is assumed that if specific organs are entrusted with the power to guarantee the execution of more comprehensive objectives this power becomes independent of society and consolidates itself as domination.<sup>14</sup>

It is difficult not to reproach this assertion with ignorance, and that for at least two reasons:

Firstly, the problem mentioned has been solved theoretically, namely, with the principle of democratic centralism worked out by Lenin and, secondly, this principle has long since proved its efficiency. The basic idea of democratic centralism is the organic connection of the will of the whole of society with the individual responsibility of the socialist commodity producers and the territorial units. The assumption that social planning is ultimately nothing but a kind of economy operated by state commands ignores the whole living reality of the development of socialist society whose economic stability and prosperity is based not least on the very effectiveness of social planning. At the same time this assumption is theoretically shallow; social planning is simply defamed, but its nature is not examined. In a serious approach to this theoretical task it is not difficult to ascertain the nature of social planning; it is the development and binding stipulation of the socially optimum aims of development. Then the individual operating units are not really independent *in spite of* planning, but strictly speaking, *because of* it. The more exactly social optima are defined, the greater the security of the orientation of the operation of each economic unit from the beginning of the correct aims, and the greater the security of avoiding having economic actions *appear* to the individua

<sup>14</sup> To mention only one example out of a vast number: Peter Christian Ludz. Die Entwicklung der DDR (The Development of the GDR), in: Das 198. Jahrzehnt (The 198th Decade). Op. cit., pp. 213 ff.



enterprise as effective, but which in reality are not so from the social point of view. Or, in other words: "The 'freedom', which is often conjured up in this connection, does not consist in the 'dream of independence' of objective laws, 'but in the knowledge of these laws, and in the possibility this gives of systematically making them work towards definite ends. . . Freedom of the will therefore means nothing but the capacity to make decisions with knowledge of the subject."<sup>15</sup>

This comprehensive connection must be the starting point if the question of the role and the possibilities of the individual within a society based on planning is to be put correctly and answered successfully. Then it is only a matter of the logically consistent continuation to arrive at the insight that planning not only allows free, consciously directed acting, but in the strict sense first makes it possible at all and requires it because then the action takes place within the framework of optimum social objectives. But it should be emphasized once again that is true only of really social planning, i. e., planning in which society is the object and aim of planning at the same time. Only then, under the prerequisite of the social ownership of the means of production and the political power of the working people, does society also become the entire subject of planning, is planning borne by all members of the society. Here it is impossible to describe even approximately the system of institutions which has been developed in our society for the all-round inclusion of all working people in planning and management; it extends from institutions of the whole of society, such as the Scientific Council, to a carefully coordinated system of institutions on the level of the enterprise and communal units. Millions of working people take an active part in them; their exact determination is somewhat difficult for us because of the manifold forms of the cooperation of the working people.<sup>16</sup>

The social character of the process of decision-making under socialism is thus at the same time the practical reduction and absurdum of all technocratic conceptions with respect to socialist society. If, as presupposed in these conceptions, each vertically organized decision process of necessity leads to the rule of the persons concerned under socialism every worker who is consciously acting for society, every member of production committees, councils of innovators, voluntary commissions, etc., would have to be assigned to technocracy, simply because he executes actions and makes decisions influencing the actions of other people. To the degree to which all working people are included in planning and management, and this is our declared aim, logically the whole of society would in the end have to merge into technocracy.

The general conclusion which we deduce from all that has been said is that the understanding of the nature of social planning arises only out of the understanding of the relations of production and that planning is not to be understood simply as a mechanism but as a process determined in its content by the structure of the relations of property and power.

<sup>15</sup> Frederick Engels: *Anti-Dühring*, Foreign Languages Publishing House, Moscow, 1959, p. 157.

<sup>16</sup> To give only a few figures. In our society there are 200,000 deputies, 300,000 members of permanent production councils, 100,000 women in 13,000 women's commissions, 35,000 young people in 6,000 youth commissions, 500,000 members of 7,000 commissions of the workers and farmers' Inspection, and many more.



## V. I. LENIN AND PROBLEMS OF DEVELOPMENT OF INTELLIGENTSIA

M. N. RUTKEVICH  
USSR

The problem of place and role of the intelligentsia in the social structure of the capitalist and the socialist society is one of the most important problems of the marxist theory of classes.

V. I. Lenin discovered the new, distinctive for the age of monopolistic capitalism, tendencies in the development of the class structure in the capitalist society. The greatest desert of the further development of marxist theory under the conditions of the developing socialist society belongs to Lenin as well. Lenin's ideas were also of the first-hand importance in the revealing of the historical fates of the intelligentsia and as well in practical realization of the course for the drawing of the intelligentsia into the socialist construction, for the growing rapprochement of the intelligentsia with the other classes and groups of the working people of our socialist society.

V. I. Lenin begins his well-known definition of classes, that was given in 1919 in the article "Great Initiative" with the difference between them by their place "in the historically definite system of social production"<sup>1</sup>. We may speak about the existence of the social stratum of intelligentsia, in the real sense of the word, only in connection with the capitalism and socialism, but it is necessary to have in mind the specific nature of the intelligentsia in both of these social systems. That's why V. I. Lenin criticized Russian narodnics for their non-historical approach to this social stratum. This point of view is methodologically wrong, it boils down to the concealing of the principal difference between the intelligentsia in the capitalist society and in the socialist society. The arguments concerning the notion of the intelligentsia "in general" without connection with any definite historical epoch, about "eternity" of their critical attitude to the existing system, about the "eternal" conflict between the young (revolutionary) generation and the old (conservative) one and the like are based on the methodologically faulty approach to the study of the social structure in general, and the place of the intelligentsia in it, in particular.

Due to the peculiarities of the development of technology and the modern state of public division of labour there are some common characteristics in the activity of the workers in the socialist and capitalist societies, but this fact does not give us grounds for concealing the cardinal social difference in the standing of the working

<sup>1</sup> V. I. Lenin. Coll. Works. Moscow, 1960, v. 29, p. 421.



class. As well, the community of the functional content of labour of the intelligents does not give us grounds for ignoring the basic difference of the role of intelligentsia under the conditions of different social-economic formations.

In capitalist society the group of people engaged in the professional non-manual labour is rather socially heterogeneous and, due to it, can't be analysed as one united social group. For example, in pre-revolutionary Russia one part of the educated representatives of the predominant classes were out of the *nobiliary* and *bourgeois* intelligentsia. A considerable part of the intelligentsia were out of *petty-bourgeoisie* by their backgrounds, ideology and psychology. Due to their marginal state a great number of them manifested certain hesitations. And only non-numerous *proletarian* intelligentsia defended the interests of proletariat, played a significant role in its revolutionary struggle. V. I. Lenin wrote: "Like any other class in modern society the proletariat not only advancing intellectuals from its own midst, but also accepts into its ranks supporters from the midst of all and sundry educated people."<sup>2</sup> Thus, the intelligents of pre-revolutionary Russia who came from the different social classes, expressed the different class interests.

Capitalist production demands a growing number of persons of non-manual labour in all spheres of life. The engineers, technicians, as well as the physicians, teachers etc. compose a specific social stratum. Still in 1904 V. I. Lenin wrote in this connection: "No one will venture to deny that the intelligentsia, as a *special stratum* of the modern capitalist society, is characterized by and large, precisely by individualism and incapacity for discipline and organization."<sup>3</sup> (My stress — M. R.). At the same time Lenin noted that by the terms "intelligent", "intelligentsia" he meant this notion in its broad sense as "include not only writers, but in general all educated people, the members of all liberal professions, the brain workers as the English call them, as distinct from manual workers."<sup>4</sup>

The tendency to the rapprochement of the intelligentsia with the working class was noted by V. I. Lenin still at the end of the XIX century. He wrote: "... capitalism increasingly deprives the intellectual of his independent position, converts him into a hired worker and threatens to lower his living standard."<sup>5</sup> Nowadays this tendency manifests itself more explicitly. Under the conditions of modern scientific and technological revolution the demand for non-manual workers (professionals and clerical workers) in capitalist countries grows. So, in France, according to the report of G. Marcher at the XIV Congress of F. C. P., the intelligentsia increased in size three times for the last 15 years. The conditions of labour and living of the majority of these people are near to those of the workers. In France 3/4 of intelligents are engaged in hiring labour and this basic fact makes them the supporters of the proletariat. Approximately such is the case with other developed capitalist countries. But this situation does not give us ground for the including of intelligentsia engaged in hiring labour to the composition of working class. But the tendency of rapprochement of the intelligentsia with the working class can't be ignored due to their objective social standing, and the possibility of strengthening of the union between the working class and the great bulk of the

<sup>2</sup> V. I. Lenin. Coll. Works, Moscow, 1960, v. 6, p. 198.

<sup>3</sup> Ibid., v. 7, p. 264.

<sup>4</sup> Ibid., v. 7, p. 324.

<sup>5</sup> Ibid., v. 4, p. 202.



intelligentsia in the modern capitalist society. Laudation of the intelligentsia as "the leader of modern society" became nowadays one of the popular objections against marxism, that revealed the historical mission of proletariat, that is the main force, according to marxism, in the struggle for the construction of socialist society. Marxism disclosed a complete theoretical insolvency of the technocratic theories of the apologists of capitalism, on the one hand, and, on the other, of the pseudo-revolutionary theories of H. Marcuse and the other petty-bourgeois theorists, who tried to oppose "the left radical student youth" to the working class, because it, in their opinion, "is losing" its revolutionary essence in developed countries. The ideas of the evident opponents of marxism are rather similar to those of the revisionists like R. Garodi, who finds "the great turning point of marxism" in the idea that the ruling role of the working class in the construction of socialism has to pass to the intelligentsia.

The Socialist Revolution basically changes the standing and the social role of the intelligentsia. A definite part of the Russian nobiliary and bourgeois intelligentsia emigrated, but its best representatives went to service to the Soviet people. The majority of the petty-bourgeois intelligentsia became the supporters of the working class.

Still during the civil war, V. I. Lenin understood that the use of the bourgeois professionals was one of the forms of class struggle in the epoch of the dictatorship of the proletariat. The history of the Soviet society confirms this thesis. At the end of the twenties and the beginning of the thirties some of the old intelligents became saboteurs and enemies of the Soviet Power. These intrigues of the hostile forces were prosecuted. The winning over the old professionals was the historical necessity. Without utilization of their knowledge and organizational skills the working class couldn't restore the economy and construct the socialism. But our country was badly in need of intelligentsia that is strongly connected with the people. The Communist Party and Socialist State have begun its formation since the first years of the construction of new society.

With the help of workers' faculty (it prepared for the high schools millions of people), by the way of foundation of the great number of high schools, which were located all over the country, by providing the students with scholarships and hostels (even in the hardest years of our history) we solved the problem of formation of the staff of professionals, originating from the workers and peasants. So to the middle of the thirties the new intelligentsia was almost formed, it absorbed a part of the old intelligentsia and became a special, comparatively homogeneous group of our socialist society.

In the other socialist countries the intelligentsia was formed under in some ways distinctive historical conditions. In some of them the process of transition of the old intelligentsia to socialism is going rather slowly and unevenly. For example, in Poland there is non-numerous technical intelligentsia, that was formed as a matter of fact in the years of the Popular Power, it is approached by the conditions of labour to the working class, and due to these facts it firmly stands on the positions of socialism, but as for some representatives of humanitarians, they even now did not free from the bourgeois ideology, and even tried to dissimilate it, the fact that played an important role in the ripe of the students' disturbances in March 1968.

It is necessary to take into consideration the fact that the bourgeois intelligentsia retains considerably longer than the class of bourgeoisie, that disappears as



soon as the private property is liquidated. But as a matter of fact its representatives do not disappear, they have to go to service to the new society, and in the majority of class as professionals. So an additional number of bourgeois elements is absorbed by the intelligentsia. Quite for a long time they retain their political attitudes, and under certain conditions may set out for the restoration of capitalism. It is just the representatives of the bourgeois intelligentsia, who composed the vanguard of the right opportunist and anti-socialist forces in Czechoslovakia in 1968; the majority of them were writers, journalists, actors, teachers at the high schools, etc. — those who are connected with ideology.

Thus the experience of the USSR and other socialist countries shows that the process of formation of the socialist intelligentsia is a rather difficult and prolonged one. This process is a part of a more general process of the transformation of the social structure, and that it is an important scene of class-struggle during the whole transition period. In some cases, as history shows, this struggle may intensify even in those countries, where the grounds of socialism are founded.

\*

And what is the stratum of the intelligentsia under socialism? What place does it occupy in the social structure of the Soviet society nowadays?

The difference between the working class and the class of collective-farmers is first of all determined by their different relation to the forms of the socialist property (public and group). Besides, there is a certain difference between manual and non-manual workers. It is a well-known fact that the clerical workers as well as the professionals who work at the collective-farms are the members of these collective-farms, and their relation to the means of production is similar to that of the collective-farmers. As for all the rest non-manual workers (besides the creative workers and also the representatives of free professions, etc.) engaged at state rural and urban enterprises, their relation to the means of production is similar to the workers' one. In some of our philosophical, sociological, economical works this problem is simplified somehow. So, O. I. Shkaratan supposes that "the very affiliation to the group of workers of state enterprises, the receipt of the wages. . ." means by itself the affiliation to the class of workers.<sup>6</sup> Accordingly, a number of the experts consider that the professionals who are engaged in the collective farms must be affiliated to the class of collective farmers.

The base of these ideas is the belief that there is only one criterion of class-social distinction irrespective of the social structure, that is the relation to the means of production. But the group of persons noted as "the workers and clericals" can't be analysed as a definite class, because its composition is rather heterogeneous.

Lenin in his definition of classes, that was given by the way after the Great October Socialist Revolution, marks not only one sign of the class — the relation to the means of production — but as well the role of the social groups in the system of division of labour and in the sphere of distribution. The relation to the means of production is the principal class sign in those societies, where the *private* property on the means of production *does dominate* and *does separate* people. Another

<sup>6</sup> O. I. Shkaratan. "Problemy sotsialnoi struktury rabocheho klassa SSSR" (Problems of the social structure of the USSR working class). Mysl. Moscow, 1970, p. 100.



thing with the ruling of the *public* property, that *does unite* people. In general the relation to the means of production is not only a sign of class distinctions, but under socialism it is more evident, because both of the forms of the public socialist property are essentially of one and the same type, and besides nowadays they are converging in the USSR most rapidly. And as soon as the difference in relations to the means of production is becoming of second importance, the difference in the role of the social groups in public organization of labour with necessity is going to the first ground. These distinctions vary, but the principal one is the *distinction* in the *character of labour*. It is just the character of labour that determines the difference between the workers and the collective farmers, on the one hand, and the persons of non-manual labour, on the other.

The same criterion affords to differentiate the groups of non-manual workers in the army, too. The concept of "the character of labour" means not only the correlation between manual and non-manual efforts in labour activity, as well as a number of other moments of labour: the degree of stereotype in the work operations; the technical equipment of labour; the creative saturation of labour, etc. All these moments in the whole determine the obligatory level of *skill* and are connected with the level of educational and professional training. If we use the criterion in question to the group of persons of non-manual labour, we may subdivide it into the group of *professionals* and the group of *clericals*.

Strictly speaking, the difference between these two main groups originates from capitalism: the status of an engineer and a physician in all spheres of life considerably differs from that of a clerk and a salesman, that is fixed by the state statistics. Still at the beginning of the century V. I. Lenin marked this tendency: "... capitalism increases the number of office and *professional workers* WITH PARTICULAR rapidity and makes a growing demand for intellectuals."<sup>7</sup> As for the group of professionals, Lenin wrote further that a part of them originates from bourgeoisie, and the other — from proletariat. No doubt, in this case Lenin meant only the most educated representatives of non-manual workers under capitalism.

Professionals are the intelligents in the full sense of the world. The intelligentsia of the socialist society is a large group of working people that grows rapidly, professionally engaged in non-manual labour and that must have professional secondary or higher education. In general, there are 30 mln. persons of non-manual labour in the USSR, the intelligents compose more than a half of this number, we mean by the intelligents the persons with the diplomas of the professional higher and secondary schools, but if we take into consideration a great number of the so-called "practical workers", the persons of non-manual labour of high skill without professional diploma, the group of intelligentsia will compose much more than a half of the pointed figure. L. I. Brezhnev in his report at the XXIV Congress of CPSU, characterizing the group of intelligentsia, marked the main groups of it: the group of scientific workers of the engineers, of the technicians, of the agronomists, of the teachers, of the physicians.<sup>8</sup> These categories of working people are usually called in the majority of the party, state and statistics data the group of *professionals*.

The second group is the group of employees — non-professionals. They are also engaged in non-manual labour, but in such categories of it that require less

<sup>7</sup> V. I. Lenin. Coll. works, v. 4, p. 202.

<sup>8</sup> See 24th Congress of the CPSU. Documents, M., 1971, p. 90.



skill, they do not require the diploma of professional secondary and the more so the diploma of a professional higher school. The modern level of the development of production forces demands a great number of the accountants, salesmen, ledgers, clerks, cashiers, secretaries, typists etc. The labour of the workers in these occupations and the like is rather simple and stereotype and does not require a higher educational level than that of skilled workers. There are different names of this social group in Soviet sociological works: "employees", "employees non-professional", "workers of service labour". The first of these names is accepted in many other countries, and in general is acceptable. But we must take into consideration that this notion has a more broad sense form. Due to this fact, it seems more reasonable to accept the name "employees — non-professionals".

Sometimes we call intelligents all the representatives of non-manual labour, in such case we simplify the real picture of the social structure. There is a significant difference between these groups of non-manual labour in the character of labour. Accordingly there is a certain difference in the social reward in different occupations. At average the wages of professionals are higher than those of employees — non-professionals *at one and the same branch of economy*. It is more reasonable to compare the wages of workers in one branch, because the conditions of labour in school for example substantially differ from the conditions of labour in mines. In order to illustrate this we give the data of the wages at Uralmash factory (Sverdlovsk). The wages of the engineers and technicians are at average 37-50% higher than the workers'.

Thus the intelligentsia under socialism is a specific social group that is not a part of the two main classes of the society of the workers and farmers and that does play a special role in the system of the social division of labour. The existence of some transitional stratum (they will be discussed later) marginal cases, coexistence of the signs of the different classes at one and the same person (for example an agronomist is a member of a collective farm) must not confuse us. It is worth to remember the reasonable words of F. Engels: "There are not absolutely precise demarcation lines" in nature.<sup>9</sup> The more so, there are no such lines in society. But of course this does not mean that there are no qualitative distinctions in nature as well as in society. There are some under socialism as well, but they are of quite different origin than those under capitalism, because the exploited classes are liquidated and the process of rapprochement of all the classes and social groups went advancing.

The rapprochement of the social standing is expressed by that fact that the principal interests of all the groups of the Soviet society coincide. But due to the existence of the social distinctions under socialism, each of the social groups of the society has as well its specific interests, which may in some cases come in conflict with the interests of the other social groups. These contradictions are *non-antagonistic*, which means that the common interests prevail over the specific ones. At the XXIV Congress of CPSU L. I. Brezhnev pointed out: "The politics of the Party gives scientific results in case when it is taking into account the common interests of the whole people and the specific interests of the classes and social groups as well, when the Party's policy yields the required results only when it fully

<sup>9</sup> F. Engels. *Dialectics of Nature*. Progress publishers, 1964. p. 215.



takes into account both the interests of the entire people and the interests of various classes and social groups and directs them into a single common channel."<sup>10</sup>

The strengthening of the social unity of the Soviet society takes its grounds in the socialist ideology that expresses the radical interests and the communist ideals of the working class, which occupied and continues to occupy "leading position in the system of the socialist social relations."<sup>11</sup>

There are some works in our press, in which this radical thesis of Leninism is doubted. It was again stressed at the last. Congress of the Party. Some of the technocratic ideas were carried from abroad, according to them, that we have already mentioned, nowadays the intelligentsia takes the role of the leader in the socialist society, the working class is opposed to the intelligentsia. So, in 1970 I. Zabelin wrote: "Nowadays the intelligentsia is becoming the leading revolutionary... class."<sup>12</sup> And this phenomenon, in the author's opinion, is typical for all advanced countries influenced by scientific and technological revolution. This quite wrong thesis was not reasoned in any way as well as the "prognosticated" by Zabelin in the same work phenomenon of "transformation" of the working class and the class of farmers to the "class of intelligentsia". In reality, there is quite another way of rapprochement of classes and social groups in the developed socialist society.

\*

The perspectives of the development of the Soviet intelligentsia are determined by the general laws of the development of the social structure, its transformation into the social structure of the communist society. In 1919, looking forward, V. I. Lenin wrote: "Clearly, in order to abolish classes completely, it is not enough to overthrow the exploiters, the landowners and capitalists, not enough to abolish *their* rights of ownership; it is necessary also to abolish all private ownership of the means of production, it is necessary to abolish the distinction between manual workers and brain workers. This requires a very long period of time."<sup>13</sup>

Lenin's order of enumerating of liquidation of class distinctions was not occasional, it coexists with the objective historical law of formation of the communist society. The process of the liquidation of the difference between manual and non-manual labour requires very much time.

The general progressive trend towards the increase in the amount of manual labour involved in material production as well as in other spheres of activity in conditions of socialism manifests itself in two main processes.

First, we have not only absolute but as well relative increase of the number of non-manual workers, and first of all of the professionals, the intelligents. In 1928, there were 11.4 mill. of workers and employees in the USSR, 521,000 of them were professionals (persons with diplomas of professional secondary and higher schools), that is — 4.6%. In 1940, accordingly, there were

<sup>10</sup> 24th Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union. Documents. Moscow, 1971, p. 87.

<sup>11</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 88.

<sup>12</sup> I. Zabelin. *Chelovek i chelovechestvo (Man and Mankind)*, Sovetski pisatel, M., 1970, p. 166.

<sup>13</sup> V. I. Lenin. *Coll. works*, v. 29, p. 421.



2.4 mil. from 33.9 mil. — 7% and in 1970 — 16.8 mil. from 90.2 mil. — 18.6%.<sup>14</sup>

Secondly, there is a process of a gradual change of the character of manual labour of the workers and farmers, it is more saturated with intellectual elements. *The rise of the cultural and technological level of the broad masses of working people*, the rapprochement of this level to the professional's one is an important factor of the rapprochement of the mainly manual labour of the workers and farmers with the non-manual of the professionals. Most intensively the cultural and technological level of the industrial workers is growing. The visual demonstration of it is the change of their educational level. In 1959 only 386 workers per thousand had completed secondary schools, in 1970 there were already 550. For example, at Uralsmash in 1952 70% of workers had not completed 7-8 grades of secondary school, in 1968 — 37%, and in 1970 — 25%, the majority of them being workers of an older generation. On the other hand, there were less than 3% of workers with completed secondary education at the factory in 1952, in 1962 — 20%, in 1970 — about 30%.

The realization of the law of universal secondary education to the end of the ninth five-year plan will result in the situation, when the whole young generation of workers will not differ in educational level from the technicians.

On the other hand, nowadays a certain number of technicians are already engaged at the workers' places. In many cases, when a worker must manipulate with the complex units, adjust the automatized lines, assemble the electronic equipment, he must have a higher educational level (an universal and technical) than a technician has, that organizes production as a footman etc. The stratum of the workers with such high level of education is worth studying in details. It has been already named "*the workers — intelligents*". This is a specific boundary stratum, which will intensively grow as soon as the scientific and technological revolution will develop, and the scientific achievements will be installed into production.

The general tendency to the social homogeneity of the socialist society also manifests in the processes of change of the innate structure of the intelligentsia: the change of the proportion between the groups of "practical workers", technicians, engineers, scientific workers, in industry and in the other branches of economy and culture.

The most visual demonstration of this tendency is the fate of the group of "practical workers". At Uralsmash in 1952 they comprised 47.3% of the number of the engineers and technicians, but in 1968 — only 22.8%. There was no noticeable change in the proportion between the number of the technicians and professionals: 60%:40%; but each of these groups grew in absolute number. In the nearest future the most intensive growth will be in such occupations as: technicians, nurses etc., due to the fact that our industry, agriculture, public health services are badly in need of these categories of workers. The number of graduates from the professional secondary schools is growing more rapidly than from the higher ones. Besides, nowadays the group of scientific workers is growing most intensively, and more and more of them get master's degree.

<sup>14</sup> SSSR v tsifrah v 1970 (USSR in figures in 1970), Moscow, 1971, pp. 169, 180; Trud v SSSR (Labour in the USSR), Moscow, 1968, pp. 22, 251.



The processes of *social shifts* play a substantial role in the rapprochement of the intelligentsia with all the other social groups and classes, and first of all with the working class. The rows of the intelligents grow at the expense of those, who are studying without discounting work and those, who originate from the families of the workers and all the social groups. L. I. Brezhnev in his report at the factory "Auto-Praha" (27 of May, 1971) stressed the fact that "the working intelligentsia, and all the ruling staff of our socialist society is so to say born by the working class, first of all, they originate from the working class, relate in blood kinship with it."<sup>15</sup>

At the XXIV Congress of CPSU there were given the data of the replenishment of the rows of the engineers and technicians at the Pervouralsk Novotrubni factory: 42% were out of the working class, 32% — out of farmers' families, 26% — out of employees' families.

The data of the other investigation at the Ural enterprise — Sverdlovsk Turbomotor factory (the group of employees was subdivided into a group of professionals and non-professionals): 44.4% of the engineers and technicians originate from the workers, 25.6% — from the farmers, 24.3% — from the employees (non-professional) and only 5.7% — from the professionals. Thus, we may say, that under the conditions of socialism the process of "self-reproduction" of the intelligentsia is subordinative. If the sons and the daughters of professionals nowadays more often become intelligents, the young men from the workers' and farmers' families comprise the majority of the students of the professional schools, the social composition of which is already approaching the social composition of the entire population, and the social composition of the students of the higher schools manifests the steadfast tendency to the rapprochement to the social composition of the population in the given region.

Thus, during the process of the development of the socialist society, the Soviet intelligentsia grows relatively and absolutely, its cultural and technological level rises, rises the number of the scientific workers in the composition of the intelligentsia. But this process in any way cannot be interpreted as the process of the transformation of the working people in the whole to the intelligents. This process must be analysed in connection with a process of a more rapid rise of the cultural and technological level of the workers, they acquire some features of the intelligentsia but remain the workers, regulating modern machines and units. As well this concerns the collective farmers and the employees, their labour is gradually mechanized due to the mechanization of agriculture, trade, sphere of regulation.

On the other hand, non-manual labour of the scientific workers, engineers, physicians, teachers changes; they use the instruments and modern mechanisms (diagnosis with the help of the computers, the new devices of curing in medicine and so on). Non-manual labour attends on manual labour. Socialist society develops in the direction to the complete social homogeneity, which with necessity supposes the workers of new communist type, confining with harmony the elements of manual and non-manual labour. More than half a century ago V. I. Lenin foresaw that the process of overcoming of difference between manual and non-manual labour is a prolonged one. Really this is a very great historical process. There are many achievements in this field. Nowadays under the conditions of the rapid scientific and technological revolution this process does get a significant acceleration.

<sup>15</sup> Pravda, 20 May 1971, p. 1.



AFRICA

GHANA

LIST OF PAPERS

Naidoo L. V. — *Class, Race and Social Change in South Africa*  
Udo J. — *Language Use in Ghana*

LISTE DES RAPPORTS

KENYA

Warburton Z. — *The Development of Sociology in East Africa*

MADAGASCAR

Banavonirivony G. — *Rôle de la sociologie dans la planification du développement en Afrique*

SENEGAL

Diallo Y. — *La signification de la dialectique marxiste-léniniste pour la pratique des pays en voie de développement*

NIGERIA

Akintoye A. — *Performance of the Military Regime in Nigeria 1966 to 1970*  
Oloko O. — *Management Nationality and Employee Commitment to Industrial Employment in Nigeria*

REPUBLIC OF  
SOUTH AFRICA

Bullensdag J. H. van der Merwe — *Occupational Mobility of Africans: The Impact of Urbanization on South African Policies*  
Steyn A. F. — *Ambrosy Parents in the Coloured Family of South Africa*



## AFRICA

### GHANA

- Naidoo L. V. — Caste, Class and Social Change in South Africa  
Ure J. — Language Use in Ghana

### KENYA

- Barbu Z. — The Development of Sociology in East Africa

### MADAGASKAR

- Ranavoarivony G. — Rôle de la sociologie dans la planification du développement en Afrique

### MALI

- Diallo Y. — La signification de la dialectique marxiste-léniniste pour la pratique des pays en voie de développement

### NIGERIA

- Akiwowo A. — Performance of the Military Regime in Nigeria 1966 to 1970  
Oloko O. — Management Nationality and Employee Commitment to Industrial Employment in Nigeria

### REPUBLIC OF SOUTH AFRICA

- Buitendag J., H. von der Merwe — Occupational Mobility of Africans: The Impact of Urbanization on South African Politics  
Steyn A. F. — Authority Patterns in the Coloured Family of South Africa



## SENEGAL

Amin S. — Planning in Africa South of the Sahara

## TUNISIA

Boukraa R. — Développement national et développement régional en Tunisie

Hermassi E. — Le colonialisme et l'Etat national en Afrique du Nord

Stambouli F. — Tradition et modernité à travers les processus d'urbanisation en Tunisie

Zghal A. — La construction nationale au Maghreb

## UGANDA

Chick J., Mazrui A. — The Nigerian Army and African Images of the Military

Kabwegyere T. B. — Family Life and Economic Change in Uganda

Mazrui A. A. — Civil Violence and Political Violence in Uganda and the United States

Marzui A. A. — Cultural Differences in Kenya and Divergent Attitudes Towards Communist China

Wallace T., Sh. J. Weeks — Youth in Uganda

## AMERICA

## ARGENTINA

Corradi J. E. — Cultural Dependence and the Sociology of Knowledge The Latin American Case

Cossio C. — El Revolucionario

Grand Ruiz, B. G. — El imperialismo yanqui nos planifica

Sluzki C. E. — Family Therapies and the Therapist's Identity

Vapnarsky C. — Information Problems in Social Research Related to Urban and Rural Planning in Developing Countries.

## BRAZIL

Barros A. — Military Interventions in Brazilian Politics: 1889—1964

Fernández F. — Patterns of External Domination in Latin America

Martins L. — Notes sur la nouvelle problématique de la transition

Pereira L. — Pentagonism, Substitute for Imperialism? A Thesis Viewed from Brazil



## CANADA

- Afendras E. — Diffusion Processes in Language: Prediction and Planning  
 Badgley R., S. Wolfe, R. Kasius, J. Garson and J. Bury — The Medical Power Elite  
 Basran G. — Theory of Development  
 Carisse C. — Valeurs familiales de sujets féminins novateurs: Perspectives d'avenir  
 Carstens P. — Problems of Peasantry and Social Class in Southern Africa  
 Chekky D. — Modernization and Kin Network in a Development Society:  
 India  
 Constat H. — Rational and Non-Rational Elements in Planning  
 De Gre G. — Realignment of Class Consciousness in the Military and Bourgeoisie in Developing Countries: Egypt, Peru and Cuba  
 Dofny J. — Occupational Mobility in Québec  
 Dofny J. — Le Québec d'Everett C. Hughes  
 Elliot H. — Remarks on the Relevance of Animal Social Behaviour Research for the Study of Man  
 Fallding H. — Religion in Canada  
 Fearn G. — Stability and Changes in the Structure of the Self  
 Ishwaran K. — Adult Literacy in a Developing Society — The Indian Case  
 Kenyon G., B. McPherson — An Approach to the Study of Sport Socialization  
 Lambert W. — An Experimental French School for English Children  
 Loubser J. — The Values Problem in Social Science in Developmental Perspective  
 Meisel J. — Language Continua and Political Alignments: The Case of French and English-Users in Canada  
 Michel A. — Prediction of a Theoretical Model in Family Planning  
 O'Neill J. — On the Pre-Theoretical Constitution of Simmel's "A Priori"  
 Parnel R. — The Professionalization of American Anthropology: A Case Study in the Sociology of Knowledge  
 Pryor E., P. George — Theoretical and Methodological Significance of Reconceptualization of the Nucleation of Family  
 Richmond A. — The Impact of Immigration Urban Planning and Renewal in Toronto  
 Rush G. — The Radicalism of Middle Class Youth  
 Ryerson S. — Social and National Factors in the Quebec "Awakening"  
 Schweitzer D. — Social Mobility and Prejudice in Switzerland  
 Simon W. — Linguistic Pluralism as Source of Cleavage and Conflicts  
 Thibault A. — Insertion sociale et intervention sociologique dans un contexte de développement social  
 Wakii P. — Sociology in the Developing Nations: Case of Pakistan  
 Wrigley J. — Magic in Sport



## CHILE

- Anguita J., E. Droguett, O. Merello, A. Otero — Les aspirations dans deux milieux sociaux et leurs relations au sein de quelques domaines d'observations: Etude exploratoire. Contribution à une recherche internationale  
 Chuaqui J. — On the Theory of Social Change and Social Relationships  
 Varas A. — Chile: A Dependent Mode of Production

## COLUMBIA

- Martinez F. G. — Planning and Social Participation in Latin America

## MEXICO

- Casanova P. G. — L'Amérique et le socialisme  
 Casimir J. — Définition et fonctions de la cité en Amérique Latine  
 Otero L. L. — Family Responses to Modernization  
 Villegas O. U. — Sociolinguistics in a Renascent Country

## USA

- Adler J., E. Linden, B. Costher — Affective Ties of Youth, Opportunity Structure and Delinquency  
 Alford R. — The City and Its Environment: Problems of City Classification for the Urban Planner and Social Scientist.  
 Al-Qazzaz A. — The Changing Patterns of the Politics of the Iraqi Army  
 Aptheker H. — Humanism of Marxist-Leninist Revolutionary Theory  
 Askenasy Al. R. — Social Workers Preferences Among Psychiatric Patients  
 Baali F. — Planning and Rural Development in the Arab World  
 Back K. W. — Small Group Research and the Issues of Micro vs. Macro-Sociology: The Case of Demography  
 Bardis P. — An International Survey of Attitudes Toward Oral Contraception: Modernization and Birth Control  
 Barton A. H. — Determinants of Leadership Attitudes in a Socialist Society  
 Barton A. H. — Empirical Methods and Elite Theories  
 Bell D. — The Post Industrial Society. Technocracy and Politics  
 Ben-David J. — Science as a Profession and Scientific Professionalism  
 Biderman A. — Prisoners of War. Cold War Captives and the Personalisation of International Conflict  
 Bidwell Ch. — Faculty Responses to Student Activism: Some Findings from a Survey of American Professors  
 Bondlich B. — Women as Role Models in Industrializing Societies: A Mackinsustin Model of Socialization for Civil Competence  
 Bonilla F. — Experiments with a Computer Model of a National Political System. Some Brazilian Examples



- Boulding E. — Women as Role Models in Industrializing Societies. A Macro-System Model of Socialization for Civil Competence
- Buckner H. T. — Social Reality as a Process
- Bustamante J. A. — The Wetback as Deviant: An Application of Labeling Theory
- Caplow Th. — Are the Rich Countries Getting Richer and the Poor Countries Poorer?
- Chaplin D. — Domestic Service as a Family Activity and as an Occupation During Industrialization
- Chaplin D. — The Failure of Democratic Politics in Peru
- Chapin F. St. — Some Exploratory Directions in Time-Budget Research
- Clausen J. A. — Social Psychiatry and Mental Health Programs in the United States
- Converse Ph., R. Pierce — Basic Cleavages in French Politics and the Disorders of May and June, 1968
- Coser R., L. A. Coser — The Principle of Legitimacy and the Patterned Infringement in Social Revolutions
- Crane D. — Communication and Influence on International Scientific Communities
- Crosser P. — Lenin's Political Sociology, What It Is and What It Is Not
- Dadrian W. — The Bi-Polar Structure of Nationalism
- Daly R. W. — The Cure of Souls in a Technological Society
- Darnell R. — The Professionalization of American Anthropology: A Case Study in the Sociology of Knowledge
- Das M. S., D. E. Allen, F. G. Acuff — A Comparative of Intercaste Marriage in India and the United States
- Das M. S. — Brain Drains and Students from Less Developed and Developing Countries
- Deutscher I. — Language in Sub- and Cross-Cultural Research
- Dickinson J. — The Sociology of Knowledge
- Di Renzo G. J. — Personality Typologies of Students and Modes of Social Change
- Di Renzo G. J. — The Politics of Students and Young Workers
- Di Renzo G. J. — Students and Workers: Contrasted Profiles of Political Participation
- Duke J. T. — The Principle of Emergence and Levels of Sociological Analysis: Some Considerations on the Relationship between Micro and Macro Sociology
- Dunham H. W., R. D. Shapiro — Adolescent Drug: Some Problems of Assessment
- Dynes R. — Interorganizational Relations in Communities under Stress
- Eitzen D. S. — The Effect of Group Structure on the Success of Athletic Teams
- Ekman P. — Universal Facial Expressions of Emotion
- Evan W. M. — Multinational Corporations and International Professional Associations as Mechanisms for Integration of the International System
- Farrag A. — Effects of Social Changes on the Mzabite Family
- Fischer M. — The Effect of University Organisation upon Teaching and Behaviour of Students



- Fishman J. A. — A Multifactor and Multilevel Approach to the Study of Language Planning Processes
- Form W. H., P. Ammassary, R. P. Gale, B. Sharma — The Accommodation of Rural and Urban Workers to Industrial Discipline and Urban Living: A Four Nation Study
- Friedrichs R. W. — The Dialectical Character of Social Knowledge
- Gale L. G. — Military Legal Systems as a Possible Research for the Sociology of Law
- Gans H. — The Positive Functions of Poverty
- Gaston J. — Rewards, Communication and the Division of Labor in a Scientific Community
- Goertzel T. — Political Attitudes of Brazilian Youth
- Gross E. — Processes of Change in University Structure: Changing Problems of Legitimacy
- Grundy K., M. Shank — African Ex-Servicement and Independence Politics in British Africa
- Gusfield J. R. — Egalitarian Politics and Mass Education in India and the United States
- Haas J. E., E. J. Bonner, K. S. Boggs, D. P. Koehler — Acceptance of an Innovation: The Case of Planned Weather Modification
- Hacker S. — Dimensions of Work and Leisure
- Harman W., O. Markley, R. Rhyne — The Forecasting of Plausible Alternative Future Histories: Methods, Results and Educational Policy Implications
- Harper D. — The Computer Simulation of a Sociological Survey
- Hartley Sh. F. — From the Principle of Legitimacy to a Concatenated Theory of Illegitimacy
- Helmer J. — Saying and Meaning: Reference in Socio-Linguistic Theory
- Himes J. S. — Urbanization and Conflict among Blacks in Relation to Social Planning in the United States.
- Holmstrom L. L. — Career Patterns of Married Couples
- Iklé F. — Social Forecasting and the Problem of Changing Values
- Kadushin Ch. — Sociometry and Macro-Sociology
- Kadushin Ch., P. Abrams — Formal and Informal Influence among Yugoslav Opinion Makers
- Kaegi W. — Patterns in the Political Activity of the Armies of the Byzantine Empire
- Kandek D., G. S. Lesser — The Internal Structure of Families in the United States and Denmark
- Kerkhoff A. C. — The Structure of the Conjugal Relationship in Industrial Societies
- Kim C. I. E. — The Military in the Politics of South Korea: Creating Political Order
- Kjolseth R. — Bilingual Education Programs in the United States: For Assimilation or Pluralism?
- Kline G., N. Christensen, D. Davis — Family Communication Patterns, Family Autonomy and Peer Autonomy. A Theoretical Model of Socialization
- Kohn M. — Class, Family and Schizophrenia: A Reformation
- Kolaja J. — Assumptions in the Sociology of Planning



- Korson J. H. — A Study in the Changing Status of Women
- Kourvetaris G. — Professional Self-Images and Political Perspectives in the Greek Military
- Kuthiala S. K. — Impact of Factory Production in Traditional Societies: Modernization, Some Alternative Views on India
- Lande C. H. — The Philippine Military Government and Politics
- Landers D., G. Lüschen — The Interdependence of Structural Levels and Performance in Bowling Groups.
- Lanfer R. — The Sources of Conflict in Higher Education — The University in Transition
- Lang G. E. — Riotous Outbursts at Sports Events
- Lasswell T. E. — Progress in the Operational Definition of Social Class
- Lasswell M. E. — An Interdisciplinary Approach to Family Dissolution Problems
- Levin J., J. L. Spates, D. M. White — Hippie Values: an Analysis of the Underground Press
- Light D. W. — The Socialization of Psychiatrists — A Case Study
- Littig L. W. — Motives of Negroes Who Aspire to Traditionally Open and Closed Occupations
- Liu W., I. Hutchison, L. H. Hong — Conjugal Power and Decision Making. A Methodological Note on Cross-Cultural Study of the Family
- Loomis Ch. P. — Educational Achievement, Functional Literacy and Modernization
- Lopata H. Z. — Social Relations of Widows in Urbanizing Societies
- Loy J. W. — Social Origins and Occupational Mobility Patterns of a Selected Sample of American Athletes
- Luchterhand E. G. — Factors in the Social and Psychophysical Functioning of Survivors of the Nazi Concentration Camps
- Marcson S. — Research Environment: A Factorial Analysis of a Government Laboratory
- Matejko A. — Can Social Systems Mature?
- Matejko A. — Institutional Conditions of Scientific Inquiry
- Mendelsohn E. — The Institutionalization of the Scientific Role in the 19th Century
- Meyriat J., N. Lin, W. D. Garvey — A Study of the Nature of Program Material and the Effects of Meeting Interaction at the Sixth World Congress of Sociology
- Michielutte R. L., J. T. Spreche — Problems and Prospects in Simulating Large-Scale Social Change
- Miller S., P. Roby — Strategies for Social Mobility: A Policy Framework
- Moberg D. — Religion in the Western World: the United States of America
- Mol H. — Religion in Australia
- Mol H. — Religion in New Zealand
- Montagy J. B. — Reported Advantages of Medical Practice in Three National Health Service Systems
- Morris M. D. — Caste and Economic Development in South Africa
- Morse R. M. — Latin American Internal Migration in Third World Perspective



- Myers A. — The Logic of Competition: Empirical Studies in the Prediction of Competitive Outcomers
- Owen J. E. — America's Current Manpower Crisis
- Park P. — The Patronage of Sociology and Its Implications for the Individual
- Parsons H. L. — Lenin's Theory of Personality
- Parsons T. — Comparative Studies and Evolutionary Change
- Price D. S. — Differences between Scientific and Technological and Non-Scientific Scholarly Communities
- Quesada G. M. — Mass Media Exposure, Patron-Dependence and Modernity
- Reni M. — Equity and Equality
- Robertson R. — Sociology and Secularization
- Rodman H., P. Voydanoff — Cross-National Research on "Deviant" Family Patterns
- Rose E. — Commonplaces in the Roots of Languages
- Saks H. — Face of the Organization of Story-Telling in Conservation
- Schaefer G. — The Structure of Local Governments and Municipal Policies: A Cross-National Comparison
- Schafer W. E. — Sport and Subculture in American Secondary Schools
- Scheff T. J. — Creating Alternative Institutions: "Psychological Counseling"
- Scholte B. — Towards a Self-Selective Anthropology
- Schmitter Ph. — Military Intervention, Political Competitiveness and Public Policy in Latin America 1950—1967
- Schuessler K. — Continuities in Social Prediction
- Sebald H. — "Adolescent Culture": Comments in a Conceptual Contradiction
- Segal D. — Civil-Military Differentiation in the New Industrial State
- Shamis S. L. — Status Language, Pilipino and Urbanization: Linguistic Engineering in Development Nations
- Shatil J. — Criteria for Socio-Economic Efficiency of the Kibbutz
- Singh A. K. — Industrialization as a Modernizing Process in Rural and Urban Settings
- Slater S. B. — Premobed Family Roles and Rehabilitation Outcome.
- Smelser N. — Classical Theories of Change and the Family Structure.
- Sommerville J. — The Relation of Morality and Law to Contemporary Youth Protests in the United States
- Sommerville J. — The Relation of Lenin's Principle of Partiinost to the Method of Sociology
- Spinrad W. — The Function of Spectator Sports
- Starr J. M. — Some Sociological Issues in International Development
- Stehr N. — Science and the Public: A Socio-Historical Analysis
- Stone P. — Child Care in 12 Countries
- Stone P. — Technical Issues and Solutions Suggested by the International Time-Budget Project
- Straus M. A. — Family Organization and Problem Solving Ability in Relation to Societal Modernization
- Streicher L. H. — The Broadsword and the Rapier: An Approach to the Analysis of National Styles in Political Caricature
- Swetser D. — Social Class and Sibling Mobility in Finland



- Tien H. J. — Comparative Analysis of Fertility Change in Developmental Perspective
- Tresierra J. — Functions and Disfunctions of Bureaucracy in Transitional Societies
- Tuchman G. — Television News and the Sociology of Work: The Influence of the Need to Control Work upon the Presentation of Reality
- Turbeville G., G. Johnsrud — The Changing Role of Minority Groups in American Athletics
- Turk H. — Coordination Among Hospitals: an Instance of Interorganizational Structures in Urban Communities
- Turner R. H. — Integrative Reliefs in Group Crises
- Vaughan T. R. — Educational Crises and the Structure of American Education
- Yoshinin J. V. — The Concept of Stability in Sociology and Social Planning
- Wallerstein I. — Imperialism and Capitalism: Are the Workers the Most Oppressed Class
- Wallerstein I. — The State and Social Transformation: Will and Possibility
- Wallerstein I. — What Does a Radical Regime Make? Criteria of Evaluation in Africa
- Walter E. V. — Meanings of Poverty in Histories and Cultures
- Walter E. V. — The Idea of Misery
- Warren D. I. — Status Consistency Research: Its Development and Contemporary Significance
- Weinberg S. — Social Stress and Cross-Cultural Generalization on the Analysis of Schizophrenia
- White H. — Multiplier Effects in Housing Moves and Job Changes
- Wilensky H. — Emerging Leisure Styles: A Microscopic Prediction about the Fate of the Organization
- William W. J. — Race Relations Models and Explanations of Ghetto Behaviour
- Young T. K. — The Cybernetics of Stratification. Prestige and the Flow of Information
- Zuckerman H., R. K. Merton — Patterns of Evaluation in Science: Institutionalization, Structure and Functions of the Reference System

## VENEZUELA

- Albornoz O. — The Profession of Engineering in a Developing Society



## ASIA

## CEYLON

Pieris R. — The Implantation of Sociology in Asia

## HONG KONG

Chaney D. — Young People and Mass Communications in a Transitional Society

## INDIA

Bhatnager S. R. — Students, Workers and Politics: A Triple Dilemma in India

Chitnis S. — Education and Modernization in India—An Experiment in Planning Education for Cultural Change

Gandhi J. S. — Junior Commissioned Officers: A Study in the Indian Military Organization

Hoch E. M. — Reluctant Husbands. A Study on Problems of Individual Emergence from the Types of Indian Joint Family

Khatri A. A. — Youth as a Factor of Change

King A. D. — Colonial Urbanization: A Cross-Cultural Inquiry into the Social Use of Space

Kuthiala S. K. — Impact of Factory Production in Traditional Societies: Modernization, Some Alternative Views of India

Lall Sh. — Emancipation of Women in India

Mukherjee R. — Development of Sociology in Developing Societies (Some Observations with Special Reference to India)

## IRAN

Kotobi M. — Importance et portée de la télévision en Iran

Touba J., Z. Sarmad-Bahar — Changing Perception of Women's Role in a Newly Developing Country

## ISRAEL

Adler Ch. — The Student Revolt: A Special Case of a Youth Culture

Ben David J. — Science as a Profession and Scientific Professionalism

Danet B. — The Language of Persuasion in Bureaucracy: "Modern" and "Traditional" Appeals to the Israel Customs Authorities



Darin-Drabkin H.— The Nature of Direct Democracy in the Kibbutz and its Implications for Other Social Conditions

Darin-Drabkin H. — The Structure of the Agricultural Cooperative Movement in Israel

Deshen S. — Varieties of Abandonment of Religious Symbols: Changes in an Israeli Synagogue

Eisenstadt S. N. — Obstacles and Reinforcements of Development

Shatil J. — Criteria for Socio-Economic Efficiency of the Kibbutz

Shirom A. — Adjustment to Technological Change by Means of Joint Management Union Committees in the American Industry

Shokeid M. — Social Networks and Innovation in the Division of Labour between Men and Women in the Family and in the Community: A Study of Moroccan Immigrants in Israel

Shokeid M. — On the Dynamics of Style: Competition over Prestige and the Development of a New Style in Ritual Among Immigrants in Israel

Shuval J. — Sex Role Differentiation in the Professions: The Case of Israel Dentists

#### JAPAN

Aldous J., T. Kamiko — A Cross-National Study of the Effects of Father-Absence: Japan and the United States

Chiba M. — Balancing Mechanism in Legal Regulation

Kurokawa M. — A Cross-Cultural Comparison of Changes in Family and Their Effects in Children

Morioka K. — Research Situation in the Japanese Sociology of Religion

Odaka K. — Employee Participation in Japanese Industries

Odaka K. — Sociology in Japan: Trends and Prospects

Shibata Sh. — The Vietnam War and the Tasks of Social Science

Takeshi H. — Dualism as a Colonial Illegality

#### LEBANON

Dodd P. — Values and Change in the Arab Family

Dodd P. — Women's Honor in Contemporary Arab Society

Iskander M. — The Problems and Prospects of Development Planning in the Middle East

#### MONGOLIA

Djugder Ch. — Realization of Lenin's Idea About Mongolia's Transition to Socialism by Passing Capitalism

Nergouille P. — Worker in Central Planning Organ of People's Republic of Mongolia



## PAKISTAN

Duja M. B. — Perceived Fertility Differentials Among Pakistanie Professional Elites

## SINGAPORE

Hassan R. — Class, Ethnicity and Occupational Structure in Singapore

Hassan R. — Interethnic Marriage in Singapore

## TURKEY

Abadan N. — The Politics of Students and Young Workers in Turkey

Kiray M. — Squatter Housing: Fast Depeasantization and Slow Workerization in Underdeveloped Countries

Ulken H. Z. — Sociologie du développement national

## AUSTRALIA

Hunt F. J. — Goals and Educational Planning: Objectives in Social Science Education

Jones F. L. — The Process of Stratification in Australia

Jones F. L. — Social Mobility in Australia and the USA

Nalson J. — Planning and Objectives for Rural Adjustment and Development in Australia

## EUROPE

## AUSTRIA

Blecha K. — An Empirically Founded Comprehensive Theory of Migration

Gehmacher E. — Long Range Policy Planning in Health Care

Jungk R. — The New Uses of Utopianism

Novotny H. — An Indicative Analysis of Some Macrosociological Studies

Novotny H., M. Schmutzer — From Groups Towards the Emergence of Nations: A Theory of Growth

Mayer K. — Sports and Politics in Austria

## BELGIUM

- Delcourt J. — Les cloisonnements dans le corps enseignant et son insularité par rapport à la société globale
- Deliege D. — The Doctor's Role on the Western Medical Market
- D'Olieslager G. — Workers and Culture
- Lafaille R., J. Lefevre, J. van Houtte — Knowledge and Opinion about Law
- Lambrechts E. — Religiosity, Social Status and Fertility Values in a Catholic Country
- Lauwers J. — Secularization: A Sociological Theory or an Ideology
- Legros P. — L'authenticité du dialogue judiciaire comme facteur du progrès social
- Lehouck F. — Les conventions collectives du travail et de sécurité sociale
- Lehouck F. — Quelques fonctions de la recherche sociale
- Lehouck F. — Sociologie et histoire
- Leplae C. — Théorie et réalité en sociologie de la famille
- Martens A. — Travailleurs migrants dans l'agglomération bruxelloise: Genèse d'un problème social
- Presvelou C. — Family Consumption: A Sociological Phenomenon
- Raemdouck Ch. F. van — Les problèmes du personnel de cadre dans l'industrie
- Verdoodt A. — Premier rapport de l'enquête internationale sur les universités et les établissements d'enseignement supérieur bilingues
- Versele S. C. — L'acceptation réelle ou formelle d'une institution pénale nouvelle

## BULGARIA

- Anguélov S. — La liberté et la responsabilité dans les changements sociaux
- Apostolov M. — Sur certains aspects sociologiques de l'alcoolisme parmi les mineurs
- Borisov V. — A Study of the Personal Motivation in Choosing the Medical Profession
- Danov V., P. Tomov — Aspects sociologiques de la planification sociale au sein de la collectivité de travail et dans la commune
- Darkovski K. — Marxism and the Concept of Ideology
- Dimitrov B. — Some Problems of Forecasting the International Relations
- Dimitrov K. — The Type of Sociological Structure of Society and the Development of Intelligentsia
- Dinev T. — Quelques problèmes de la microrégionalisation
- Dobrev A. — Perspectives du revenu de la population de la République Populaire de Bulgarie jusqu'à l'an 2000
- Dobrianov V. — On the Unity of All Levels of Sociology — Problems of Micro- and Macrosociology
- Dobrianov V. — Sociology, Social Forecasting, Prognostication and Planning



- Draganov M. — Religious Psychology in Bulgaria and the Process of its Waning Off
- Draganov R. et al. — Prognosis for the Social and Economic Development of the People's Republic of Bulgaria during the Period Ending in the Year 2000
- Dramaliev L. — Les jeunes gens et les problèmes du progrès social et de l'idéal moral
- Filipov D. — On the Formation of Society in the "Third World"
- Gargov K., A. Jablenski, T. Trendafilov, Z. Toneva — Some Epidemiological and Social Aspects of Health in Bulgaria
- Ghénov Ph. — Essai de classification des systèmes sociaux d'organisation et de direction de la culture physique et du sport
- Goranov K. — Les dimensions sociales-psychologiques de l'art et l'élaboration de prévisions concernant les processus culturels
- Grekov P., I. Glukharov — On Some General Questions of Social and Physical Planning of Towns
- Guirguinov G. — La dépendance sociale du processus de la connaissance
- Ilieva N. — Forecasting the Minimal Engagement of Women in the Household up to 1980
- Iribadjakov N. — Socio-Historical Progress from the Marxist-Leninist Point of View
- Kalchev K., L. Bozukova — Planning of Agriculture in the People's Republic of Bulgaria and Problems of Its Perfection
- Kaménov E. — La révolution scientifique et technique et les problèmes sociaux des pays en voie de développement
- Kotzev I. — Le temps libre de la jeunesse et la semaine de travail de cinq jours
- Kozharov A. — Theoretical Foundation of Social Forecasting
- Malhassian E. M. — Problèmes de l'emploi de la main-d'oeuvre dans les pays du "Tiers monde"
- Markov M. — Le développement socialiste et le système de gouvernement en Bulgarie
- Marinska R. — La place des arts dans l'avenir
- Mikhaïlov S. — Structure sociologique et planification sociale
- Minkov M. — Prévision concernant le développement de la population de la République Populaire de Bulgarie jusqu'à l'an 2000
- Mitev P. — Problems of Sociological Investigation "Young People and Books"
- Mitichev A. — Certains problèmes de l'établissement des erreurs nonstochastiques dans les études représentatives sociologiques
- Mizov N. — Affaiblissement de l'influence de la religion et typologie de la personne en Bulgarie
- Momov V. — La mesure de la conduite de l'homme et de l'influence éducative
- Nikolaeva I., A. Nenova, K. Ivanov — Some Social Aspects of Public Health of the Population of a Municipal District under the Conditions of Dispensary Service
- Nikolov E. — Les communications de masse et le progrès social
- Nikolov E. — Quelques aspects sociologiques de la communication de télévision

- Nikolov E. — La pensée de Lénine et la prévision scientifique
- Nikolov B. — Normes linguistiques et communication
- Ochavkov J. — Une méthode de mesure de la structure sociologique de la société
- Ochavkov J. — La sociologie et le pronostic social
- Ochavkov J. — Sociology of Overcoming Religion in the Socialist Society
- Ochavkova V., N. Ilieva — Problèmes de la qualification des ouvrières dans l'industrie en Bulgarie
- Pavlov D. — La théorie de la société "post-industrielle"
- Pesheva R. — The Family in Bulgaria: State and Perspective
- Petkov K. — Methodology and Techniques for Forecasting the Leisure Time of the Population in the People's Republic of Bulgaria
- Poliakova R. — Changes of the Role and Position of Scientific-Technical Intelligentsia under the Conditions of Modern Capitalism
- Popov P. — Sociology of Law in the Light of the Marxist-Leninist Theory of the State and Law
- Radev Y., M. Radéva — Quelques problèmes sociologiques de la législation
- Savova E. — Recherches sociologiques sur les besoins d'information et les intérêts du lecteur en Bulgarie
- Sémov M. — Les changements survenus au sein de la jeunesse et leur étude par la sociologie
- Spasov D. — On the Social Aspect of Knowledge
- Staïkov Z. — Physical Activity Reflected in the Time Budget of the Population
- Staïkov Z. — Time Budget as a Foundation for Bridging Macro with Micro-Sociology
- Staïkov Z. — Time Budget as a Methodological Basis for Planning and Forecasting of Social Phenomena and Processes
- Stéfanov I. — Les communications de masse et les perspectives du contact humain
- Stoiev St. — Les opinions de Herbert Marcuse en matière de sociologie
- Stoïkov A. — Les possibilités et les conditions permettant l'élaboration des pronostics concernant la culture
- Stoïtchev A. — La culture physique dans la structure sociologique de la société socialiste
- Stoïtchev T. — Typologie de la religion et de la religiosité
- Suikova I. — Some Problems of the Use of Statistical Methods of Hypothesis Testing in Comparative Analyses in Sociological Surveys
- Todorova S. — Relationships within the Collective, Working Conditions and Participation in Management
- Trendafilov T. — La doctrine léniniste de l'impérialisme en tant que conception sociologique d'ensemble du développement de la société
- Trendafilov T. — Le ménagement et la responsabilité publique dans la société contemporaine
- Turlessanov Ch. — Problèmes de la planification des assurances sociales en R. P. de Bulgarie
- Tzonev V. — Un critère de définition de l'échelle la plus convenable de mesurage des phénomènes sociaux



- Valtchev T., E. Malhassian — Le rôle de la collaboration internationale scientifique et technique dans le développement social des pays "Tiers monde"
- Vassilev R. — Problèmes théoriques et méthodologiques de la recherche sociologique de la conscience juridique
- Vassilev R. — Problèmes théoriques, méthodologiques et pratiques de l'étude comparative internationale sur l'état social des journalistes
- Vénédikov J. — Analysis of Factorial Influences on Qualitative Characteristic Features
- Vladov Ch. — Méthodes d'étude du comportement des consommateurs au marché socialiste en vue du pronostic concernant la demande
- Yakhiel N. — Interactions des rapports scientifiques internes et externes et optimisation de la gestion de l'activité scientifique
- Yakhiel N. — La prévision et le pronostic scientifique dans la société moderne
- Yanakiev R. — Some New Problems Connected with the Centralization of Socio-Economic Management-Decisions
- Yanakiev M. — Language Behaviour and Social Behaviour

## CZECHOSLOVAKIA

- Vladimir Čech — Sociological Research of Work Organization in Service of Rationalization
- Charvát F. — On Philosophical Aspects of the System Conception in Current Sociological Cognition
- Charvát F., J. Kučera — On the Theory of Social Dependence
- Charvát F. — Technique of the Inverse Questionnaire in Content Analysis
- Charvát F. — The Significance of Lenin's Bequest for the Methodological Orientation of Modern Social Science
- Filipcová B. — La sociologie du loisir et la prévision
- Filipec J. — Certaines bases théoriques de la recherche du développement des sociétés contemporaines
- Fišera I. — Research into Value Orientations and Aspirations (Selected Chapters of the Project)
- Fišerová V. — Family, Industrialization and Mechanism of the Formation of Status
- Formánek M. — Political Analysis of Czechoslovak Sociology
- Houška J. — Capitalisme contemporain et révolution sociale
- Houška J., Kára K., Tlustý V. — Sociological Theory and Social Practice
- Hrabé J., O. Podzemský — F. Engels and his Contribution to the Sociological Theory of Armed Violence
- Hübschmannová M., J. Řehák — Ethnicity and Communication
- Huláková M. — Lenin and Culture
- Janoušek J. — Social Psychological Problems of Dialogue in Cooperation
- Jiruška K. — Planned Reconstruction of the Village in Czechoslovakia with Special View to the Cultural Aspect
- Kahuda F. — Personality Measurement in Youth Studies

- Kahuda F. — Prolegomena to Methods of Diagnostic Analysis of Human Personality
- Kaláb M. — Le matérialisme historique et la conception marxiste de la sociologie
- Kaláb M. — Motivation of Social Relations in Socialist Revolution
- Kaláb M. — Principes marxistes de la conception de la structure sociale et du changement social
- Kára K., V. Tlustý — Sociological Theory and Social Practice
- Katriak M. — Lenin and the Scientific Method in Sociology
- Khol J. — Research into the System Relations of Social Behaviour Determinants
- Kohout J. — Sociology and the Management of a Socialist Enterprise
- Kolář J. — Social Status of the Executives
- Košťalová T., J. Hlavsa, J. Košťal — Creative Potential and Its Use in Organization
- Krejčí J. — On Sociological Aspects of the Development of Science as an Information System
- Křížová A. — The Relation between Basic and Applied Research
- Kunstová A. — The Position and Importance of the Statistician Specialist in Scientific Teams Carrying out Research in Sociology
- Kutta F. — The Social Conditions of Solving the Crisis of the System of Organization and Management
- Kvasnička B. — A Contribution to the Development of the Christians Relation to Socialism in Czechoslovakia
- Librová E. — Loisirs en plein air et résidences secondaires
- Macháček L. — Sociological Aspects of Planning the School Reform
- Matejovsky A. — Les transformations des fonctions sociales de l'enseignement supérieur
- Musil J. — Town Planning as a Social Process
- Nečáscová M. — The Mobility of Scientific Workers in the Czechoslovak Socialist Republic
- Padevět K. — Enquête sociologique de la formation et de la qualification des travailleurs en CSSR
- Pašiak J. — La jeunesse et le métier dans la planification sociale
- Plško S. — Les problèmes d'adaptation dans les conditions du changement structural de la société
- Pospíšilová A. — Les possibilités et les avantages d'un plan pour l'effectivité de l'éducation professionnelle des adultes
- Richta R. — The Scientific and Technological Revolution and Socialism
- Rychtařík K. — Lenin's Contribution to the Development of Sociological Thinking
- Šafář Z. — Basic Data on Social Differentiation in the Czechoslovak Socialist Society
- Sagara D. — Sociological Aspects of the Management of Agricultural Cooperatives
- Škoda C., J. Janouch, T. Husak — Computer Written Psychiatric Examination. Present Stage of Its Development and Diagnostic Usefulness
- Slejška D. — Integration of Work Groups into the Social System of Work Organization



- Soukup M. — Towards the Human Species Survival Research  
 Štastný Z. — La professionalisation en tant que facteur des transformations de la société rurale  
 Šulč O. — Futurology and Philosophy  
 Tondl L. — Science as a Vocation  
 Zeman K. — Fatigue, Biological Rhythm, Sleep and Leisure  
 Yungmann B. — Some Aspects of Social Mobility in Contemporary Czechoslovakia

## DENMARK

- Blegvad B. M. P. — Instrumental Law as a Means of Social Change  
 Kutschinsky B. — Public Opinion About Law and Legal Reform  
 Rishoj T. — The Development in Social Mobility in Greater-Copenhagen

## FINLAND

- Aalto R. — The Goals of Youth Organizations and the Wishes of Young People and Young Workers Concerning Youth Work  
 Haavio-Mannila E. — Cross-National Differences in Adoption of New Ideologies and Practices in Family Life  
 Haavio-Mannila E., R. Jaakkola — Sex Roles and the Medical Profession  
 Heinila K. — Survey of the Value Orientations of Finnish Sport Leaders  
 Heiskanen V. S. — Contextual Analysis and Theory Construction in Cross-Cultural Family Research  
 Seppänen P. — The Role of Competitive Sport in Different Cultures  
 Uusitalo P. — Recidivism after Release from Closed and Open Penal Institutions  
 Valkonen T. — Sociological Forecasts in City Planning

## FRANCE

- Abboud N. — Jeunesse: "Fait de structure" ou produit mouvant de la pratique politique et idéologique d'une société historique  
 Abdel-Malek A. — L'avenir de la théorie sociale  
 Antoine J. — Opinion publique et décisions de politique économique et sociale: bilan et tendances de l'expérience française  
 Bensimon D. — Développement et sous-développement en Israël  
 Bertaux D. — Nouvelles perspectives sur la mobilité sociale en France  
 Besse Guy — Classe ouvrière, alliance de classes, révolution  
 Bisseret N. — Notion d'aptitude et société de classes en France  
 Boccara P. — Les aspects sociologiques de l'analyse de Lénine de l'évolution du capitalisme  
 Bockstaele M. van, P. Schem — Limites des négociations et négociation des limites

- Boltanski L. — Consommation médicale et rapport au corps dans les différentes classes sociales
- Bourdieu P. — Facteurs de changement et forces d'inertie
- Burlen C. — La réalisation spatiale du désir et l'image spatialisée du besoin
- Busch Ch. — Domaines d'applications majeures de la méthode des budgets-temps libre d'une sociologie de la vie quotidienne
- Castel R. — Continuité et changement dans l'histoire de la médecine mentale: quelques problèmes de méthode
- Castells M. — Propositions théoriques pour une recherche expérimentale sur les mouvements sociaux urbains
- Castells M. — Structures sociales et processus d'urbanisation: analyse comparative intersociétale
- Chairol Cl. — Pour une grammaire socio-linguistique
- Chobaux J. — La relation éducative: quelques réflexions méthodologiques
- Chombart de Lauwe P.-H. — Pour une sociologie des aspirations
- Coquery-Fidrovitch C. — De l'impérialisme ancien à l'impérialisme moderne: l'avatar colonial
- Cornu R. — Implantation régionale, régionalisation du conflit et conflit régional
- Crozier M. — L'étude des systèmes organisationnels comme mode d'approche empirique des problèmes de macrosociologie
- Dion M. — La généralisation théorique dans l'oeuvre de F. le Play et dans "De la division du travail social" de E. Durkheim
- Dogan M. — Facteurs de la révolte des étudiants français en mai 1968
- Dumazedier G. — Hypothèses sur la société post-industrielle et le loisir
- Durand C. — Ouvriers et techniciens en mai 1968
- Durand M. — Initiative économique, politique d'emploi et conflit social
- Fichelet M. and R. — French general practitioners, a study in the Evolution of Medical Practice: Problems of Change
- Fichelet M. et R. — Le médecin face à la formation continue
- Fourastié J. — Planning in Southwestern Europe
- Frisch J. — Structures de la population active française et mobilité professionnelle
- Gingras F.-P. — L'engagement politique des jeunes
- Guilbert M., N. Lowit, J. Creusen — Un aspect nouveau des problèmes de l'emploi: le développement des entreprises loueuses de main-d'oeuvre (entreprises de travail temporaire)
- Guinchat C. — Une théorie de loisir — est-il possible?
- Herth H., F. Raveau, J. G. Henrotte — Asthénie, syndrome carrefour
- Imbert M. — Loisir, stratification sociale et urbanisation
- Isambert-Jamati V. — Essai d'analyse sociologique d'une réforme scolaire française du début du siècle
- Kalogeropoulos D. — Sondages sur l'image de la justice
- Ledrut R. — Les images de la ville: dimensions de l'urbain et systèmes urbanistiques latents
- Lisle M. — The Future Concept and Measurement of Extensive Consumption as a Basis for Policy Decisions



- Marenco Cl. — De la sociologie des organisations à l'étude des organisations dans la société
- Matarasso M. — Media et gaspillages économiques modernes
- Mathieu N. — Notes pour une définition sociologique des catégories de sexe
- Maurice M. — Evolution de l'entreprise et transformation des relations sociales
- Picon B. — Essai d'explication des politiques d'entreprises en système capitaliste
- Pitrou A. — L'avis des usagers dans une politique de planification sociale
- Poisson J. P. — Le changement social rapide dans le monde moderne. Réalité ou illusion
- Raybaut P. — Activités de loisir et d'autoculture dans des bandes de quartier
- Raybaut P. — Communication de masse et relations interethniques dans un foyer de jeunes travailleurs des Alpes Maritimes
- Riffault M. C. — Sociologie et développement
- Riffault M. C. — Techniques quotidiennes et mentalités en quelques pays en voie de développement
- Saada L. — Les procédés de l'euphémisme dans un dialecte arabe
- Scardigli V. — The Demand for Social Amenities: Some Remarks on its Future in France
- Selia H. — Contradictions sociales, conflits intrapsychique, transformations historiques
- Serge M., M. Tanguy — Une nouvelle idéologie de l'enseignement
- Sicard E. — Cohérence psychique et identité personnelle dans les pays "en voie de développement"
- Thoenig J.-Cl. — Action bureaucratique et société urbaine
- Thomas L. V. — Dualisme et domination en Afrique Noire
- Touraine A. — Les mouvements sociaux
- Trystran J. P. — De la documentation automatique à la banque de données
- Willener A. — Les cadres et le pouvoir

#### GERMAN DEMOCRATIC REPUBLIC

- Assmann G., G. Pietrzynski — The Responsibility of State Management in Socialist Industrial Enterprise for Including the Workers into the Process of Management
- Berger H., M. Lindtner — On the Function of Mathematical Models in Sociological Research
- Bohring G. — On the Role and Development of Profession in the Socialist Society
- Brehme G. — State Power and Social Question in Developing Countries (Some Remarks on Typology and Approach)
- Dohnke D. — The Importance of a Large Context for the Understanding of Smaller Units
- Edeling H. — Social Development and Social Forecasting in the Socialist Society

- Erbach G., E. Buggel — Sociological Problems in the Presentation of Tendencies of Development as to the Socialist Physical Culture in the GDR
- Ernst K. — La communauté traditionnelle et le progrès social en Afrique Sub-Saharienne
- Gras F. — Methodological Aspects in the Interpretation of the Results Attained by Sociological Empiric Investigations
- Hahn G. — Factors of Development in Creating an European Security System
- Hahn E. — Sociological System Conception and Social Prognosis
- Hahn E. — Lenin and Sociology
- Hüttner H., I. Hüttner, B. Schmidt — A Motivation Model of Health Behaviour
- Jetzschmann H. — Methodological and Methodical Problems of Sociological Research of Information Processes
- Kossok M. — Potentialities and Limitations of the Armed Forces in the Developing Countries. The Case of Latin America
- Krambach K., H. Schmidt — Socialist Transformation of Agriculture and Complex Social Planning of Rural Development
- Krüger M. — Sociological Aspects of Social Prognosis in a Regional Area
- Kuhrig H. — The Professional Woman in the Family
- Kulow H. — The Unity of Dialectical-Historical Methods and Logical-Mathematical Methods in Forecasting Social Processes
- Lötsch M. — On the Socio-Economic Conditionality of Power Structures in the Process of Social Decision
- Manz H. G. — The Socialist Mode of Living and the Time Budget of the Population
- Maretzki H. — Structure Conditions for the Creation of a European Security System
- Meyer H. G. — Remarks about Social Relation Change in Social Structure and the Mechanism of Social Power
- Pföh W., H. Engelstaedter — On Long-Term Tendencies in the Development of University Education in the GDR
- Puschmann M. — On the Alleged Change in Bourgeois Society under the Influence of the Representatives of "Intellectual Technology"
- Rittershaus J. — The Democratic Participation of the Working People in the Planning and Management of Socialist Industry
- Roeder H. — The Rational Organization of Problem Solving Processes in the Sociological Research By Means of Systematical Heuristics
- Schellenberger G. — On Some Objective and Subjective Conditions of the Developmental Work in Science and Technology in the Socialist Large-Scale Research
- Schneider K. — On the Subjective Reflection of Management Activity by Doctor and Nurse — a Study to Derive a Conception for a Sociological Analysis of Management in the Hospital
- Staufenbiel F. — Sociological Problems of Urban Planning in the GDR
- Stollberg R. — The Attitude of the Working People to Automation in Socialist Industrial Enterprise



Taubert H. — The Working Class and the Class Structure of the Social System of Socialism in the German Democratic Republic

Waltenberg I. — Problems of Activity Measuring by Scaling Observation

Weidermann D. — Character, Structure and Developmental Tendencies of the Bourgeoisie in the South Asian and South East Asian States

Weidig R. — The Development of Close Collective Relations between Production Workers and the Technical Intelligentsia in the Process of Socialist Automation of Industrial Production

Wolf H. F. — Expectations as a Factor in the Attitude of Young People to Changes in the Character of Work in the Technological Revolution in the GDR

#### GERMAN FEDERAL REPUBLIC

Allerbeck K. R. — Structural Conditions of Student Movements: the Student Community and the Student Role

Bodenstedt A. — Theoretical Concepts of Innovation and Cooperation Research and the Problem of Their Application to Development Projects in Traditional Agrarian Societies

Bredow W. von — The West-German "Bundeswehr" as an Institution for Political Education

Gerhardt U. — Role, Conflict and the Class Structure

Hammerich K. — Occupational Career Patterns of Top-Athletes

Harder T. — Problems in Constructing Links Between Micro- and Macro-Levels of Observation

Hartig M., U. Kurz — Some Aspects of Integrative Sociolinguistics

Heiseler J. H. von — Codetermination-Participation of Workers' Control.

Hoerning K. H. — Modernization and Social Class in the New States of Tropical Africa

Höhe J., E. Mochmann — Z. A. R.: An Integrated Storage, Retrieval and Analysis System for Survey Data

Kaase M. — Determinants of Political Mobilization for Students and Non-Academic Youth

Kaupen W. — The Lawyer: Agent of Social Change or of Social Stagnation

Kaupen W., Werle R. — Knowledge and Opinion of Law and Legal Institutions in the Federal Republic of Germany (Preliminary Results)

Kaupen-Haas H. — The Role of the Doctor in Post-Industrial Society

Kruschel S. — Influence of Latent Tendencies on the Results of Development: Forecasting on the Examples of Minor Nonlinearities in Some Processes of Economic Development

Lipp W. — Reductive Mechanisms Analysis in the Process of Civilization

Luckmann T. — Suggestions on the Direction of Sociological Research on Language

Mayer K. U., Müller W. — Roles, Status and Careers: Some Comments on Mobility Analysis and New Data on Intergenerational Mobility in West Germany

Pfeil E. — Communication Patterns of Urban Families

- Pfetsch F. — Development and Growth of Scientific Organizations in Imperial Germany  
 Planck U. — Die Landjugend als Factor der Landverwandlung  
 Prosenc M. — Freizeit in der Bundesrepublik. Theorien und Realität  
 Scheuch E. — The Organizing Institution for Everyday Life (E. G. Family, Community, Bureaucratic Behaviour) as Constants in Sociology  
 Yong M. — Reductive Mechanisms Analysis in the Process of Civilization

## GREAT BRITAIN

- Abrams Ph. — Military Regimes and the Restoration of Order  
 Allen Sh. — Class, Culture and Generation  
 Allen V. L. — The Meaning and Differentiation of the Working Class in Tropical Africa  
 Beqiraj M. — Simple Ways of Thought-Formation Observed in Peasant Life, but not Limited to Peasant Groups  
 Blum F. — The Significance Universals for the Sociology of Knowledge  
 Cartwright A. — The Developing Role of the General Practitioner in Family Planning  
 Cullen J., V. Nichols — A Micro-Analytic Approach to the Understanding of Metropolitan Growth  
 Duncan - Jones P. — Social Mobility, Canonical Scoring and Occupational Classification  
 Elias N. — Dynamics of Consciousness within that of Societies  
 Elias N. — State and Nation. Building Processes  
 Eggleston S. — A Model for the Study of Changing Attitudes to Education  
 Forster P. — Esperanto as a Social and Linguistic Movement  
 Frankenberg H. — Social Prerequisites of the Development of Science  
 Goldthorpe J. — Theories of Industrial Society Reflections on the Recrudescence of Historicism and Future of Futurology  
 Halmos P. — The World Sociology and the Personal Service Professions  
 Halmos P. — The Anti-Scientific Backlash in Professionalization  
 Harries-Jenkins G. — Disfunctional Consequences of Military Professionalization  
 Lopasic A. — The Influence of Islam in the Social Structure of the Balkan Societies  
 Marris P. — Ambiguity and Commitment — The Crisis for Asian Businessmen in Nairobi  
 McKinlay R. D., T. V. Sathyamurthy — Innovative and Equilibrating Military Political Regimes: A Study of Pakistan, Egypt, Indonesia and Ghana  
 McRae D. — Possibilities and Limits in Sociological Forecasting  
 Newton K. — Centralized and Non-Centralized Community Decision-Making System in England and the United States  
 Nichols V., J. Cullen — An Application of Time. Budget Studies with Respect to London  
 Parker S. R. — Trends in the Sociology of Leisure in Great Britain



- Robertson R. — Sociology and Secularization  
 Rose R. — The Maintenance of a Divided Regime: The Case of Northern Ireland  
 Smith G., J. Barnes — Some Implications of Action-Research Projects for Research  
 Stacey M., E. V. Batstone, C. A. Bell, A. Murgott — The Rejection of a Planning Proposal. Banbury Refuses to Expand to 70,000  
 Stander S. — Medical Manpower in the United Kingdom  
 Urwin D., R. Rose — Persistence and Disruption in Western Party Systems between the Wars  
 Wilder-Okladek F. — A New Approach to Two-Way Migration/Return  
 Wilson B. — Aspects of Secularization  
 Wolpe H. — Class, Race and the Occupational Structure in South Africa

## HUNGARY

- Andorka R., B. Buda, I. Hegedüs, J. G. Kiss — The Influence of Social Change on the Frequency of Certain Forms of Deviant Behaviour  
 Balogh J. — Elements of Youth's Outlook upon Life  
 Bánlaky P. — Lenin and Sociology: Some Theoretical Problems  
 Cseh-Szombathy L. — The Internationalization of Deviant Behaviour Patterns During the Socialization in the Family  
 Farkas J. — Use of Network-Models in Social Planning  
 Ferge S. — Comment perçoivent les enseignants la relation entre l'école et la société  
 Fukasz G. — The Future Society and the Technical Progress  
 Füredi J. — A Comparative Study on the Milieu of Hungarian Psychiatric Words  
 Havas A. — Vocational Guidance in Hungary  
 Hegedüs A. — Economic Reforms and Changes in the Power Structure  
 Hegedüs A., M. Markus — The Community and Individual  
 Jozsa P. — L'Etat actuel de la consommation des biens culturels dans les sociétés développées et les possibilités de l'influence  
 Kemeny I. — Social Change and History  
 Kulcsar K. — Legal Agents of Social Change  
 Laky T. — The Instrument Compelling the Organizations to Conform  
 Löcsei P. — Syndyasmos in Contemporary Budapest  
 Losonczy A., J. Sas — Some Problems of Aspiration Research  
 Markus I. — The Agricultural Population of Hungary Planned Changes in Their Way of Life, a Complex Task for Social Planning  
 Molnar L. — Functions of Politics in Social Planning  
 Molnar J. — The Major Trends of Social Change in Hungarian Villages  
 Patakí F. — La structure du champ social de la jeunesse estudiantine et l'urbanisation  
 Rozsa G. — Some Contradictions between Research and Scientific Information — A Sociological Approach

Szabady E. — Study of the Impact of a Family Protection Measure: The Selective Role Played by Social Factors in Utilizing the Allowance for Child Care in Hungary

Szesztay A. — Scientific Schools in Hungary

Szesztay A. — Sociological Portrait as a Bridge between Micro- and Macro-Sociology

Szücs I., Toth I. — A Sociological Programme for Town Planning

Vészi B. — Economic Changes and Political Structures

Zsille Z. — Chances of Youth

#### ITALY

Bellacicco A. — Reliability of the Forecasting Models of Not-Repeating and Not-Repetitive Events. An Introductory Approach

Castellano V. — Déduction et induction dans la prévision des faits sociaux

Cavalli A., A. Martinelli — Toward a Conceptual Framework for the Comparative Analysis of Student Movements

Cecilia M. P. — The Artistic and Information's Phenomenon

Cerese F. P. — Differential Economic Activity and Demographic Response in Four Southern Italian Regions

Consoli F. — Contradiction within the Working Class in Marxist Theory

De Novellis L. S. — Temps libre et réalité sociale

Ferraresi F. — Some Notes on the Possibilities of Political Intervention of the Italian State Bureaucracy

Ferrari V. — Succession and Inheritance Italian Law: An Analysis of Testaments

Ferrarotti F. — A Short Note on the Uses of Sociology in Developing Societies

Ferrarotti F. — V. I. Lenin about the Social Function of Violence

Gallino L., Saccomani E. S. — Report on the Situation of Sociological Studies in Italy over the Past Twenty Years

Grazia-Resi B. — Mutations dans l'utilisation des loisirs au sein d'une région en voie de développement

Izzo A. — The Present "Boom" and Crisis of the Sociology of Knowledge

Levi F. — Sul Ruolo Nel Consiglio Di Stato Italiano Nella Formazione di Norme Giuridiche

Rositi F. — Étude sur l'ambivalence culturelle: le cas de la culture juvénile

Rositi F. — Recherches sur la jeunesse en Europe

Savona E. U. — Law and Social Control. A Case Study: British Legislation Against Racial Discrimination

Statera G. — Utopia and Mass Mobilization in the Italian Student Protest

Stroppa C. — A Research Proposal on Youngsters and Community Patterns

Tomeo V. — Opinion About Law in Italian Movies

Varotti A. — Urban Growth and Evolution of Interpretative Patterns of Urbanism



## NETHERLANDS

- Boesjes-Hommes R. W. — The Valid Operationalization of Concepts  
 Cassee E. — Doctors' Behaviour and Patients' Satisfaction  
 Dessaur C. I. — Prediction in Criminology  
 Dijkhuis-Potgieser H. — The Scampect: Some Aspects of the Performance of Interviewers  
 Goudsblom J. — On High and Low in Society and in Sociology — A Semantic Approach to Social Stratification  
 Halbertsma H. A. — The Concept of Credit in Social Intercourse: A Study of Control and Change in Contest Situations  
 Have P. ten — Emancipation and Culture  
 Heuvel W. v. d., J. M. G. Persoon — Specialization within the Medical Profession: Medical Health Officer  
 Kater A. — Les structures du pouvoir et les programmes de participation provoquée  
 Kooy G. A. — Marital Success in the Netherlands  
 Kroes R. — Decolonization and the Military: The Case of the Netherlands — A Study in Political Reaction  
 Lammers C. J. — Student Unionism in the Netherlands  
 Merwe v. d. C. — Documentation for Sociological Research Methods and Techniques  
 Mok A. L. — Professions and Science: A Note on the Innovative Capacity of the Postindustrial Society  
 Saal D. S. — The Functions of the Family for the Older Child  
 Schuyt J. M., J. C. M. Ruys — Attitudes towards New Socio-Economic Legislation  
 Scott S. F. — The French Revolution and the Professionalization of the French Officer Corps, 1789—1793  
 Teitler G. — Guerrilla and Society  
 Teulings A., W. Otten — The Myth of Outsiders and Strong Man  
 Van Den Ban A. W., C. A. Muntjewerff — Goals, Organizations and Strategies of Change Agencies  
 Vinke P. — Attitudes Towards Graduation in Income-Tax in the Netherlands  
 Wouters C. — On Youth and Student Protest

## NORWAY

- Aarebrot F., S. Rokkan — Nation-Building, Democratization and Mass Mobilization: First Results of a Statistical Analysis of Norwegian Data  
 Aas D. — Mapping Data From Large Scale Time-Studies  
 Galtung J. — Pluralism and the Future of Human Society  
 Grønseth E. — The Disfunctionality of the Husband Provider Role in Industrialized Societies  
 Nypan A. — Diffusion of Innovation and Community Leadership in East Africa  
 Rokkan S. — Comparative Research and Macrosociological Case Studies

## POLAND

- Adamski W. — Cultural Activity of Youth as a Factor of Education
- Bejnarowicz J. — Medical Needs of the Society and the Professional Orientations of Young Physicians
- Ciupak Z. — Physical Culture in the Consciousness of the Present-Day Man
- Czerwinski M., B. Gotowski, A. Sicinski — Projecting of the Development of Educational Needs in Poland in the Period 1970—2000
- Dobrowolska D. — Les transformations du système des valeurs de la population rurale des régions industrialisées en Pologne populaire
- Dyoniziak R. — La promotion sociale et le sentiment de l'échec ou de la réussite
- Dyoniziak R. — The Cultural and Social Differentiation in Poland
- Dyoniziak R. — Ecole Supérieure des Sciences économiques
- Dziecielska-Machnikowska S. — Vision de la société socialiste dans les oeuvres de Lénine
- Palewicz J. — Social Aspects of Drinking Among Polish Youth
- Galeski B. — The Results of Comparative Study on Diffusion of Agricultural Innovations in Poland
- Gesek J. T. — Sociological Aspects of War and Policy in Modern Times
- Gočkowski J. — Moral Norms and Methods of Sociotechnique
- Gostkowski Z. — The Use of Tachonomic Measures in Target Setting Based on International Comparisons
- Graczik J. — Selected Problems of Recruitment and Selection in the Polish People's Armed Forces
- Halpern E. — The Foundation of the Disharmony and the Conflicts within the Complex of Investments
- Indisow L. — Sociology of the Profession of Officer-Doctors
- Jakubczak F. — Life Records Contributed to Competitions as a Socio-Cultural Phenomenon in Poland
- Jalowiecki I. — Sociotechnics and the Problem of Decision Making
- Janicki J. — Activisation politique de la jeunesse et progrès social
- Janiszewski L. — Prevision of Development Trends in the Realm of Culture on a Sea-Going Vessel
- Kadzielski J. — Le rôle de la radio et de la télévision dans la planification de l'éducation en Pologne
- Kloskowska A. — Qualitative Versus Quantitative Factors in Cultural Planning and Development
- Komorowska J. — Tendances à la nivelation des différences entre les familles ouvrières et celles de l'intelligentsia à Varsovie
- Kowalski St. — Prognoses Bases of Democratization in Education under Conditions of Socialism
- Kozminski A. — Recherches sociologiques sur les informations et décisions dans les organisations économiques socialistes.
- Krawczyk B. — The Social Reach of Sport Institutions in the Industrial Establishment
- Krawczyk B., Z. Krawczyk — Sociological Problems of Sport Against the Background of Social Knowledge Concerning Physical Culture



- Krawzyk Z. — Spectacle Sport as an Element of Contemporary Culture — an Analysis of Attitudes
- Kubin J. — Sociology of Social Research Utilization
- Kurczewski J. — The Penal Attitudes and Behaviour of the Professional Judges
- Lobodzinska B. — Trends in the Homogeneity and Equality in Urban Marriages in Poland
- Lysiowa E. — Profession de l'agriculture dans la conscience sociale de deux générations de la campagne.
- Malicka W. — Les motifs de la construction des maisons unifamiliales et les préférences en matière de logement des personnes construisant sur le terrain de l'agglomération varsoivienne.
- Markowska D. — Family Life and the Social Structure of the Village in Poland.
- Nowakowska I. — Les perspectives de l'éducation secondaire et la structure sociale
- Nowicka E. — Generalizations on Culture-Change Movements among North American Indians and Melanesians
- Olczyk E. — Educational Functions of Socialist Forces
- Palecki K. — The Influence of Press on the Legal Consciousness — The Scheme of Research
- Piotrowski J. — The Employment of Married Women and the Changing Sex-Roles
- Piotrowski J. — Family Change and Social Policy
- Podgorecki A. — Comparative Studies of Legal Systems
- Podgorecki A. — Problems of Social Engineering
- Podgorecki A. — The University's Developmental Perspective
- Podgorecki A. — Scientific Entrepreneurs
- Pudelkiewicz E. — Sociological Research of the Problem of Sports in Housing Estate in a Family of Three Generations
- Rybicki P. — The Approaches in "Sociological Classics and the Current Phrasing of Issues in Relating Microsociology to Macrosociology"
- Saar E. — Competitive Sport as a Factor in Social Migration Process
- Sicinski A. — Prognoses and Social Planning in the Socialist Economic System
- Siemienska R. — The Problem of Adaptation of Industrial Workers from Rural Areas to the Life in the Town Conditions
- Slomczynski K. — Socio-Occupational Differentiation and Education Authority. Income and Prestige
- Strzelecki J. — Prevision of Social Needs as a Source of Directives for Social Planning
- Swiecicki A. — Moral Evaluations Relative to Professional Work
- Szaniawski K. — Remarks on Mathematization of Sociology
- Szczepanski J., A. Sicinski, J. Strzelecki — Anticipated Changes of Style of Life in Socialist Poland on the Background of Hypotheses of Changes in the Social Structure
- Sztompka P. — Teleological Language in Sociology
- Teodorczyk H. — Some Problems of Recruitment and Selection in the Professional N. C. O. Corps

- Teodorczyk H., J. Graczyk — Background and Political Liaisons of the Professional Military in the Polish People's Army
- Turowski J. — Trends in Post-War Changes in Polish Towns
- Wallis S. — The Future of Social Spaces and the Experience of the Past
- Weber B. — The Youth and Times
- Weinarowic J. — Medical Needs of the Society and the Professional Orientation of Young Physicians
- Wesolowski W. — The Planning and Forecasting of Class Structure Transformations in Socialist Society
- Wiatr J. — The Military Regime in Poland, 1926—1939, in a Comparative Perspective
- Widerszpil St., A. Owieczko — Management and Political Process in Socialist Society
- Wisniewski W. — The Academic Progress of Students of Different Social Origin
- Wohl A. — Prognostic Models of Sport in Socialist Countries on the Background of Changes in Sports in People's Poland
- Zagorski K. — Social Mobility and Changes in the Structure of Planning Society
- Zajczyk L. — Les opinions de la jeunesse polonaise sur le rôle du film soviétique
- Ziolkowski J. — Planning in Urban and Rural Development: Some Preliminary Notes
- Zissowski G. — The Problem of Inaccessible Individuals in the Sociological Representative Surveys
- Zygulski K. — Remarks on the Sociological Study of Youth and Their Culture
- Zygulski K. — Tendances de la sociologie du loisir en Pologne
- Zürn M. — Sport and Physical Recreation in the Leisure Time Culture of Big-Town Dwellers

## ROMANIA

- Albert F. — La place de l'étude dans la structure des loisirs de l'ouvrier
- Aluas I. — Phénomènes migrationnels dans deux zones rurales de Roumanie
- Apostol P. — Critical Considerations on the Operational Analysis of the Relationship "Management — Public Response" in Processes of Social Transformation
- Apostol P. — The Dialectics of Social Prevision and Planning
- Apostol P. — The Opening of Culture Towards Future
- Badina O. — Dimitri Gusti in the Sociology of his Time
- Badina O. — La corrélation entre les transformations socio-professionnelles de la jeunesse et les modifications sociales globales dans la perspective du développement planifié
- Badina O., A. I. Bejan — L'étude scientifique de la jeunesse et la prospection de ses tendances et de son travail
- Badina O., O. Nea m țu — L'expérience de l'école sociologique roumaine sur la connaissance et l'action sociale



- Badina O., O. Neamtu, V. Krasnaseski — Scientifics — A System of the Sociology Ethics and Politics of Science
- Badina O., F. Mahler — The Sociological Problem of the Integration of Youth
- Badrus Sh. — Present Contradictions and the Future
- Badrus Sh. — Social and National Forces in the Development of the Third World Countries
- Bazac D., I. Dumitrescu, F. Mahler, V. Radulien — Social et Individuel dans la structure et la dynamique de l'idéal de vie chez les adolescents écoliers
- Bejan A. I., G. D. Buruiana, P. Datculescu — Le rapport entre statique et dynamique dans la structure du loisir chez certaines catégories de jeunes
- Berescu G. — Le rapport entre les mobiles de la construction de la famille et ses fonctions
- Berlogea O., A. Profeta, L. Nesculescu — The Integration of the Medical Profession into the General Process of Institutionalization of the Medical Action and Physician-Patient Relationship in the Dynamics of Social Development
- Berlogea O. — Socialist and Capitalist Planning: their Differences
- Burloiu P. — Expérience roumaine dans le domaine de la planification de l'éducation
- Caramelea V. V. — L'anthropologie sociale en Roumanie et les recherches sur l'interrelation "Société-Culture-Personnalité"
- Cazacu A. — La route professionnelle et la stabilisation urbaine de la main-d'oeuvre
- Cazacu T. S. — The Dynamic-Contextual Method in Sociolinguistics.
- Caravia P. — Paramètres sociaux de l'analyse des besoins d'information dans le monde contemporain
- Cernea M., Gh. Chepes, E. Gheorghe, H. Ene, M. Larionescu — Social and Economic Structures and Diffusion of Innovation in the Cooperative Village
- Cernea M. — Investigation into Latent States and Prevision of Industrial Manpower Fluctuation
- Cimpeanu P. — Prémisses de la planification de l'action culturelle dans le milieu rural
- Constantinescu M. — Considérations sur la transformation des relations sociales
- Constantinescu M. — The Urbanization Process in the Socialist Republic of Romania
- Constantinescu V. — La perception de soi et la perception d'autrui des sujets des zones rufo-urbaines
- Crişan M. — Quelques aspects de la famille contemporaine. L'intégration de l'homme dans la société
- Cristea P. — Industrialisation, progrès, technique
- Culea H. — Cadres socio-culturels du genre commun de connaissance
- Damian N. — Aspects of the Relation Husband-Wife in the Slatina Area
- Desmireanu I. — Le plan du développement économique et social de la Roumanie
- Dragan I. — Facteurs de l'homogénéisation de la structure sociale en Roumanie

- Dragan I. — Rythme de l'urbanisation et intégration urbaine des migrants d'origine rurale
- Dumitru N. S. — Structure de la problématique touchant la personnalité adolescente, objet de la recherche sociologique
- Ernö G. — La sociographie en Roumanie
- Ernö G. — Le rôle du dialogue dans le développement de la sociologie
- Florea C. — Le rapport désarmement — sécurité dans la société contemporaine
- Florea E. — Nouveaux contenus et sens majeurs de la conscience national socialiste
- Goliat I. — La sociologie de la science facteur important d'une politique active dans le domaine de la science
- Georgescu F. — La place occupée par le sport et sa structure dans le cadre de la culture physique
- Grindea D. — Considérations théoriques et pratiques sur la fonction productive de l'enseignement
- Grünberg L. — Imagistic Knowledge and Sociology of Knowledge
- Hoffmann O. — Les concepts de statut et de couche dans l'analyse de la mobilité et de la stratification sociale
- Ionescu C. — Le budget de temps des salariés
- Ionescu C. — Le développement de la structure sociale de la Roumanie
- Ionescu C., I. I. Matei — Lénine et la prévision sociale
- Ionescu M. — Le progrès technique et le rapport: effort physique, effort intellectuel dans l'acte productif
- Iordachel I., I. Cauc — L'utilisation de la méthode du cas, dans l'élaboration d'une typologie du village roumain contemporain
- Ioanid M. — L'informatique documentaire dans les sciences sociales une modalité d'approche
- Krasnaseski V., C. Mamali — The Index of Refraction of Microgroups and their Contingencies with the Macro-Social Element in the Younger Generation.
- Krausz S. — La corrélation entre la valeur du dirigeant et les performances du groupe dans le travail des mines
- Mahler F. — Youth and Social Development
- Matei I., M. Matei — La sociologie et les problèmes du développement urbain et rural
- Mazilu D. — La fonctionnalité du droit dans le perfectionnement des relations sociales
- Mazilu D. — La receptivité de l'opinion publique à l'amélioration de la réglementation juridique.
- Mazilu D. — La participation au pouvoir
- Moldovan R. — Characteristics to the Definition of Planning in Socialist Economy
- Muresanu P., O. Berlogea — A Long Term Planning of the Necessary Staff of Physician
- Necsulescu L., H. N. Popescu, N. Sirjiata, R. Jana — L'orientation professionnelle de la jeunesse et la planification sociale. La famille et l'orientation professionnelle



Nicu A., Constandache, A. Cazacu, C. Radut, V. Mazilu, Al. Foc-seneanu, E. Wilk, S. Rusu — L'intégration sociale du sportif de haute performance

Pinzaru P. — La pensée politique de V. I. Lénine et la vie sociale contemporaine

Pinzaru P. — Le dynamisme des changements de l'époque contemporaine et les dimensions socio-politiques de la société future

Schifirnet C., O. Neamțu — Du stockage de l'information à l'action créatrice

Silețchi M., L. Curta — Au sujet de l'élaboration des modèles mathématiques de précision sociale

Stoian St. — Le processus d'intégration éducationnelle dans un village du nord de la Transylvanie.

Taigar S. — Changes in Family Income in Romania

Topa L. — Sociologie de la famille et formation de la jeunesse pour la vie de famille

Topa L., P. Barbulescu — Family Sociology and the Training of Youth for Family Life

Trebici V. — Aspects démographiques de l'urbanisation en Roumanie

Varga V. — Considérations conceptuelles et méthodologiques concernant la recherche de l'avenir

Vasilescu M., G. Manescu, B. Brinzei — Conséquences et implications sociales de la modification du nombre et de la structure de la force de travail en Roumanie

Vlad C. — Determinism, Sociology and Social Life Management

Vlad C. — Sociological Coordinates Regarding the Direction of the Evolution and Role of the Nation in the Present Epoch

Zamfir C. — Determining Factors of the Organization of Social-Human Activities

#### SPAIN

López-Cepero J. M. — Quelques aspects sociologiques de la population active jeune en Espagne

Rodríguez-Campoamor H. — Report on a World-Wide Comparative Study of the Participation of Employers' and Workers' Organizations in Economics and Social Planning Undertaken by the International Labour Office

Sánchez de la Torre A. — Relation juridique et sanction de droit

#### SWEDEN

Abrahamsson B. — Elements of Military Conservatism: Traditional and Modern

Himmelstrand U. — Ethnicity, Political Power and Mobilization: Some Determinants of Political Perception and Behaviour in a Multiethnic Federal System: the Case of Nigeria

Lindberg G.—The Analysis of Human Activities with Reference to Physical Environment

Trost J. — The Scandinavian Countries — One or Several Cultures?

#### SWITZERLAND

Bassand M. — Urbanisation et loisir

Bassand M., U. Windisch — Changement social et structure du pouvoir

Campiche R. J. — La sociologie de la religion en Suisse

Girod R. — Mobilité séquentielle

Rossen St. — Planning in North Western Europe

Ziegler J. — Le temps social des sociétés industrielles et des sociétés émergentes

#### USSR

Abaev V. I., P. A. Azimov, Yu. D. Dechériev, F. P. Filine — Développement des fonctions sociales des langues des peuples de l'URSS et quelques problèmes de la théorie de la linguistique sociale

Afanasiev V. G. — V. I. Lenin on Scientific Administration of Socialist Society

Aganbegyan A. G. — On the Functions of Mathematics in Sociology

Akhitov — Planning the Socio-Economic Development of Cities Under Conditions of Socialism

Akhiézer A. S., A. B. Kotchérov — Urbanisation en URSS. Tendances et perspectives

Amosov N. M. — Heuristic Patterns of Social Systems

Amvrosov A. A. — La classe ouvrière de l'URSS: situation dans la société et perspectives du développement

Aminova G. A. — Social Planning in the USSR

Andréiev J. L. — Spécificité du développement non-capitaliste des peuples qui n'ont pas achevé le processus de formation des classes

Andreieva G. M. — On the Relation Between Micro- and Macro-Sociology

Andrianov B. — Processus ethniques contemporains dans les pays de l'Afrique

Antosenkov E. — Labour Turnover in USSR National Economy: Socio-economic Nature and Principles of Control

Arab-Ogly E. A. — La technique et l'homme

Arab-Ogly, E. A. — Social Consequences of the Scientific-Technological Revolution and the Future of Society

Arkhangelskii — On the Place of Moral Regulation in the Whole System of Control

Arnoldov A. I. — Cultural Progress and Its Criteria

Artemov V. A., Kutyrlov, Patrushev — Free Time — Problems and Perspectives



Arutyunian U. V., M. N. Guboglo, L. M. Drobizheva, M. G. Pancratova — L'urbanisation du village en URSS et quelques problèmes de la gestion sociale

Aroutunov S., R. Djanilgassinova — Les régularités de la combinaison du traditionnel et du nouveau dans les cultures en voie de développement des pays de l'Asie de l'Est

Avroutine V. A. — Essai d'application de la méthode d'enquête dans l'étude d'interaction fonctionnelle des langues

Baller E. A. — Social Progress and Cultural Heritage

Baichura W. — Social, Political and Historical Factors — the Most Significant Driving Force in the Development of Language

Baranov A. — Sur le modèle social du logement dans la société socialiste urbanisée

Baskakov N. A. — Particularités de la formation de la terminologie dans différentes conditions sociales du développement de la langue

Baskakov N. A. — Tendances du développement des fonctions sociales des langues turkmènes à écriture récente

Belova V. A., Darskii L. E. — Optimal and Expected Size of the Family in the USSR According to Data From a Public Opinion Research

Berri, V. Braguinskii — Planification centralisée et démocratisation de la gestion

Bertagaev T. A. — Sur l'unification et l'intégration des langues littéraires parentes

Besouglov — Les aspects sociaux de la participation à l'activité planificatrice des organes représentatifs soviétiques locaux du pouvoir

Bestuzhev-Lada I. V. — Forecasting as a Specific Category for the Investigation of the Future

Bliakhman A. S., O. I. Chkaratan — Pronostic sur l'efficacité de l'utilisation des cadres dans les entreprises industrielles

Bobnéva M. I. — L'organisation de production

Bogatyrev I. D. — Sur la planification de la santé publique en URSS

Bolgov V. I. — Time-Budget of the Working People and Social Development  
Borchtch A. J. — Sur la gestion du rôle des facteurs sociaux dans l'individualisation des langues romanes

Borgoyakov — Développement de la langue khakase littéraire nationale dans les conditions de la réalisation de la politique nationale de Lénine

Borissov G. — Démographie et psychologie sociale

Borodkin F. M., B. Mirkin — Some Problems of Sociological Information Measuring Systems

Botcharov, Frésinskaïa — Problèmes sociaux des villes — centres de l'activité scientifique

Budagov R. A. — Man's Influence on Language

Bourlatskii F. M. — Planification du monde entier: utopie ou réalité

Bramley — Le niveau de vie et la gestion du développement social dans les conditions du socialisme

Chaoumian — Grammaire applicative et perspective du développement des langages informationnels

Darbéeva A. A. — Développement des fonctions sociales des langues mongoles au cours de l'époque soviétique

- Daukaev A. A. — On Some Programmes and Mechanisms of the Functioning of Social Systems
- Déchériev Iu. D. — La méthodologie, la théorie et la pratique soviétique de planification et de prévisions du développement de la langue
- Déchériéva T. — Les méthodes mathématiques en sociolinguistique
- Djaukian — La méthode statistique d'étude des dialectes et de leur histoire
- Diliguenskii G. G. — Les besoins de l'individu et la société
- Dobrov G. — Les pronostics scientifiques et techniques en relation avec les nécessités des perspectives de la planification de l'économie socialiste
- Dobrov G. — Quantification of Scientific Information
- Dobrushkin M. — Lenin's Idea of the Union Between Working Class and Intelligentsia
- Doctorov — Le modèle des facteurs régressifs et la tâche des pronostics
- Dolgoval A. — La conscience juridique comme régulateur du comportement des adolescents
- Eliseev — The Attitude of the Soviet Worker to the Process of Automation
- Elméev — La fonction de but de la planification sociale et les problèmes de son effacement
- Epstein L. — On the Structure of Intelligentsia as Social Stratum
- Ermolenko D. V. — The Scientific Forecast of International Relations in the Light of Lenin's Teaching
- Fadeev E. T. — Scientification of Production: Problems and Perspectives
- Faynburg Z. I. — General Theory of Social Planning
- Firsov B. M. — Impact of Television on Modern Society and Its Social Consequences
- Frish A. S. — Democracy and Social Planning
- Gabritchidzé — Les organes représentatifs du pouvoir et les aspects sociaux de la planification de l'économie
- Galkin A. A. — Towards a Structural Characteristics of Socio-Political Crises
- Gantzkaïa O. A., L. N. Térentiéva — Étude de la famille sous l'aspect des processus ethniques
- Gavriletz I. N. — Les grandeurs aléatoires ayant une structure et leur utilisation en sociologie
- Guéliuta A. M. — La révolution scientifique et technique et les problèmes sociaux du travail de techniciens et d'ingénieurs
- Gerchikov W. I. — On System Character of the Objects of Social Management
- Glagolev V. F. — Methodology of Prognostication of Peace and Disarmament Problems
- Glezerman G. E. — Lenin and Problems of Scientific Prevision
- Goldenberg — Sur la question de la perception des oeuvres artistiques et de la typologie du lecteur dans la recherche sociologique concrète
- Goncharenko N. V. — Leninist Methodology of Culture Investigation
- Gordon L., V. Volk, E. Klopov — Sur la question de la typologie du temps libre
- Gougouchvili P. P. — La productivité du travail sous l'aspect des cadences de la croissance économique et des bases scientifiques de la planification



- Grajdannikov E., A. I. Chtcherbakov — Le problème des pronostics du travail scientifique individuel
- Gvishiani D. M., Editor in Chief — The Social, Economic and Organizational Problems of the Soviet Science
- Iliachtchenko T. P. — Dialectes sociaux et styles professionnels
- Ikonnikova G. I., I. S. Kon — Youth as a Social Category
- Istoshin I. — A Method for Measuring Latent Variables of Social Objects by Means of Pattern Recognition Theory
- Jovtobrukh M. A. — Les voies de rapprochement des variétés écrites et orales de la langue littéraire
- Kaminskaïa S. N., I. B. Mikhaïlovskaiâ — L'opinion publique sur la justice dans les procès criminels
- Kantorovich L. B. — The Significance of Sociological Research in the Treatment and Realization of the Principles of Optimal Planning and of Management
- Kasimirtchouk V. P. — Le mécanisme social de l'action du droit
- Kask K. — Sur la structure du public théâtral d'Estonie
- Katkova I. — Le comportement démographique des jeunes
- Katagochtchina N. A. — Rôle des facteurs sociaux dans les processus de formation et de développement des langues littéraires écrites
- Katzenelenboigen A. I., V. M. Polterovich — Values and Organization of Socio-Economic Systems
- Kelle V. Zh. — The Problem of Levels of Theory in the Sociology of Science
- Kérimov D. A. — Planification sociale: quelques résultats et perspectives
- Khabibulin K. N. — From the Experience of the Formation of the Bashkir Nation
- Khainman S. A. — Scientific and Technological Progress and the Problems of Socio-Economic Prognostication
- Khanasarov K. H. — Développement de la langue ouzbek pendant les années du pouvoir soviétique
- Kharchev A. G., Golofast — Methodological Aspects of Comparative Studies in the Sociology of the Family
- Khassanov B. — Développement fonctionnel de la langue kazak littéraire pendant la période soviétique et son interaction avec les autres langues des peuples de Kazakhie
- Kholodkovskii — Le développement de la planification et la crise de la démocratie parlementaire
- Khovanov N. V. — Problems of the Construction of Figure Scales for the Directed Characteristics of the Scientific and Production Collectives
- Kirshin — Towards the Problem on Social Conditions of Control
- Kichanova I. M. — Cultural and Moral Aspects of the Dynamics of Social Development and Religious Orientation of Personality
- Kochetov G. M. — Young People's Occupational Plans and Their Fulfilment.
- Kogan L. B. — Urbanisation et culture urbaine
- Kogan L. B. — Some Methodological Principles of Planning Spiritual Culture under Socialism
- Kollontay V. M. — Some Peculiarities of the Social Processes in the Developing Countries

- Konopliov V. K. — Social Orientation of the Soviet Youth in Military Field
- Konstantinov F. T. — Some Problems of the Future of Nations and Nationalities
- Korlétéanu N. G. — Développement différencié des niveaux de langue dans leur position à l'égard du conditionnement social
- Kozlov V. I. — Les processus techniques en URSS et les composantes de leurs pronostics
- Kozlov V. I. — The Role and Place of the Natural Factors of Reproduction Among the Other Social Attitudes
- Kossolapov V. V. — Les aspects informationnels de la sociologie de la science
- Kouguel — La mobilité professionnelle dans la science et la tendance de son changement
- Kudriavtzev V. — Law and Social Reality
- Kulaghin A. S. — Analysis of the Changes in the Living Conditions of Young Specialists
- Kulichenko M. — Lenin on the Role of the Working Class in Solving the National Question
- Kulikov N. K. — On the Essence of the Scientific Method of Carrying Out and Planning the Research
- Kutzenkov A. A. — The Indian Caste
- Lapin N. I., V. Kolbanovskii — Interaction of Social Structure of Society and the Industrial Enterprise in the Context of Scientific-Technological Revolution
- Larmin O. V. — Objective and Subjective Factors in Demography
- Lefevr A. B. — A Formal Method of Research of Reflexive Processes in Human Conflicts
- Liakhov I. I. — La construction sociale
- Loiberg M., Yu. Sikorskii — Workers Combining Intellectual and Physical Work in the Social Structure of the Industrial Enterprise
- Lubashevskii I. — Youth Social Problems Study in the USSR
- Maïzel I. — La science en tant que facteur de la régulation sociale
- Malinin E. — Social-Economic Problems of Raising National Economic Efficiency of Developing New Regions in Siberia
- Malinine V. G. — Modèles de la communication de masse
- Marzoéva-Kozyréva T. Z. — Conditions sociales et ethno-linguistiques pour la formation de la langue nationale ossète
- Medvedev V. F., A. A. Rakov — Methods and Models of Demographic Prognosing
- Medvedev V. F., V. V. Shvyrkov, L. P. Chernish — Prognosing of Demand
- Mélechtchenko — Lénine sur le rôle du progrès scientifique et technique dans le développement de la société
- Ménovchtchikov G. A. — Certains types de contacts de langue chez les aborigènes de l'extrémité nord-est de la Sibérie
- Mezhuev — The Problem of Socialist Culture in the Light of Scientific-Technological Revolution



- Midler A. — Usage of Mass Media in the Social Insurance of the Installation of New Technology
- Mikhalevskii B. N. — Development of the Planned Economy and of the Conception about the Balanced and Non-Balanced Economic Growth
- Mikhéev — Aspects politiques des conceptions sociologiques
- Milikovskii A. — The Concept of Imperialism — an Instrumentality for Analysing Contemporary Capitalism
- Milstein O. A. — The Attitude of Various Social and Demographic Groups Towards Physical Culture and Sports as a Sociological Problem
- Minkovskii G. M. — Problèmes de l'étude de l'efficacité social de la législation relative à la jeunesse
- Mintz L. E. — Problems of Working Time, Non-Working Hours and Leisure
- Mirkin B. G. — An Approach to the Analysis of Primary Sociological Information
- Mirskii G. — Le rôle de l'armée dans la vie politique des pays en voie de développement
- Mitin M. B. — V. I. Lenin and Some Problems of the General Sociological Theory of Marxism
- Modrzhinskaya E. D. — The Theory of "Pluralistic Democracy" and Socialism
- Mokronosov N. — Consideration of Needs and Interests of Working People As the Condition of Scientific Control of Social Progresses
- Momdzhhan Kh. N. — Social Theory in an Age of Dynamic Social Changes
- Mukhachev V. — Administration and Public Control
- Nazimov I. N. — L'attitude de l'individu envers le travail et son activité de production
- Naumova N. F. — Satisfaction with Work as a Social Characteristic
- Nemchenko V. S. — The Problem of Prognostication of the Professional Structure of Engagement in Societies of Different Types
- Nikolskii L. B. — Pronostics et planification du développement de la langue
- Nitoburg N. L. — De l'aspect ethnique du problème des Nègres aux Etats Unis
- Notchevnik — Au sujet du climat socio-psychologique dans l'équipe de recherche scientifique
- Novikov N. — Le contenu social du radicalisme contemporain de gauche aux Etats Unis
- Novikov N., A. M. Maximenko — L'influence de certains facteurs socio-économique sur le niveau des performances sportives de divers pays
- Novoselov — On Certain Tendencies in the Development of the Intellectual Potential
- Okulov A. F. — Social Progress and Religion
- Olshansky V. B. — On Some Logical Premises of the Socio-Psychological Study of Industrial Enterprise
- Orlov A. V. — The Culture of Leisure Hours
- Osipov G. V. — Modern Evolutionism and the Issue of Social Progress
- Osipov G. V. — Theory of Social Evolution and Empirical Patterns of Development

Osipova E. V. — Development by V. I. Lenin of Marxian Conception of Personality

Ostrovitianinov Yu. K., S. Sterbalova — Socio-Economic Structure and Type of Power in the Underdeveloped Countries

Ougrinovitch D. M. — Analyse structurale et fonctionnelle de la religion et ses perspectives sociales

Ougrinovitch D. M., R. Lopatkine, H. Momdjan — Le progrès social et la religion: au sujet de l'approche structurale et fonctionnelle de la religion

Urlanis B. Tz. — Politique démographique et son influence sur le comportement démographique de la population

Pakhalina T. N. — Influence de certains facteurs sociaux sur le développement de la langue

Pankratova M. — La famille paysans en URSS et quelques problèmes de la planification

Panfilov V. Z. — About the Place of Language as a Characteristic Feature of Nation at Different Stages of Development of Human Society

Patrughin Yu. P. — On Measuring Qualitative Characteristics

Patrushev V. D. — Aggregate Time Balance of a Nation (Economic Region) and Its Role in Socio-Economic Planning

Patrushev V. D. — Aggregate Time Balance of a Nation as a Means of Forecasting the Proportions of Human Activity

Pavlov — Aspects sociologiques des recherches des formes démographiques de gestion dans la coopérative agricole socialiste

Perevedentzev V. I. — Concentration of the USSR Urban Population and Criteria for City's Optimalization

Pétrov I. G., Mélamid, Prianichnikov N. — Modèle de la composante périodique

Pétrov N. — L'homme dans le système de la communication de masse

Pétrova-Averkiéva Yu. — Le Néo-évolutionisme et le relativisme dans l'ethnographie contemporaine

Pilipenko N. V. — V. I. Lenin on the Relationship of the General Laws and Specific Features in the Building of Socialism

Pilipov — Urban Youth: Education and Mobility

Poltnikov S. N., Morozov — Investigation of the Creative Situations within the Collective Body

Popov S. I. — La théorie sociologique de Lénine de la corrélation entre le général et le particulier dans le développement de la société socialiste

Prigojine A. — La corrélation entre la formalisation et l'auto-organisation dans les systèmes sociaux

Ratinov A. R. — Legal Consciousness as a Source of Legal Activity and a Regulator of Legal Behaviour

Rébané Ya. K. — La gnoséologie marxiste, les rapports interdisciplinaires et la sociologie de la connaissance

Rojine — Le problème des lois dans la théorie sociologique marxiste

Rolbinov A. R. — La conscience juridique en tant que source d'activité juridique et régulateur du comportement juridique

Rumiantsev A. M. — Social Prognostication and Planning in the Soviet Union



- Rutkevich M. N. — On the Conception of Social Mobility
- Rutkevich M. N. — V. I. Lenin and Problems of Development of Intelligentsia
- Riashenko B. R. — Problems of Planning and Regulating the Social Structure of the Collective Body in the Enterprise
- Ryvkina R. — To the Study of Relations between Different Kinds of Mobility
- Samochtchenko I. S., V. I. Nikitinskii — Certains problèmes théoriques de l'étude de l'efficacité des normes juridiques
- Samsonov Yu. B. — Coding of Information in the Social Systems
- Semenov V. S. — On the Theory of Social Change and Social Relationships
- Sevastianov L. I. — Representation of Social Factors in the Models of Optimal Settlement for New Industrial Regions
- Shabad B. A. — The Problem of Opposing Changes and Criticism of the Sociological Theories of Militarism
- Shubkin V. N., D. L. Konstantinovskii — On Social Prediction of Youth's Chances for Education
- Shubkin V. N. — Youth's Value Orientations in Occupational Choice
- Shvyrkov Yu. M. v. — Differences in the Socio-Economic Conditions and Methodology of Planning
- Smoliar I. M. — Social and Spatial Pattern of the Town
- Sokhan L. V., etc. — Gestion sociale, planification, pronostics
- Soloviov N. — Le divorce comme objet de l'étude sociologique
- Sonine M. Ia. — Problèmes méthodologiques du pronostic des ressources en main-d'oeuvre dans leur emploi
- Starouchenko G. B. — Sur l'orientation socialiste du développement de certains pays de l'Afrique et de l'Asie
- Stépanov U. S. — Le domaine des implications linguistiques comme sphère de prévisions dans la langue
- Stepanian S. A. — The Future of Human Society and Developmental Phases in Its History
- Stronguina — Sur certains problèmes du développement des agglomérations urbaines en URSS
- Taganov I. N., O. I. Shkaratan — On the Methods of Research of Social Structures
- Tchaguine B. A. — De l'accroissement qualitatif du rôle du facteur subjectif
- Tchangli I. I. — Le modèle idéal du travail communiste et les contradictions réelles de son devenir
- Torsuev Yu. — Social Management and Youth
- Tochtchenko J. — Les formes de planification des changements sociaux dans la société socialiste
- Trapeznikov C. — Importance sociale du bilinguisme et le multilinguisme dans l'Etat soviétique multinational
- Tursunbaev A. B. — Soviet Experience in Solving the Problems of Nomadism and Sedentary Life
- Urlanis B. Tz. — V. I. Lenin and Demographic Science
- Valentei D. I. — Some Problems of Forecasting the Development of Population

- Valentinova N. G., V. V. Medvédev — Certains problèmes des petits groupes dans les équipes sportives
- Vassilenko V. A. — Le pouvoir, sa structure et ses déterminantes
- Vershlovskii S. G., L. N. Lesokhina — Orientation Towards Education and Personality's Behaviour
- Voline B. N. — Les séminaires des sciences techniques dans la science contemporaine
- Volkov Yu. E. — Acts of Social Management and the Attitude of the Society Members to Them
- Volkov G. N. — Humanism of Sciences
- Voronov Yu. — Stratified Sampling in Sociological Research
- Yadov V. A., E. Beliaev, V. Vodzinskaya — Cross-Disciplinary Approach to the Study of the Relation Between Value-Orientations and Manifest Behaviour
- Yakovlev A. M. — Les problèmes conceptuels des recherches sociologiques concrètes en droit
- Yakovlev A. M. — Les problèmes théoriques de la sociologie du droit
- Yanitzki O. N. — Aspects socio-informationnels de l'urbanisation
- Yankova Z. A. — Family and Neighbourhood in the Process of Shaping Personality in Every-Day Life
- Yarguina Z. N. — Le progrès social et quelques problèmes de la transplantation d'habitants en perspective
- Yaroshevskii B. E. — The Experience of Central Asia Republics in Socio-Economic Planning
- Yartzéva — Le rôle international du langage scientifique
- Yourkévitch — Les relations mutuelles entre les époux dans les familles des ouvriers (quelques aspects)
- Zagoruiko N., T. Zaslavska — On the Possibility of Pattern Recognition Methods Utilization in Sociological Research
- Zaitzeva M. I. — Creativity as Value and Motive
- Zaiontchkovskaïa — La formation et la qualification comme facteurs de la mobilité et de l'adaptation des nouvellement transplantés
- Zaslavska T. — Objectives and Methods in Planning Rural-Urban Migration
- Zborovskii A. — Problèmes de la théorie sociologique du temps libre
- Zdravomyslov A. G. — Interrelation Between Economics and Sociology in the Light of Two Opposing Traditions in Modern Sociological Thought
- Zdravomyslov A. G. — Social Process, Information and Decision-Making
- Zhemanov — On Prognosis of Processes of Change in Professional Structure of Society
- Zhilin P., S. Tiushkevich — Political Aims of War and Their Influence on the Social Behaviour at War
- Zhuravliov B. B. — On Some Peculiarities of the Scientific Type of Management Under Socialism
- Zlobin N. S. — Correlation Between Scientific-Technological and Cultural Revolutions
- Zotova O. I., A. G. Achkénazi, Iu. Kovalenko — Sur certains aspects sociologiques du choix profession par les élèves terminant leurs études secondaires



- Zvéguintsev — Les corrélatifs linguistiques du pronostic scientifique  
 Zvorikin A. A. — Report on Research in the Sociology of Science  
 Zvorikin A. A. — Science as a Social System. Foundations of Its Development and Mechanism of Its Functioning  
 Zvorikin A. A. — Theoretical Foundations of the Social Processes Control

## YUGOSLAVIA

- Barbić A. — Some Thoughts for the "Theory of Mass Communications"  
 Burić O. — Modernization of the Family and Inconsistency of its Structure  
 Ibrahimpašić M. — Military Profession in Self-Managed Society  
 Jerovšek J., S. Možina — Self-Management in Working Organizations from the Point of View of Efficiency and Democracy  
 Jusić B. — The Need of Maximizing and the Necessity to Economize with Educational Contents  
 Kostić Cv. — Spécificité de la planification dans la société autogestionnaire de Yougoslavie  
 Kuwacić I. — A Theoretical Approach Towards the Understanding of the Contemporary Youth  
 Popović S. — The Role of the Armed Forces in the System of National Defense  
 Vulić E., Sp. Vulić — Technical Progress and Employing Problem of the Young Personnel

## PAPERS BY SEVERAL AUTHORS FROM DIFFERENT COUNTRIES

RAPPORTS ECRITS PAR PLUSIEURS AUTEURS PROVENANT  
DE DIFFERENTS PAYS

- Abdulaziz M.H., A. A. Mazrui — Factors Influencing Language Maintenance and Code-Switching among Bilingual Speakers of Swahili and English (Kenya, Uganda)  
 Borodkin F., S. Doncheva, M. Penkov — About Measuring in a System of Parameters (USSR, Bulgaria)  
 Cranach M. von, A. Jablensky — Effects of Verbal Information on the Perception of Psychomotor Behaviour by Groups of Psychiatrists and Laymen (GFR., Bulgaria)  
 Lüschen G., R. O. Blood, M. Lewis, Z. Staikof, V. Stolte — Family Organization, Interaction and Ritual. A Cross-Cultural Study in Finland, Germany and Ireland (G.D.R. Bulgaria)  
 Micklin M., C. A. León — Rejection of the Mentally Ill in a South American City: Variations by Age, Sex and Social Position (USA, Colombia)  
 Naraghi E., C. A. O. van Nieuwenhuijze — The Sociology of Development: per Aspera ad Astra? (Iran, Netherlands)

Rogers E. M., I. R. Ascroft, N. G. Rölling — Cross-Cultural Generalizations about the Relative Success of Agricultural Change Programs in Peasant Villages: Research in Brazil, Nigeria and India (USA, Finland)

Roy P., C. P. Andrade, J. Guba — Planning Viable Rural-Urban Growth Centres in India (India, Iran)

Schweitzer D., A. M. Elden — Politics of the Youth Counter-Culture and Demands for Change (Canada, USA)

Siotis J., G. Catephores — Some Notes on the Military in Greek Politics: An Additional Note on "The Institutionalization of a Defense Society" (Switzerland, England)

LIST OF PARTICIPANTS

LISTE DES PARTICIPANTS



## AFRICA

### LIST OF PARTICIPANTS

Senaitin Farouk Mohamed, 48 Avenue Atlas, Kouba

### LISTE DES PARTICIPANTS

Fahim Hussein M., American University, Cairo

Hayashi Takeshi, 7 Bahgat Ali Str., Zamalek, Cairo

Kamal Ahmed, Higher Inst. of Sociology Work, 3 Kamal Salim Str., Garden City, Cairo

Mahmoud Fahmy Mohamed, Higher Inst. of Sociology Work, 3 Kamal Salim Str., Garden City, Cairo

Roberts Robert E. T., American University, 112 St. Kasr el Aini, Cairo

## GHANA

Abraham Joseph Hayim, Dept. of Sociology, University of Ghana, Legon, Accra

Hardiman A. J. P. O. Box 5, Legon, Accra

Hardiman Margaret, P. O. Box 5, Legon, Accra

Naldou Lutchmans, Dept. of Sociology, University College, Cape Coast  
Bir Teem, University of Ghana, Legon, Accra

## KENYA

Abdulaziz Mohamed Hassan, University College, P.O. Box 30197, Nairobi

Astroff Joseph Raymond, University College, P.O. Box 30197, Nairobi

Barta, University College, P.O. Box 30197, Nairobi

Coleman James Stewart, University of Nairobi, P. O. Box 30197, Nairobi

## LIBERIA

Blayo Bequato, University of Liberia, Monrovia

## AFRICA

### ALGERIA

Benatia Farouk Mohamed, 48 avenue Alilat, Kouba

### ARAB REPUBLIC OF EGYPT

Fahim Hussein M., American University, Cairo

Hayashi Takeshi, 7 Bahgat Ali Str., Zamalek, Cairo

Kamal Ahmed, Higher Inst. of Sociology, Work, 3 Kamal Salan Str., Garden City, Cairo

Mahmoud Fahmy Mohamed, Higher Inst. of Sociology Work, 3 Kamal Salan Str., Garden City, Cairo

Roberts Robert E. T., American University, 113 Sh. Kasr el Aini, Cairo

### GHANA

Abraham Joseph Hayim, Dept. of Sociology, University of Ghana, Legon, Accra

Hardiman A. J., P. O. Box 8, Legon, Accra

Hardiman Margaret, P. O. Box 8, Legon, Accra

Naidoo Lutchmana, Dept. of Sociology, University College, Cape Coast

Ure Jean, Iniversity of Ghana, Legon, Accra

### KENYA

Abdulaziz Mohamed Hassan, University College, P.O. Box 30197, Nairobi

Ascroft Joseph Raymond, University College, P.O. Box. 30197, Nairobi

Barbu, University College, P.O. Box 30197, Nairobi

Coleman James Smoot, University of Nairobi, P. O. Box 30197, Nairobi

### LIBERIA

Blamo Bernard, University of Liberia, Monrovia



## MADAGASCAR

Ranaivoarivony Guy de Princy, 13 Cheminn Fr. Lehmann 1218 Crand-Saconnex, Genève, Suisse

## MALI

Diallo Yaya, Kissingen Str. 47, 110 Berlin, DDR

## NIGERIA

Akiwowo Akinsola Ayodele, block 2, flat 2 Alzayatti, Crescent University, Ibadan

Akiwowo A. B., block 2, flat 2 Alzayatti, Crescent University, Ibadan

Morgan Robert W., Univ. of Lagos, College of Medicine, Private Mail Bag 12003, Lagos

Oloko Olatunde, School of Social Studies, University of Lagos, Lagos

## REPUBLIC OF SOUTH AFRICA

Batson Edward, University of Cape Town, Rondebosch Cape Province  
Buitendag Johannes Jacobus, 14 Nobbs Road Summerstrand, Port Elizabeth

Cilliers Stephanus Petrus, Dept. of Sociology, Univ. Stellenbosch, Stellenbosch

Higgins Edward, Rhodes University, Graham Town

Steyn Anna Francina, Rand Afrikaan University, Box 524, Johannesburg

## RHODESIA

Roberts Charles, University College, P. O. Box MP 167 Mount Pleasant, Salisbury

## TUNISIA

Stambouli Fredj, 23 Rue d'Espagne, Tunis

## UGANDA

Chick John David, Makerere Univ. College, Dept. of Sociology, P. O. Box 7062, Kampala

Kabwegyere Tarsis B., Makerere Univ. College, Dept. of Sociology, P. O. Box 7062, Kampala

- Mazrui Ali Al Amin, Makerere Univ. College, Dept. of Sociology, P.O. Box 7062, Kampala  
 Tandon Yashpal Amarchand, Makerere Univ. College, P. O. Box. 7062, Kampala  
 Wallace Tina, P. O. Box 6255, Kampala  
 Weeks Sheldon G., P. O. Box 16022, Kampala

## AMERICA

## ARGENTINA

- Corradi Juan Eugenio, Rodriguez Peña 1416 2 B, Buenos Aires  
 Fischman de Slemenson Marta Raquel, Pampa 2119 — 11 D, Buenos Aires  
 Sluzki Carlos E., Paraguay 1373 10 A, Buenos Aires  
 Suarez Francisco, Rubendarío 719 Martínez, Provincia de Buenos Aires  
 Vapnarsky Cesar A., Virrey del Pino 3230, Buenos Aires  
 Veron Eliseo, Virrey del Pino 3230, Buenos Aires

## BRAZIL

- Cardoso Fernando Henrique, Rua Bahia 499, São Paulo  
 Pereira Luiz, Dept. of Sociology, Univ. of São Paulo, Caixa Postal 8.105, São Paulo  
 Rangel Lauro, Pza 15 de Novembro 101, Rio de Janeiro  
 Rattner Heinrich, Av. 9 de Julho 2029, São Paulo S. P.

## CANADA

- Afendras E., International Center for Research on Bilingualism, Cité Universitaire, Québec 10  
 Badgley Robin F., 1104 Belmoral Pl, Dakville, Ontario  
 Beauchamp Theodore L., 255 Stewart St. Apt. 55, Ottawa 2, Ontario  
 Belanger Paul, Dept. Sociologie, Univ. Laval, Québec  
 Bell Norman, 563 Spadina Ave., Toronto  
 Belowo Francois, 2050 Ricner 5, Ste-Foy 10  
 Blain Robert, Caltelbeau Drive, Lucerne, Québec  
 Bojrque Gilles, 10185 Iberville, Montreal  
 Caldarola Carlo, Dept. of Sociology, Univ. of Alberta, Edmonton  
 Carisse Colette, Dept. de sociologie, Université, Montréal  
 Carsch Henry, 1 Mowat Avenue, Kingston, Ontario  
 Chekki Dan A., Univ. of Winnipeg, Winnipeg 2



- Cheurefils Aline, 19 Youville, Chateauguay P. Z.  
 Clark Samuel Delbert, Univ. of Toronto, 563 Spadina Ave., Toronto,  
 Ontario  
 Clark Mrs. S. D., Univ. of Toronto, 563 Spadina Ave., Toronto, Ontario  
 Coulombe Pierre E., 1795 Devlin Crescent, Ottawa 8, Ontario  
 Darnell Regna, Anthropology Dept., Alberta Univ., Edmonton  
 De Gre Gerard, Univ. of Waterloo, Waterloo, Ontario  
 Dofny Jacques, 5120 Earnscliffe, Montreal  
 Elliott David, Dalhousie University, Halifax, Nova Scotia  
 Elliott Henry C., Univ. of Alberta, Dept. of Sociology, Edmonton, Alberta  
 Elliott Jean Leonard, Dalhousie University, Halifax, Nova Scotia  
 Fallding Harold, 125 Empire Street, Waterloo, Ontario  
 Fearn Gordon, Dept. of Sociology, Alberta University, Edmonton 7  
 Fish David Gomer, 9-725 Sherbrook Street, Winnipeg, Manitoba  
 Frenette Nicole, 3333 Metropolitain 500, Montreal, Quebec  
 Guindon Hubert, 1280 St. Marc. 1508, Montreal  
 Gurcharn S. Basran, Dept. of Sociology, Univ. of Saskatchewan, Saskatoon  
 Hackler James C., Dept. of Sociology, Univ. of Alberta, Edmonton 7,  
 Alberta  
 Harman Richard, 2055 St. Mark 14, Montreal  
 Ishwaran K., York University Toronto, Toronto  
 Jonassohn Kurt, 4072 Grey Ave., Montreal 260  
 Jones Frank Edward, Dept. of Sociology, Mc Master Univ. Hamilton,  
 Ontario  
 Jones Jean, Dept. of Sociology, Mc Master Univ., Hamilton, Ontario  
 Jung Richard, Dept. of Sociology, Univ. of Alberta, Edmonton, Alberta  
 Labarre Annamarie, 1000 Cotre Vertue, Montreal 381 P. Q.  
 Laplante Marc, 420 Ouest Lagauchetière Chambre 425, Montréal  
 Layne Neville, Dept. of Sociology, Univ. of Windsor, Ontario  
 Lepage Bernard, 301 Boulevard Deguire, Montréal, Québec  
 Lepage Laurent, 6060 des Anqueins, Anjou 434 MTL.  
 Loubser Jan J., 42 Colin Ave., Toronto 197  
 Loza Sarah, Alberta Univ., Edmonton, Alberta  
 Lucas Rex A., 25 New Street, Toronto 5  
 Maller Harry Mark, Univ. of Toronto, Dept. of Sociology, 563 Spadina  
 Ave., Toronto 179, Ontario  
 Massot Alain, 363 Besserev 303, Ottawa  
 Meisel John, Queen's Univ., Kingston, Ontario  
 Michel Andree, Univ. of Ottawa  
 Michelson William Michael, 334 Sheldrake boul., Toronto 315, Ontario  
 Milner Henry, 12 Waverly, Ottawa  
 Milner Sheilaigh H., 32 Waverly, Ottawa  
 Nandy Santosh Kumar, P. O. Box 609, Postal Station A, Toronto 116,  
 Ontario  
 O'Neill John, York University, Toronto 12  
 Peterson Eggert S., Apartment 208, 470 Cambridge Str., Ottawa, Ontario  
 Pizarro Narciso, 3250 Forest Hill 1104, Montreal  
 Rawin Solomon John, Sir George Williams Univ., Montreal

- Richer Andre, 130 Str. Louis Avenue, Beaurepaire, Québec  
 Rush G. B., Simon Frazer Univ., Dept. of Political Science, Burnaby 2, British  
 Columbia  
 Ryerson Stanley B., 3519 Lorne Avenue, Montreal 130, Quebec  
 Ryerson Mildred, 3519 Lorne Avenue, Montreal 130, Quebec  
 Schindler Fred, IBR York Univ., Toronto  
 Schweitzer David Richard, Dept. of Anthropology and Sociology, Univ.  
 of British Columbia, Vancouver 8, British Columbia  
 Stacey Clara Jeanette, 33 Glenborough PK. Cresc. Willowdale 450, Ontario  
 Thibault Andre, 75 West boul., Dorchester, et. 7, ch. 700, Montreal 128,  
 Québec  
 Wrigley John Richard, 16 St Joseph Str., Apt. 42, Toronto 5, Ontario

## CHILE

- Chuaqui Irene, Zwierzyniecka 7, Poznan, Poland  
 Chuaqui Jorge, Zwierzyniecka 7, Poznan, Poland  
 Droguett Ester, Ejército 233, Santiago  
 Juana Anguita, Ejército 233, Santiago  
 Otero Quiroz Blanca Adriana, Vaticano 4276, Santiago  
 Porcell Nestor, Departamento de Sociologia, Unidad de Ciencias Sociales,  
 Universidad de Chile, Santiago  
 Quijano Obregon Anibal, Casilla 179-D CEPAL, Santiago  
 Ramallo Massanet Luis Ignacio, Casilla 3213, Santiago  
 Rivera Deodato, Casilla 3213, FLACSO, Santiago  
 Solari Aldo E., División de Desarrollo Social — ILPES, Casilla 1567, Santiago

## COLUMBIA

- Costa Pinto Luis de Aguiar, 74 Ford Foundation, Apartado  
 Aéreo 52986, Bogotá  
 Costa Pinto Sulamita B., 74 Ford Foundation, Apartado Aéreo 52986,  
 Bogotá  
 Fals-Borda Orlando, Apartado Aéreo 51012, Bogotá

## CUBA

- Betancourt Gilda, Dept. of Sociology, Habana University, La Habana  
 Dewelde Alsina Lucia, Relaciones Internacionales, Universidad de la  
 Habana, La Habana  
 Gutierrez Palmaseda Miguel, Dept. of Sociology, Univ. of Habana,  
 La Habana  
 San Jose Acosta Santos, Relaciones Internacionales, Universidad de la  
 Habana, La Habana



## ECUADOR

Ortiz Villacis Marcelo, P. O. Box 1281, Quito  
 Yepes Del Pozo Juan, H. J. Buja 211, Quito

## MEXICO

Castaños Rodriguez Heriberta, La Hacienda Andador 294, Villacoapa,  
 México 22 D. F.

Gomezgil Juan Ignacio, Olivar de los Padres 532, México 29 D. F.

Kuttler de López Camara Eugenia, Sagredo 252-2, México 20 D. F.

Lenero Otero Luis, Avenida Cuauhtemoc 1486 — Quinto Piso, México  
 13 D. F.

Lopez-Camara Francisco, Sagredo 252-2, Guadalupe Inn., México 20 D. F.

Marin Lopez Rubén Eduardo, Facultad Ciencias Políticas U. N. A. M.,  
 México 20 D. F.

Morante Flores José Manuel, Avenida del Convento 43, Coyoacán  
 21 D. F.

Rodriguez Sala de Gomezgil Ma Luisa, Olivar de los Padres 532,  
 México 20 D. F.

Rubio Corbalá Pablo Ernesto, Universidad 2074, México 20 D. F.

Ruiz de Chavez Paniagua Leticia, Ozuloama 6 Col. Hipódromo,  
 México 11 D. F.

Sanchez Carmoná Irene Benita, Ave. Pacifico 109-6 México 21 D. F.

Trejo Rey, B. Traven 96-209, Mexico 12 D. F.

Uribe Villegas Oscar, Palestina 117, México 16 D. F.

## URUGUAY

De Riz Liliana Antonieta, Social Sciences Inst. Mercedes 1705, Mon-  
 tevideo

Rama Carlos M., Coronel Alegre 1340, Montevideo

## USA

Abbott Joan, Box 170 Chatham College, Pittsburgh

Abel Theodore, Box 208 Palisades N. Y. 10964.

Abrams Peter, Basr. Columbia Univ., 605 W 115 St. New York. N. Y. 10025

Adler Judith, 28 Roseland St., Cambridge, Mass.

Afendras Evangelos Angelou, East West Center Univ. of Hawaii, Lin-  
 coln Hall, Honolulu, Hawaii 96 822

Aldous Joan, Univ. Minnesota, Family Study Center, 1014 Social Sciences  
 Bldg, Minneapolis, Minn. 55455

Alford Robert R., Dept. of Sociology, Univ. Wisconsin, Madison, Wis-  
 consin

- Askenasy Alexander R., 900 West 190 Street (Apt 12K), New York  
 Baali Fuad, Western Kentucky Univ., Bowling Green, Kentucky 42101  
 Bask Kurt Wolfgang, Dept. of Sociology, Duke Univ., Durham, North  
 Carolina 27706  
 Back Mary Louise, Dept. of Sociology, Duke Univ., Durham, North  
 Carolina 27706  
 Bardis Panos D., Univ. of Toledo, Ohio  
 Barros de Souza Costa Alexandre, 1414 East 59th Street, Chicago, Illinois  
 60637  
 Barton Allen, B. A. S. R. Columbia Univ., 605 W 115 St., New York, N. Y.  
 10025  
 Beal George, 2022 MC Carthy RD, Ames, Iowa  
 Ben David Joseph, Univ. of Chicago, Dept. of Sociology, 1126 East 59th  
 Str., Chicago, Illinois 60637  
 Bernard Jessie, 4200 Cathedral Ave. N. W., Washington, D. C. 20016  
 Bhatnagar Savitri Rani, 15 Nelson Avenue, Edison, New Jersey 08817  
 Bice Thomas W., 6307 Blackburn Court, Baltimore, Maryland 21212  
 Biderman Albert, Room 400, 1200—17th St., N. W. Washington D. C.  
 20036  
 Biderman A. D. Sumico, Room 400, 1200—17th St., N. W. Washington  
 D. C. 20036  
 Bidwell Charles E., 5835 Kimbark Ave. Chicago, Illinois 60637  
 Birnbaum Norman, Amherst College, Amherst, Mass. 01002  
 Blalock Hubert M., Dept. of Sociology, Univ. of North Carolina, Chapel  
 Hill, N. C. 27514  
 Blau M. Peter, 7700 SO. Luella, Chicago, Illinois 60649  
 Bonilla Frank, Inst. of Political Studies, Stanford Univ., Stanford, Cali-  
 fornia 94305  
 Boonsanong Punyo Dyana, Cornell Univ., Ithaca N. Y.  
 Booth Alan, 2630 Winthug RD., Lincoln, Nebraska 68502  
 Bosserman Charles Phillip, Dept. of Sociology, Univ. of South Florida,  
 Tampa, Florida  
 Boulding Elise, Univ. of Colorado, Boulder, Colorado 80302  
 Brandt William A. JR., 5225 Southwest boul., apt. 204, St. Louis, Mis-  
 souri 43139  
 Britson Robert C., One Terrace Drive, Pittsburgh, Penn. 15205  
 Britson Paula, One Terrace Drive, Pittsburgh, Penn. 15205  
 Broderick Carlfred, 791 Cornwall Road, State College, Penn. 16081  
 Bruhns Fred Charles, 2727 Mount Royal Road, Pittsburgh, Penn. 15217  
 Brunswick Ann, 630 W 168 St. Columbia Univ., New York, N. Y. 10032  
 Buck Peter, History of Science. Dept., Harvard Univ., Holyoke Center,  
 838 Cambridge, Mass. 02138  
 Bustamante Jorge A., Univ. of Notre Dame, Dept. of Sociology and  
 Anthropology, Notre Dame, Indiana 46556  
 Caldwell Miriam Ann, 1555 Alameda Padre Serra, Santa Barbara, Cali-  
 fornia 93103  
 Caplow Theodore, Cabell Hall Univ. of Virginia, Charlottesville, Virginia



- Casimir Jean, 104—25 212th Place, New York 11924  
 Chall Leo P., 73 8th Ave., Brooklyn N. Y. 11215  
 Chapin Frances Stuard JR., City and Regional Planning Dept., Univ. of North Carolina, Chapel Hill, N. Carolina  
 Chaplin David, Sociology Science Univ. Wisconsin, Madison, Wis.  
 Christensen Harold T., Dept. of Sociology, Purdue Univ., Lafayette, Indiana  
 Christensen Alice S., Dept. of Sociology, Purdue Univ., Lafayette, Indiana  
 Clark Terry Nichols, 2851 King Drive 1301, Chicago, Illinois 60616  
 Clark Priscilla P., 2851 King Drive 1301, Chicago, Illinois 60616  
 Clausen John A., 1963 Yosemite Road, Berkeley, California 94707  
 Clausen Suzanne, 1963 Yosemite Road, Berkeley, California 94707  
 Cline Hugh, Russell Sage Foundation, 230 Park Ave., New York 10017  
 Cline Patricia, Russell Sage Foundation, 230 Park Avenue, New York 10017  
 Cogswell Betty E., Carolina Pop Center Univ. Square, Chapel Hill, North Carolina 27514  
 Cohen Leonard, BASR. Columbia Univ., 605 W 115 St. New York, N. Y. 10025  
 Connor Philip E., University of New York, Brockport N. Y.  
 Converse Philip, 1312 Cambridge RD., Ann Arbor, Michigan  
 Cooper Lawrence C., 64 Manville RD, Pleasantville, New York 10576  
 Coser Lewis A., 52 Evland Road, Stony Brook, N. Y. 11790  
 Coser L. Rose, 52 Evland RD, Stony Brook, N. Y. 11790  
 Grane Diana, The Johns Hopkins Univ., 615 North Wolfe St., Baltimore, Maryland 21205  
 Croft Howard, 311 9th St. S. E., Washington DC 20024  
 Crosser Paul, 1286 East 8th St., Brooklyn, New York 11230  
 Cunningham Ineke, 180 Delaware 7E, Chicago, Illinois 60611  
 Dadrian Vatakn, Florida Atlantic Univ., Boca Raton, Florida 33432  
 Daly Robert W., 101 Revere Road, Dewitt, New York  
 Davis Anne J., Nursing School Univ. Calif. Medical Center, 14834th Ave., San Francisco, California 94122  
 Demerath Jay, American Sociological Association, 1001 Connecticut Ave., Washington D. C.  
 Denitch Borgan Denis, B. A. S. R. 605 W 115 St., New York, N. Y. 10025  
 Deutscher Irwin, 2464 Guilford RD, Cleveland Heights, Ohio 44118  
 Deutscher Mrs. Irwin, 2464 Guilford RD, Cleveland Heights, Ohio 44118  
 Dexter Carolyn, Pennsylvania State Univ., The Capitol Campus, Middletown, Penn. 17057  
 Dickinson John Kellogg, 4 Humboldt St., Cambridge, Mass. 02140  
 Dickinson Lenore M., 4 Humboldt St., Cambridge, Mass. 02140  
 Dimitroff Helen, 445 E 68th St., New York, N. Y. 10021  
 Direccion Gordon J., Dept. of Sociology, Univ. Newark, Delaware 19711  
 Dobson Richard Bruce, 41 Meacham RD, Somerville, Mass. 02144  
 Dubin Robert, Univ. of California, Irvine, California 92664  
 Duke James Taylor, Brigham Young Univ., Provo, Utah 84601  
 Dunham Warren H., 446 Fisher Road, Grosse Pointe Farms, Michigan  
 Dynes Russell R., 1775 S College RD, Columbus, Ohio 43210

- Eaton Joseph, Univ. of Pittsburgh, Penn.  
 Eitzen Stanley, Univ. of Kansas, Lawrence, Kansas 66044  
 Ekman Paul, 1405 Fourth Ave., San Francisco, California  
 Elinson Jack, 630 W. 168 St. New York City  
 Elinson May, 630 W. 168 St., New York City  
 Eling Ray, Health Center, Univ. of Conn., 2 Holcomb St., Hartford, Conn.  
 06112  
 Endleman Robert, Adelphi Univ., Garden City, New York 11530  
 Etzioni Amitai, Columbia Univ., New York City  
 Evan William M., Dept. of Sociology, Univ. Pennsylvania, Philadelphia,  
 Penn.  
 Evans Idris W., Dept. of Sociology, Univ. Missoula, Montana 59801  
 Faber Bernard, Dept. of Sociology, Brown Univ., Providence RI 02906  
 Field Mark G., 40 Peacock Farm Road, Lexington, Massachusetts 02173  
 Finsterbusch Kurt, American Sociological Association, 1001 Connecti-  
 cut Ave. N. W., Washington D. C. 20036  
 Fisher Anita, Columbia Univ. 722 W. 168 St., New York City  
 Fishman S. Joshua A., Yeshiva Univ., Ferkauf Grad School, 55 Fifth  
 Ave., New York N. Y. 10003  
 Form William, Michigan State Univ., E. Lansing, Michigan  
 Forni Floreal Homero, 5107 Blackstone Ap. 506, Chicago, Illinois 60615  
 Freeman Howard, 15 Park Ave., Newton, Massachusetts 02158  
 Freidson Eliot, Room 308, 19 Univ. Place, New York 10003  
 Friedrichs Robert W., Drew Univ., Madison, New Jersey 07940  
 Fuller Lon L., 16 Traill St., Cambridge, Mass. 02138  
 Gagnon John H., Sociology Dept., State Univ. of N. Y., Stony Brook  
 L. I., New York 11790  
 Gale A. Leslie C/O Gale G. Leslie, State Univ. College, Dept. of So-  
 ciology, Brockport, New York 14420  
 Gale Leslie, State Univ. College, Brockport, N. Y. 14420  
 Gaston Jerry Collins, 908 S. Johnson, Carbondale, Ill. 62901  
 Gaston Mary, 908 S. Johnson, Carbondale, Ill. 62901  
 Glen H. Elder JR., 303 Hoot Owl Lane, Chapel Hill, North Carolina  
 Goertzel Teo, University of Oregon, Eugene, Oregon  
 Gollin Albert E., 2954 Northampton St. N. W., Washington DC 20015  
 Goslin Gillian Lindt, 2954 Northampton St. N. W. Washington DC  
 20015  
 Goslin David A., 33 West 10th St., New York, N. Y.  
 Gross Edward, Dept. of Sociology, Univ. of Washington, Seattle  
 Gross Florence, Dept. of Sociology, Univ. of Washington, Seattle  
 Grundy Kenneth W., Case Western Reserve Univ., Cleveland, Ohio  
 Gusfield Irma, 7228 Monte Vista Ave., La Jolla, California 92037  
 Gusfield Joseph, 7228 Monte Vista Ave., La Jolla, California 92037  
 Haas J. Eugene, 55 Ponderosa DR, Loveland, Colorado 80537  
 Haas Mrs. Eugene, 55 Ponderosa DR, Loveland, Colorado 80537  
 Hacker Sally, 4215 Roseneath, Houston  
 Harper Dean, 296 Troy RD, Rochester, New York  
 Hartley David E., 15 Van Tassel Lane, Orinda, California



- Hartley Foster Shirley, 15 Van Tassel Lane, Orinda, California  
Houser Philip M., Univ. of Chicago, 1126 E. 59 St., Chicago, Ill. 60637  
Houser Zelda, Univ. of Chicago, 1126 E. 59 St., Chicago, Ill. 60637  
Heberle Francisca Toennies, 1637 Cloverdale Ave., Baton Rouge, Louis. 70708  
Heberle Rudolf, 1637 Cloverdale Ave., Baton Rouge, Louisiana 70708  
Helling Barbara, 219 No. Lincoln St., Northfield, Minn. 55057  
Helling George, 219 No. Lincoln St., Northfield, Minn. 55057  
Helmer John, 600 Quincy House Harvard Univ., Cambridge, Mass.  
Hill Reuben, 4650 Fremont South, Minneapolis, Minnesota 55409  
Hill Mrs. Reuben, 4650 Fremont South, Minneapolis, Minnesota 55409  
Himes Estelle J., Dept. of Sociology, Univ. of North Carolina, Greensboro, North Carolina 27412  
Himes Joseph S., Dept. of Sociology, Univ. of North Carolina, Greensboro, North Carolina 27412  
Holmstrom Lynda Lytle, 26 A Charlesbank Way, Waltham, Mass. 02154  
Hurvitz Nathan, 3756 Santa Rosalia DR, Los Angeles, California  
Hurvitz Mrs. Nathan, 3756 Santa Rosalia DR, Los Angeles, Calif.  
Hutchison Ira W., Florida State Univ.  
Ikle Fred Charles, 1467 Amalfi Drive, Pacific Palisades, California 90272  
Inkeles Alex, 520 William James Hall, Harvard Univ., Cambridge, Massachusetts  
Inkeles Bernadette, 520 William James Hall, Harvard Univ., Cambridge, Massachusetts  
Janowitz Gayle, 1357 E 55th Place, Chicago, Illinois 60637  
Janowitz Morris, 1357 E 55th Place, Chicago, Illinois 60637  
Jenkins Thomas H., 1400-F Mont Michel/688 Riddle RD, Cincinnati, Ohio 45220  
Jones Richard M., 7510 North 21 St., Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19138  
Jones Butler A., Cleveland State Univ., Cleveland, Ohio 44115  
Jordan John Edward, 444 Erickson Mich. State Univ., East Lansing, Michigan  
Kadushin Charles, B. A. S. R. Columbia Univ., 605 W 115 St., New York, N. Y.  
Kaegi Walter E., Dept. of History, 1126 E. 59th St., Chicago, Ill. 60637  
Kakulski J. Daniel, 344 East 9th St., New York, N. Y. 10003  
Kandel Denise, Biometrics Research, New York State Dept. of Mental Hygiene, New York  
Kaplan Barbara, 3415 Lacewood RD, Tampa, Florida 33618  
Kaplan Max, 3415 Lacewood RD, Tampa, Florida 33618  
Kaplan Morton A., 1126 East 59 St., Chicago, Ill. 60637  
Kassof Allen Howard, Dept. of Sociology, Princeton Univ., Princeton, New Jersey 08540  
Katz Zev, 4 Jakob Road, Belmont, Mass. 02178  
Kelley Jacqueline M., Socio-Religious Research Inst., Univ. of San Francisco, San Francisco, California 94117  
Kelman Howard R., Prev. Medicine Dept., New York Medical College, 106 St. Fifth Ave., New York 10029

- Kenyon Gerald, Univ. of Wisconsin, School of Education, Madison, Wisconsin 53706
- Kerckhoff Alan, Duke Univ., North Carolina
- Kilson William, Univ. of Massachusetts, Amherst, Mass 01003
- Kleiner Robert, Dept. of Sociology, Temple Univ., Philadelphia, Penn. 19122
- Kline F. Gerald, 1937 James Ave. S., Minneapolis, Minn.
- Kohn Melvin L., National Inst. of Mental Health, Bethesda, Maryland 20014
- Kolaja Jiri, Dept. of Sociology, West Virginia Univ., Morgantown, W. V. 26506
- Korson Abigail, Soc. Dept., Univ. of Massachusetts, Amherst, Mass. 01002
- Korson Henry, Soc Dept., Univ. of Massachusetts, Amherst, Mass. 01002
- Koyano Shogo, Dept. of Sociology, Central Mich. Univ., MT. Pleasant, Mich. 48858
- Krause Elliott, Northeastern Univ., Boston, Mass.
- Kurzweil Edith, 1050 Park Ave., New York, N. Y. 10028
- Lande Carl Herman, Dept. of Political Science, Univ. of Kansas, Lawrence, Kansas 66044
- Lande Nobleza A., Dept. of Political Science, Univ. of Kansas, Lawrence, Kansas 66044
- Landers Daniel, 24 Tudor Rd, Brockport, New York
- Lang Gladys Engel, Dept. of Sociology, Columbia Univ., New York, N. Y. 10027
- Lang Kurt, Dept. of Sociology, State Univ. of New York at Stony Brook, Stony Brook, L. 2. N. Y. 11790
- Larsen Greta, Dept. of Sociology, Univ. of Washington, Seattle, Washington 98105
- Larsen Otto, Dept. of Sociology, Univ. of Washington, Seattle, Washington 98105
- Lasswell Marcia E., 875 Hillcrest Drive, Pomona, California
- Lasswell Thomas, 875 Hillcrest Drive, Pomona, California
- Laufer Robert, Dept. of Sociology, State Univ. of New York, Albany, New York
- Laumann Edward, Dept. of Sociology, Univ. of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Michigan 48104
- Laumann Susan, Dept. of Sociology, Univ. of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Michigan 48104
- Lee Alfred McClung, 100 Hemlock Rd, Short Hills, N. J. 07078
- Lee Elizabeth Briant, 100 Hemlock Rd, Short Hills, N. J. 07078
- Lesser Gerald, Lab. of Human Development, Harvard Univ.
- Lewis Ralph, P. O. Box 4264, Santa Barbara, California 93103
- Light Donald Jr., Dept. of Sociology, Princeton Univ., Princeton, New Jersey 08540
- Linz Juan, Dept. of Sociology, Yale Univ., New Haven, Conn. 06520
- Linz T. Rocio, Dept. of Sociology, Yale Univ., New Haven, Conn. 06520
- Lipset Seymour, Harvard Univ., Cambridge, Mass. 02138
- Liu William, Univ. of Notre Dame, Notre Dame, Indiana 46556



- Loomis Charles, Dept. of Sociology, Michigan State Univ., East Lansing, Michigan
- Lopata Znaniecki Helena, 220 E Walton, Chicago, Ill. 60611
- Loy John, Univ. of Massachusetts, Curry Hicks Bldg., room 9, Amherst, Mass. 01002
- Luchterhand Elmer, Dept. of Sociology, Brooklyn College, Brooklyn, New York 11210
- Luchterhand Erika, Dept. of Sociology, Brooklyn College, Brooklyn, N. Y. 11210
- Luchterhand Patricia, Dept. of Sociology, Brooklyn College, Brooklyn, N. Y. 11210
- Lueschen Clare, Dept. of Sociology, Univ. of Illinois, Urbana, Illinois
- Lueschen Guenther, Dept. of Sociology, Univ. of Illinois, Urbana, Illinois
- Lutterman Kenneth, 11601 Milbern Drive, Rockville, Maryland
- Man Singh Das, Dept. of Sociology, Northern Ill. Univ., Dekalb, Illinois 60115
- Manning David, 230 Marlborough St. Boston 02116, Massachusetts
- Marcson Simon, Rutgers Univ., Dept. of Sociology, New Brunswick, New Jersey
- Mauksch Hans, 309 Russell boul., Columbia, Missouri 65201
- Maxfield Maria Ursula, II Westcrest Trail, Fayson Lakes, NJ 07405
- Maykovich Minako, Dept. of Sociology, Sacramento State College, Sacramento, California
- Mc Daniel Gerald, Sacramento State College, 6000 Jay St., Sacramento, California 95819
- Mc Kinney John, Dept. of Sociology, Duke Univ., Durham, North Carolina 27706
- Meja Volkes, 28 Roseland St., Cambridge, Mass.
- Mendelsohn Everett, Holyoke Center 838, Harvard Univ., Cambridge, Massachusetts 02138
- Mertens Walter, 15 Clemmons St., RFD Framingham, Massachusetts 01701
- Merton Robert, Columbia Univ., 415 Fayerweather, New York
- Micklin Barbara, 7031 Freret St., New Orleans, La. 70118
- Micklin Michael, 7031 Freret St., New Orleans, La. 70118
- Miller S. M., 735 East Building, New York Univ., New York, N. Y. 10003
- Milis Theodore, Buffalo, New York
- Moberg David, Dept. of Soc. and Anthropology, Marquette Univ., Milwaukee, Wisconsin 53233
- Mogey John, 249 Summit Ave., Brooklyn, Mass.
- Mol Johannis Hans, Dept. of Soc. and Anth., Marquette Univ., Milwaukee, Wisconsin 53233
- Montague Joel, P. O. Box 157-T, Friday Harbor, Washington 98250
- Moore Harriett, 11 Lupine Lone, Chesterton, Indiana 46304
- Moore Emily, Population Council, 245 Park Ave., New York, New York 10017
- Morris M. D., Univ. of Washington, Seattle, Washington
- Nimbark Ashakant, Dowling College, Oakdale, N. Y. 11769

- Nonet Philippe, Univ. of California, Berkeley, California  
 Olesen Virginia, Crad. Soc. Univ. Medical Center, 1373 3rd Ave., San Francisco, Calif. 94122  
 Palmore Erdman, P. O. Box 3003, Duke Medical Center, Durham. North Carolina 27706  
 Park Peter, 40 Munroe St., Northampton, Mass. 01060  
 Parker Seymour, Dept of Sociology, Temple Univ., Philadelphia Penn, 19122  
 Parsons Howard, Univ. of Bridgeport, Bridgeport, Conn. 06602  
 Parsons Talcott, Harvard Univ., Dept. of Social Relations, Cambridge, Mass. 02138  
 Parvez A. Wakil, Dept. of Anthropology, Wayne State Univ., Detroit, Michigan  
 Pearlin Leonard, National Inst. of Mental Health, Bethesda, Maryland  
 Pierce Roy, Survey Research Center, Univ. of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Michigan  
 Ponce Elsa, 365 West End Ave., New York 10024  
 Porter Beverly, 365 West End Ave., New York 10024  
 Price Derek J. De Solla, 2036 Yale Station, New Haven, Connecticut 06520  
 Quarantelli Enrico L., Dept. of Sociology, Ohio State Univ., Columbus, Ohio 43210  
 Radway Lawrence, 22 Occom Ridge, Hanover, New Hampshire  
 Reader George Gordon, 525 E 68 St., New York, N. Y. 10021  
 Reid Otto, 4302 Stanford St., Chevy Chase, Maryland  
 Reid Mrs. Otto, 4302 Stanford St., Chevy Chase, Maryland  
 Reiss Albert, Dept. of Sociology, Univ. of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Michigan 48104  
 Richardson Arthur, Columbia Univ., Medical Center, 600 West 168 St., New York, N. Y. 10033  
 Roby Pamela, Dept. of Sociology, Washington Univ., Washington D. C. 20006  
 Rodman Hyman, 71 E Ferry Ave., Detroit, Michigan 48202  
 Rogan Elaine, 8121 Hendrie boul., Huntington Woods, Michigan 48070  
 Rogers Everett M., Dept. of Communication-MSU, East Lansing, Michigan 48823  
 Roghman Klaus, 68 Winbourne Rd., Rochester, N. Y. 14611  
 Rose Edward, Dept. of Sociology, Colorado Univ., Boulder, Colorado 80302  
 Rose Evelyn, Dept. of Sociology, Colorado Univ., Boulder, Colorado 80302  
 Ruebhausen Oscar, 450 East 52nd St., New York  
 Safilios Rothschild Constantina, 2900 E Jefferson, Detroit, Michigan 48207  
 Saks Harvey, Dept. of Sociology, Univ. of California, Irvine, California 92664  
 Schaefer Guenter, Dept. of Pol. Science, Univ. Binghamton, Binghamton, N. Y. 1390  
 Schafer Walter, Univ. of Oregon, Dept. of Sociology, Eugene, Oregon 97403  
 Schafer Mrs. Walter, Univ. of Oregon, Dept. of Sociology, Eugene, Oregon 97403



- Schallert Eugene, Socio-Religious Inst., San Francisco Univ., San Francisco, California 94117
- Scheff Thomas, Dept. of Sociology, Univ. of California, Santa Barbara, California
- Schmitter Philippe, Dept. of Pol. Science, Univ. of Chicago, Chicago, Illinois 60637
- Scholte Bob, Annenberg School 3620, Walnut St., Philadelphia Penns. 19104
- Schuessler Karl, 1820 E. Hunter, Bloomington, Indiana
- Schwartz Richard, 1818 Sheridan Rd., Evanston, Illinois 60201
- Sebald Hans, Arizona State Univ., Temple, Arizona 85281
- Segal David, Dept. of Sociology, Univ. of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Michigan 48104
- Segal Mrs, David, Dept. of Sociology, Univ. of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Michigan 48104
- Sewell Elizabeth, Dept. of Sociology, Univ. of Wisconsin, Madison, Wisconsin 53706
- Sewell William, Dept. of Sociology, Univ. of Wisconsin, Madison, Wisconsin 53706
- Shands Harley, Roosevelt Hospital, 428 West, 59th St., New York, N. Y. 10019
- Shapin Jan, 1301 Delaware Ave., S. W. apt. N-419, Washington D. C. 20024
- Sheldon Eleanor, 170 E., 83rd St., New York, N. Y. 10028
- Shibutani Tamotsu, Dept. of Sociology, Univ. of California, Santa Barbara, California 93106
- Shibutani Sandra, Dept. of Sociology, Univ. of California, Santa Barbara, California 93106
- Skolnick Jerome, Univ. of California, Santa Barbara, California 93106
- Smelser Neil, 8 Mosswood Rd., Berkeley, California 44720
- Smith Peter, Dept. of History, Wisconsin Univ., Madison, Wisconsin 53706
- Solzbacher William, 6030 Broad St., Washington D. C. 20016
- Somerville John, 1426 Merritt Drive, El Cajon, California 92020
- Spinrad William, Adelphi Univ., Garden City, Long Island, N. Y. 11530
- Sprehe Timothy, Dept. of Sociology, Fla State Univ., Tallahassee, Fla.
- Srole Leo, Columbia Univ. College Physicians Surgeons, New York City
- Stanley Manfred, 318 Stratford St., Syracuse, New York 13210
- Stanley Sara, 318 Stratford St., Syracuse, New York 13210
- Starr Jerold Martin, Dept. of Sociology, Univ. of Penn, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania
- Stehr Nico, Dept. of Sociology, Univ. of Oregon, Eugene, Oregon
- Stepan Alfred, Political Science Dept., Yale Univ., New Haven, Connecticut 06520
- Stone Philip, Dept. of Social Relations, Harvard Univ., Cambridge, Mass. 02138
- Straus Murray, Univ. of New Hampshire, Durham, New Hampshire 03824
- Streicher Helen, 7305 South Crandon Av., Chicago, Illinois 60649
- Streicher Lawrence, 7305 South Crandon Av., Chicago, Illinois 60649
- Strudler Harold, 345 East, 52nd St., New York City

- Suda Zdenek Ludvik, 15 Highmeadow Rd., Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania  
15215
- Supek Rudi, Columbia Univ., Bureau Soc. Research, New York, N. Y. 10025
- Sussman Marvin, 11027 Magnolia Drive, Cleveland, Ohio 44106
- Sweetser Dorrian, 16 Forest St., Norwell, Mass. 02061
- Sweetser Frank, 16 Forest St., Norwell, Mass. 02061
- Ta Chou Huang, 232 Cornell Quaters, Ithaca, N. Y. 14850
- Tabb William, 59 Mansfield Apts. Storrs
- Tallam Janet, Dept. of Anthropology, Berkeley, California
- Tien H. Y., Dept. of Sociology, Ohio State Univ., Columbus, Ohio
- Toffler Alvin, 40 East, 78 St., New York, N. Y. 10021
- Tresierra Julio Cesar, 626 N., Lafayette boul., ap. A, South Bend, Indiana  
46601
- Tuchman Gaye, I Amsterdam Av., Passaic, New Jersey
- Turbeville Gus, Coker College, Hartsville, S. C. 29550
- Turk Herman, Univ. of Southern, Los Angeles, California
- Turner Ralph, 1126 Chautauqua boul., Pacific Palisades, California 90272
- Turner Mrs. Ralph, 1126 Chautauqua boul., Pacific Palisades, California  
90272
- Twaddle Andrew, 704 Pine Ridge Rd., Media Pa 19063
- Ugalde Antonio, Dept. of Sociology, Univ. of New Mexico, Albuquerque  
N. M.
- Vaillancourt Jean Guy, Univ. of California, Berkeley, Calif.
- Varas Augusto, 6924 Millbrook boul., St., Louis, Missouri 63130
- Varma Baidya Nath, 62 Belvedere Drive, Youkers, N. Y. 10705
- Varma Savitri Devi, 62 Belvedere Drive, Youkers, N. Y. 10705
- Vaughan Trd, College of Arts and Science, Dept. of Sociology, Univ. of  
Missouri, Columbia
- Vernon Glenn, Dept. of Sociology, Univ. of Utah Salt Lake City, Utah
- Voshinin Igor, 6631 Wakefield Drive, apt. 617, Alexandria VA 22307
- Wallace Walter, Russell Sage Foundation, 230 Park Av., New York
- Wallerstein Immanuel, 515 Hamilton Hall, Columbia Univ., New York,  
N. Y. 10027
- Walter E. Victor, 204 Aspinwall Av., Brooklyn, Massachusetts
- Warren Donald, 1611 Hatcher Crescent, Ann Arbor, Michigan
- Watanuki Joji, 431 S. Summit St., Iowa City, Iowa 52240
- Weightman George Henry, 780 Greenwich St., apt. 6 K, New York 10014
- Weinberg S. Kirson, 255 Bernon Av., Glencoe, Illinois 60022
- Weinberg Rita, 255 Vernon Av., Glencoe, Illinois 60022
- Weinman Bernard, 753 Holland Rd., Holand Pa. 18966
- White Cynthia, James Hall, Harvard Univ., Cambridge, Mass.
- White Harrison, James Hall, Harvard Univ., Cambridge, Mass.
- White David, 230 Marlborough St., Boston 02116, Mass.
- White Mrs. David, 230 Marlborough St., Boston 02116, Mass.
- Wilenski Harold, 1771 Highland Place, apt. 201, Berkeley, California
- Williams Timothy Alden, 1829 Alabama Lane, Manhattan, Kansas 66502
- Wilmeth Richard J., Dept. of Sociology, Univ. of Iowa, Iowa City, Iowa  
52240



- Wilmeth Lydia, Dept. of Sociology, Univ. of Iowa, Iowa City, Iowa 52240  
 Wilson William, Univ. of Massachusetts, Amherst, Mass.  
 Wylie Anne Stiles, 997 Memorial Dr., Cambridge, Mass.  
 Wylie Lawrence, Harvard Univ., 5959 Lake Harbor Rd., Muskegon, Michigan 49441  
 Young T. R., Colorado State Univ., Ft. Collins, Colorado  
 Zuckerman Harriet, 420 Fayerweather Hall, Columbia Univ., New York, N. Y. 10027

## VENEZUELA

- Abouhamad Jeannette, Altamira, Ave. 12. Entre 6 y 7 Trans. N 15, Caracas  
 Albornoz Orlando, Apartado 50061, Caracas  
 Castaneda Eduardo, Edif. Baphel. Conde a Padresierra, Piso 9, Caracas  
 De Leo Alfred, Quinta Julieta Calle Suapure, Colinas de Bellomonte, Caracas  
 Izaguirre Marisa, C/O Cordiplan, Palacio de Miraflores, Caracas  
 Perez Jose Lorenzo, Central University, Caracas  
 Silva Chirinos Antonio, Universidad de Zulia, Maracaibo

## ASIA

## CEYLON

- Fernando P. M., University of Ceylon, Peradeniya, Colombo  
 Pieris Ralph, Ministry of Planning, Central Bank, Colombo

## HONG-KONG

- Chaney David Christopher, Dept. of Sociology, University of Hong-Kong  
 Pui-Leung Lee Rance, Sociology Dept. Chung Chi College, Chinese University of Hong-Kong, Shatin N. T.

## INDIA

- Bose Santi Priya, 139 Regent Estate, Calcutta 32  
 Chitnis Suma, Oysters Apartments, Bombay 5  
 Ghosh Samir Kumar, 114 SRI Arabinda Road, P. O. Konnagar near Calcutta, West Bengal  
 Hoch Erna M., Govt. Medical College, Spinagar, Kashmir  
 Khatri Abdullah Ahmed, B.M. Institute, Ahmedabad 9

Kidder L. Robert, 17/2 Rest House Road, Bangalore  
 King Anthony D., Dept. Social Sciences, Indian Inst. of Technology-Hauz-  
 khas, New Delhi 29  
 Mukherjee Ramkrishna, Indian Statistical Inst., 203 Barrackpore Trunk  
 Road, Calcutta 35  
 Murickan Joseph, Loyola College, Trivandrum 17, Kerala  
 Prasad Narmadeshwar, 6 A Rajendranagar, Patna 16, Bihar  
 Roy Prodipto, 40 Lodi Estate, New Delhi 3  
 Saksena R. N., Director, Institute of Social Sciences, Agra  
 Sharma Baldev R., Indian Inst. of Management, Ahmedabad 15  
 Unnithan T. K. Narayanan, Sociology Univ. of Rajasthan, Jaipur,  
 Rajasthan

## INDONESIA

Koent Jaraningrat, DJL. Teuku Tjhik Ditiro 43, Djakarta

## IRAN

Afchar-Naderi Nader, Inst. Etudes et Recherches Sociales, Teheran  
 Basstanpour Manoutchehr, Nat. Committee World Literacy Programme,  
 Teheran  
 Kotobi Morteza, Inst. Etudes et Recherches Sociales, Seraye Jaleh, Teheran  
 Menryar Amir-Hooshang, Dept. of Psychology, Pahlavi University, Shiraz  
 Sarmad-Bahar Zohren, 78 Kennedy Avenue, Teheran  
 Tofigh Firouz, Inst. for Social Research and Studies, Univ. Teheran  
 Touba Jacqueline, Seraye Teghizaden, Teghizaden, Teheran  
 Versluys Jan D. N., P. O. Box 1555, Teheran

## ISRAEL

Adler Chaim, Dept. of Sociology, Hebrew University, Jerusalem  
 Ben-David Joseph, Hebrew University, Dept. of Sociology, Jerusalem  
 Chen Michael, Dept. of Educational Sciences, Tel-Aviv Univ., Ramat Aviv  
 Cohen Eric, Dept. of Sociology, Hebrew University, Jerusalem  
 Danet Brenda, 7 Haralmach Str., Jerusalem  
 Darin-Drabkin Haim, 10 Rue Karni, Tel-Aviv  
 Deshen Shlomo, Tel-Aviv University, Tel-Aviv  
 Eisenstadt Samuel, Hebrew University, Jerusalem  
 Katz Elihu, Hebrew University, Jerusalem  
 Katz Mrs. Elihu, Hebrew University, Jerusalem  
 Kies Naomi Eleanor, Eliezer Kaplan School, The Hebrew University,  
 Jerusalem  
 Sabel Bernard, 27 Zamenhoff, Haifa  
 Shapira Rina, 9 Levi Itzhack, Tel-Aviv  
 Shirom Arie, 14 Tshernichovsky Str., Jerusalem



Shokeid Moshe, Fac. of Social Sciences, Ramat Aviv, Tel-Aviv  
 Shuval Judith, Israel Inst. of Applied Soc. Research, P. O. Box 7150, Jerusalem

Sobel M., 27 Zamenhoff, Haifa  
 Yuchtman E., 79 Univ. Str., Tel-Aviv

## JAPAN

Baba Akio, 4-4-7, Aobadai, Meguro-ku, Tokyo  
 Hiroshi Suzuki, Faculty of Literature, Kyushu National University, Fukuoka  
 Ishimura Zensuke, 6 35 16 Fukasawa Setagaya Tokyo, Tokyo  
 Iwao Munakata Peter Francis, 17 Nakanochō Ichigaya, Shinjuku-ku, Tokyo  
 Kamiko Takeji, Momoyama Hushimi, Kyoto  
 Kawashima Takeyoshi, 22/28 Fukazawa 7-Chome, Tokyo  
 Kitagama T., 927 Izumicho Kitatamagun, Tokyo  
 Masaji Chiba, 203 Denenchofu 2, Chome Ohta-ku, Tokyo  
 Mikami Hiroyuki, 17 17 Gehome Kamiyoga, Setagaya-ku, Tokyo  
 Morioka Kiyomi, Department of Sociology, Tokyo Kyoiku Univ. Bunkyo-Ku, Tokyo  
 Noriko Saito, 3-11-4 Yokokawa Sumidaku, Tokyo  
 Odaka Kunio, 2 2 5 Hongomagone, Bunkyo-ku Tokyo 113  
 Odaka Mrs. Kunio, 2 2 5 Hongomagone Bunkyo-ku, Tokyo 113  
 Shibata Shingo, 37 Toyama Cho Shinjuku-ku, Tokyo  
 Shibata Sadako, 37 Toyama Cho Shinjuku-ku, Tokyo  
 Shimazaki Minoru, 3-11-14, Nakaochiai, Shinjuku-ku, Tokyo  
 Shimazaki Miyoko, 3-11-14, Nakaochiai, Shinjuku-ku, Tokyo  
 Toshio Kamba, 1-11, Midorigaoka Chofu Shi, Tokyo  
 Yamamoto Mikio, Juntend University, Tokyo

## JORDAN

Es Said Nimra Tannous, Supreme Ministerial Committee for Relief, P. O. Box 5029, Amman

## LEBANON

Dodd Peter, American Univ. of Beirut, Beirut  
 Iskander Michel, CO UNICEF, P. O. Box 5902, Beirut

## MALAYSIA

Mokhzani Bin Abdul Rahim, Faculty of Economics and Administration  
 University of Malaya, Kuala Lumpur

## MONGOLIA

Jugder Tchimio, Inst. of History, Academy of Sciences, Ulan Bator  
Rozong Jomdan, Inst. of History, Academy of Sciences, Ulan Bator

## PAKISTAN

Badrud-Duja M., East Pakistan Research and Graduation Centre

## PHILIPPINES

Rixhon Gerard, Notre Dame of Jolo College, Jolo Sulu No. 103

## SINGAPORE

Riaz Hassan, Dept. of Sociology, University of Singapore, Singapore

## TURKEY

Ari Oguz, Middle East Technical Univ., Ankara  
Asgari Minu, Hacettepe Univ., Ankara  
Kandiyti Deniz, Middle East Technical Univ., Ankara  
Karal Ibrahim, Middle East Technical Univ., Ankara  
Kili Suna, Robert College Bebek, Istanbul  
Kiray Mübeccel, Middle East Technical Univ., Ankara  
Planck Ulrich, Paris Cadessi 54/9, Kavaklidere, Ankara  
Timur Serim, Inst. of Population Studies, Hacettepe Univ., Ankara  
Timur Taner, Faculty of Political Science, Ankara Univ., Ankara  
Treadway Roy Clay, Nufus Etutleri Enstit., Hacettepe Univ., Ankara  
Ülken Hilmi Ziya, Sisli Reg. Pazaloglu Sok. 22/3, Kapsa Apt., Istanbul

## AUSTRALIA

Chu Hao-Jan, Department of Oriental Studies, University of Melbourne,  
Parkville, Victoria 3052

Hunt Frederick John, Faculty of Education, Monash University, Clayton,  
Victoria

Jones Frank Lancaster, Department of Sociology, Australian Univer-  
sity, Canberra 2600



Nelson John Spencer, Sociol. University of New England Armidale, New South Wales

Richmond Catherine Katy, Dept. of Sociology, La Trobe Univ., Melbourne  
Zubrzycki Jerzy, Department of Sociology, Australian National University, Canberra

#### NEW ZEALAND

Pitt David Charles, University of Waikato, Hamilton

#### EUROPE

##### AUSTRIA

- Blecha Karl, Fleischmarkt 3 5, 1010 Wien  
Cede Franz, Rennweg 1, 6020 Innsbruck  
Cserjan Karoly, Franz-Josefskai 27 C/O. Österr. Inst. für Raumplanung,  
1011 Wien  
Farnleitner Johann, Stubeuring 12, 1010 Wien  
Fischer Marina, Kaserngasse 20, 1238 Wien  
Gehmacher Ernst, Fleischmarkt 3 5, 1010 Wien  
Goessler Irmtraut, A 1160 Wien  
Grafinger Josef, Nermanngasse 2 A, Wien  
Heinrich Hans-Georg, Fenstelgasse 5, Wien  
Hoffmann Dimiter, 1070 Lindeng 13-15/24, Wien  
Jungk Robert, Steingasse 31, Salzburg  
Mayer Klaus, I. Inst. für Soziologie, A 4045, Linz  
Morel Julius, Sillgasse 6, Innsbruck  
Mundel Wilfried, Kammer für Arbeiter und Angestellte, Prinz Eugen Str.  
20 22 A, 1041 Wien  
Nowotny Helga, Stumpergasse 56, 1060 Wien  
Ornauer Helmut, European Coord. Center, Franz Josefs Kai 3, 1010 Wien  
Rosenmayr Leopold, A 1080 Alserstrasse 33, Wien  
Schmutzer Manfred, Stumperg 56, Wien  
Schulz W., Arnethg. 2-4/3/19 A, 1160 Wien  
Silberbauer Gerhard, 1220 Siebenburgerstrasse 16-26/60/8, Wien  
Stagl Justin, Sonnleithenweg 18 A, 5020 Salzburg  
Staininger Otto, Ketzerg. 101-103, 1234 Wien  
Steindl Johanna, Klausenburgerstr. 30 A, 1100 Wien  
Szinovacz Maximiliane, 14 Hutteldorfstr. 26/6, Wien  
Wossner Jacobus, Inst. Soc. and Social Philosophy, Linz  
Zapotoczky Klaus, Durerstr. 19 A, 4020 Linz

## BELGIUM

- Aiken Michael, Fazentendreef 12, Keerbergen 2850  
 Baeyens Herman, Tuinbouwlaan 23, Dilbeek  
 Bango Jenő F., 108 Blyde Inkomstraat, Leuven  
 Bare Jacques, Centre Recherches facteurs humains, 83 Chaussée de Char-  
 leroi, Bruxelles  
 Beauduin Marie Anne, 57 rue de la Madelaine, Bruxelles  
 Biron Andre, la Niestree, 4462 Wihogne  
 Bonis Jean, Inst. de Sociologie, 71 boul. d'Avroy, Liège  
 Bracke Defever Mia, Tervuurse Vest 54, 3000 Leuven  
 Brisbois Jules, Inst. de Sociologie, 71 boul. d'Avroy, Liège  
 Bundervoet Jan, Konijnen Straat 18, 3370 Verrijk  
 Creyf Roger, Langestr. 58, 8000 Brugge  
 Delcourt Jaquaes, Spaanse Kroonlaan 20, 3040 Korbeek LO  
 Deliège Denise, Ecole de Santé Publique, Univ., Av. Chapelle aux Champs  
 4, 200 Bruxelles  
 Delobelle André, Av. du Lothier 11, 1150 Bruxelles  
 Delooz Pierre, rue Washington 186, 1050 Bruxelles  
 Deltombe Roger, Inst. de Sociologie, 71 boul. d'Avroy, Liège  
 Descy Jacques, 4 Av. Chapelle aux Champs, Bruxelles 15  
 Dobbelaere Karel, Paul Lebrunstraat 25, 3000 Leuven  
 Dooghe Gilbert, J. Vandeveldelaan 6, 3200 Kessel — LO  
 Dorsinfang Annie, 25 rue des Taxandres, Bruxelles 4  
 Draperie Richard, 2 Pl. Vayder Elst, Bruxelles  
 Dumon Wilfried, Rotspoelstraat 101, 3030 Heverlee  
 D'Hertegelt Hugo, L. Ruelensstr. 1A, Kessel  
 D'Hertegelt Bruynooghe Rose Mie, Gemeentestraat 60, 3200 Kessel LO  
 D'Olieslager Godelieve, Vandenbemptlaan 53, 3030 Heverlee  
 Evrard Pol, Inst. de Sociologie, boul. d'Avroy 71, 4000 Liège  
 Feldheim Pierre, Inst. de Sociologie, 44 Av. Jeanne, 1050 Bruxelles  
 Festjens Van Raemdonck Christel, Maria Theresiastraat 113, 3000  
 Leuven  
 Gassel Itamar, 3 Av. Maurice, 1050 Bruxelles  
 Golson Freddy, Willekensmolenstraat 57, 3500 Hasselt  
 Gortely George, 80 Av. Armand Jungsmans, 1056 Bruxelles  
 Govaerts France, rue Général Lotz 18, 1180 Bruxelles  
 Grosjean René, 15 B rue de Henne, Chenée  
 Gubbels Robert, Av. Baron d'Huart 184, 1950 Kraainem  
 Halleux Roger, Inst. de Sociologie, 71 boul. d'Avroy, Liège  
 Hansenne Michel, 32 rue du Village, 4108 Rotheux Rimièrè  
 Humblet Jean-Emile, Av. de la Lasne 26, 1320 Genval  
 Humblet Mrs. Jean Emile, Av. de la Lasne 26, 1320 Genval  
 Javeau Claude, Inst. de Sociologie, 44 Av. Jeanne, 1050 Bruxelles  
 Joset Paul-Ernest, Avenue des Biches 16, 1180 Bruxelles  
 Lafaille Robert, Kruishofstraat 142, 2020 Antwerpen  
 Lambinet Françoise, Inst. de Sociologie, boul. d'Avroy 71, Liège



Lambrechts Edmond, Centre de Recherches Sociales, Van Evenstraat 2B, Leuven

- Lauwers Jan, Naamsestraat 40, 3000 Leuven  
 Leemans Edward, Hof Ter Eikenlaan 11, 3009 Winksele  
 Lefevere Jan, Bolwerkstraat 5, 2000 Antwerpen  
 Lehouck Fernand, Van Overbckelaan 104, 1080 Bruxelles  
 Lepplae Claire, Naamsestraat 42, 3000 Leuven  
 Lesthaeghe Ronny, Zwaluwenstraat 27, 8400 Oostende  
 Maeckelberghe Werner, P/A/ Prinsstraat 16, 2000 Antwerpen  
 Martens Albert, Voorstadstraat 7A, 1000 Bruxelles  
 Mercier Jean-Jacques, rue de Mons 65, 7020 Hyon  
 Minon Paul, Place d'Italia 4, Liège  
 Presvelou Clio, Avenue Plasky 201, 1040 Bruxelles  
 Rabier Jacques-René, rue de la Loi 200, Bruxelles  
 Remouchamps Robert, Lever S. A., Unilever House, Bruxelles 4  
 Sansen, M. I. A. C., Consciencestraat 50, 3000 Leuven  
 Servais Emile, 116 Vlaminguestraat, 3000 Leuven  
 Troclet Léon, rue de Sclessin 4, Liège  
 Van Den Brande August, Zwijnaardse Stiv. 602, Gent  
 Van Houtte Jean, Burgemeester Wouterstraat 37, Berchem-Antwerpen  
 Van Mechelen Frans, Waverse Baan 180, 3030 Neverlee  
 Van Outrive Lode, Van Couwenhovelaan 28, 3009 Winksele  
 Vanhoorick Walter, Gloriantlaan 5, 3060 Bertem  
 Verdoodt Albert, Naamse Straat 40, Leuven  
 Versele Severin-Carlos, 44 Avenue Jeanne, 1050 Bruxelles  
 Versichelen Marthe, Molenstraat 7, St. Martenes Latem  
 Vranken Jan, Tessenstraat 21, 3000 Leuven  
 Warszawiak Jochweta, 39 rue des Schevins, Bruxelles  
 Wauty Dancot Marie Claire, 4 Avenue Chapelle aux Champs, Bruxelles 15

#### BULGARIA

- Alexandrov Kiril, 47-D Boul. Samokov, Sofia  
 Ananiev Kosta, 17 Nansen Str., Sofia  
 Andonov Assen, 51 G. Dimitrov Str., Kardjali  
 Andonov Spass, 38 Septemvriiska Str., Blagoevgrad  
 Anguelov Stefan, 11 Oborishte Str., Sofia  
 Anguelov Dontcho, 11 D. Debelianov Str., Dimitrovgrad  
 Angelov Tacho, 15 San Stefano Str., Sofia  
 Ankov Lubomir, 5 Y. Stamenov Str., Kazanlak  
 Apostolov Miladin, 2 Han Asparuh Str., Sofia  
 Apostolov Tenyu, 15 Vaptzarov Str., Sofia  
 Arabadjiev Michail, 24 Boul. Tolbouhin, Sofia  
 Arabadjiev Vasil, 23 Shipchenski prohod Str., Sofia  
 Aroyo Jack, Lenin, bl. 28, Sofia  
 Atanassov Alexander, 19, 277 Str., Sofia  
 Avishai Stella, 28 Iskar Str., Sofia

- Avramov Rouben, 58 Kl. Gotvald Str., Sofia  
 Babanova Margarita, 2 Plana Planina Str., Sofia  
 Baichinska Liuba, Lenin, bl. 6, Sofia  
 Baichinski Kostadin, Lenin, bl. 6, Sofia  
 Bankov Hristo, 90 Stamboliiski Str., Sofia  
 Bardarov Gueorgi, 104 Stamboliiski Str., Sofia  
 Bachvarov Michail, Svoboda, bl. 18-B, Sofia  
 Belchev Nikolai, Zdravetz, Gagarin bl., Rousse  
 Blagoeva Nedialka, 7 Iskar Str., Sofia  
 Bliznakov Petko, Rupi, bl. 47-3, Varna  
 Bogdanov Gueorgi, 11 Slaveikov Str., Targovishte  
 Boev Boyo, Motopista, bl. 233, Sofia  
 Borissov Vesselin, 212-4 N. Kamenov Str., Sofia  
 Boychev Dencho, 1 Slaveikov Str., Kasanlak  
 Bouzov Venetzi, 3 Vazrazhdane, Sofia  
 Bouzukov Rangel, 54 B. Ujen-E, Plovdiv  
 Bunkov Angel, 24 Venelin Str., Sofia  
 Chiderov Ilija, 27-A Stamboliiski Str., Sofia  
 Christov Angel, 4 Smoljan Str., Varna  
 Christov Christo, 11 Oborishte Str., Sofia  
 Christov Gueorgi, 21 Baba Ilijtza Str., Sofia  
 Christova Ivanka, 72 N. Guerov Str., Varna  
 Dandalova Iskra, 39 Parchevich Str., Sofia  
 Danov Vassil, 3 Slavianska Str., Rousse  
 Danchev Nikolai, 66 G. Guenov Str., Gabrovo  
 Davidov David, 9 Strandja Str., Sofia  
 Delev Kiril, 15-A K. Popov Str., Sofia  
 Delibeev Ilija, 22 Grebenetz Str., Sofia  
 Dechev Kourti, 69 Ablanova Str., Sliven  
 Dimitrov Boiko, 23 San Stefano Str., Sofia  
 Dimitrov Gueorgi, 51 Dimitrov Str., Kardgali  
 Dimitrov Ivan, 105 D. Petkov Str., Sofia  
 Dimitrov Ivan, 35-B V. Levski Street, Veliko Tirново  
 Dimitrov Krastyu, 132 Rakovski Str., Sofia  
 Dinev Ivan, 142 Slivnitza Str., Sofia  
 Dinev Tanyu, 17 H. Yankova Str., Yambol  
 Dobrev Assen, 38 Suhodolska Str., Sofia  
 Dobrev Krassen, 22 G. G. Desh Str., Sofia  
 Dobrianov Velichko, 93 Oborishte Str., Sofia  
 Donev Rousin, 59-A Gradpazardgiiski Str., Plovdiv  
 Donchev Stefan, 27 Batak Srt., Sofia  
 Doudov Doudo, 6 Toulcha Str., Rousse  
 Draganov Mincho, Mladost, bl. 91-A, Sofia  
 Dramaliev Lubomir, Lenin, bl. 22-A, Sofia  
 Enev Ivan, 174 Septemvri Str., Stara Zagora  
 Evtimov Krastyu, 5 Denkoglu Str., Sofia  
 Fesitcheva Neviana, 13 Karavelov Str., Varna  
 Fidanov Dimiter, 191-2 Rakovski Str., Sofia



- Ganev Gantcho, 23-25 Moskovska Str., Sofia  
Ganovski Sava, 3 Benkovski Str., Sofia  
Gargov Kolyu, Istok, bl. 51, Sofia  
Goranov Krastyu, 2 Plana Planina Str., Sofia  
Gospodinov Ivan, 10 Slavianska Str., Shumen  
Grekov Pantelei, 25 Bouzloudja Str., Sofia  
Grigorov Kiril, 4-A Orfei Str., Sofia  
Grigorov Nikolai, 13 Dimitrov Str., Silistra  
Grozev Kouncho, 2 Bistrizta Str., Sofia  
Guenov Philip, 99 Oborishte Str., Sofia  
Guenova Jelka, Garra Elin Pelin 2-A  
Guenovski Mihail, 32 Samuil Str., Sofia  
Guentchev Nikolai, 36 St. Bogoridi Str., Sofia  
Gueorgiev Anguel, 14 Lenin Str., Smoljan  
Gueorgiev Delcho, 21 Lenin Str., Smoljan  
Gueorgiev Dimiter, 191-2 Rakovski Str., Sofia  
Gueorgiev Evgeni, 11 Oborishte Str., Sofia  
Gueorgiev Gueorgi, 21 Baba Ilijtza Str., Sofia  
Gueorgiev Kolyu, Istok, bl. 51, Sofia  
Gueorgiev Yancho, 156-1 Stamboliiski Str., Sofia  
Guindev Panayot, 45 V. Kolarov Str., Sofia  
Guirguinov Guirguin, Lenin, bl. 49-D, Sofia  
Hadgimitov Boris, 81 Suhodolska Str., Sofia  
Hinov Simeon, 41 V. Kolarov Str., Sofia  
Ilieva Nikolina, 22-B Persenk Str., Sofia  
Ilieva Yordanka, 68 Botev Str., Kazanlak  
Jordanov Ivan, 8 Botevgradski prohod Str., Sofia  
Jordanov Mincho, 5 Komsomolska Str., Shumen  
Iotov Kolio, 11 Oborishte Str., Sofia  
Iribadgakov Nikolai, 79 Kabakchiev Str., Sofia  
Iuroukova Mariika, 50 G. Guenov Str., Sofia  
Ivanov Ivan, 7 Stamboliiski Str., Mikhailovgrad  
Ivanov Ivan, 55 Iako Dorosiev Str., Plovdiv  
Ivanov Valo, 14 Chomakov Str., Plovdiv  
Jablenski Assen, 56 V. Zaimov Boul., Sofia  
Jelev Stefan, 50 V. Zaimov Boul., Sofia  
Jeliazova Ivanka, 28-B Botevgradsko shose, Sofia  
Kalderon Beti, 125-2 Lenin Boul., Sofia  
Kalchev Kalcho, 27 Boul. Rouski, Sofia  
Kambourova Roumiana, 15 I. Bogorov Str., Varna  
Kaneva Liliana, 27 N. Hrelkov Str., Sofia  
Karadgov Kiril, 130 bl. Geo Milev Str., Sofia  
Karakashev Veselin, 11 Poptomov Str., Sofia  
Kartalov Assen, 27 Kamenitza Str., Plovdiv  
Katchaunov Stefan, 13-A Ivan Assen II Str., Sofia  
Kinkina Maria, 40 Chehov Str., Sofia  
Kirilov Ivan, Lenin, bl. 48, Sofia  
Kirov Todor, 12 St. Karadga Str., Sofia

- Kichev Encho, 5 Lenin Str., Razgrad  
 Koen Emil, 34 Ivan Asen II Str., Sofia  
 Koenov Nissim, 1 Chr. Stantchev Str., Sofia  
 Kojarov Assen, 34 Denkoglou Str., Sofia  
 Kojouharov Kanyu, 9 I. Vazov Str., Sofia  
 Kostadinov Todor, 19-15 Boulaine Str., Haskovo  
 Kostov Konstantin, Bakston, bl. 19-3, Sofia  
 Kotzev Ivan, 56-A Souhodolska Str., Sofia  
 Kotzeva Makedonia, 18 Makedonia Str., Varna  
 Koulev Spas, 38 Septemvriiska Str., Blagoevgrad  
 Kountchev Vlatchko, 4 Narodno Vastanie Str., Sofia  
 Krastev Boiko, 3 Kaloyan Str., Sofia  
 Langazov Dossyu, 34 P. Napetov Str., Sofia  
 Lazarova Liza, 70 Ivan Assen II Str., Sofia  
 Lilkov Todor, 89 Stamboliiski Str., Sofia  
 Liptchev Yordan, 41-B J. Karamfilov Str., Varna  
 Malhassian Eduard, 18 Serdica Str., Sofia  
 Makrelova Milka, 117-A Dimitrov Str., Stara Zagora  
 Manev Ivan, 2 I. Alexiev Str., Stara Zagora  
 Marinov Dacho, 10 Samokov Str., Sofia  
 Marinska Rouja, 20 Giovanni Gorini Str., Sofia  
 Markov Marko, 80 Tzerkovski Str., Sofia  
 Mastikov Peter, 13—3 Pransa Poliana Str., Sofia  
 Mateev Boris, 125 T. Petkov Str., 60—138, Vidin  
 Mikhailov Stoyan, Lenin, bl. 58-A, Sofia  
 Minkov Minko, 6 Verila Str., Sofia  
 Mitev Peter, Borovo, bl. 9-V, Sofia  
 Mitichev Anton, 53 S. Dimitrov Str., Sofia  
 Mitkov Gueorgi, 2 Kozlodui Str., V. Tirnovo  
 Mizov Nikolai, 85 K. Velichkov Str., Sofia  
 Mladenov Assen, 84 Kozludui Str., Sofia  
 Mladgova Elena, 20 Giovanni Gorini Str., Sofia  
 Momov Vassil, 58 Oborishte Str., Sofia  
 Mustakov Delko, 38 Malchika Str., Plovdiv  
 Naidenov Vladimir, 167 Stamboliiski Str., Sofia  
 Naidenova Penka, 45 Graf Ignatiev Str., Sofia  
 Manev Nanio, 79 N. Nikolov Str., Stara Zagora  
 Naumov Iliya, 50 Ispanska Revoliuziya Str., Sofia  
 Naoumov Nikolai, 31 Trepetlika Str., Sofia  
 Natev Atanas, Lenin, bl. 9-B, Sofia  
 Nentcheva Radka, 20 Stamboliiski Str., Sofia  
 Nikolov Bojil, 78 Chehov Str., Sofia  
 Nikolov Elit, 18 Geo Milev Str., Sofia  
 Nikolov Ivan, Lenin, bl. 72, Sofia  
 Nikolov Liuben, 158 K. Popov Str., Sofia  
 Obretenov Alexander, 26 Blagoev Str., Sofia  
 Ochavkov Jivko, 2 San Stefano Str., Sofia  
 Ochavkova Vera, 2 San Stefano Str., Sofia



Passi Isak, 20 P. Evtimii Str., Sofia  
Pachev Rad, 198 Moskva Str., Plovdiv  
Pachev Tacho, Nadejda, bl. 11-B, Sofia  
Pavlov Deyan, 103 Borodinski boy, Sofia  
Pavlov Todor, Bulgarian Academy of Sciences, Sofia  
Pavlova Pavlina, 151 Rakovski Str., Sofia  
Pesheva Raina, 32 V. Zaimov Str., Sofia  
Petkov Todor, 89 Stamboliiski Str., Sofia  
Petrov Hristo, 23 31 January Str., Sofia  
Petrov Rosen, Milin kamak 71, bl. A, vh. 2  
Petrov Stoyan, Istok, bl. 96-B, Sofia  
Pironkova Stefka, 29 Vitosha Str., Sofia  
Pobornikov Dragomir, 6 E. Markov Str., Plovdiv  
Poliakova Raina, 16-A Sofiiska Komuna, Sofia  
Polikarov Azaria, 46 Skobelev Str., Sofia  
Popov Ivan, Istok, bl. 9-A, Sofia  
Popov Nikola, 11 Krasna poliana Str., Sofia  
Popov Peter, 39 Skobelev Str., Sofia  
Popova Trifonka, 68 Trakiya Str., Plovdiv  
Radev Yaroslav, 42-A Nezabravka Str., Sofia  
Radeva Minka, 42-A Nezabravka Str., Sofia  
Radoslavov Liubomir, 22 Tolbuhin Str., Sofia  
Rachkov Rachko, 90 Tolbuhin Str., Sofia  
Ribarski Kiril, Lenin, bl. 12-A, vh. 2, Sofia  
Roussev Ivan, 12 V. Kirkov Str., Sofia  
Rousseva Pepa, 18 D. Jeliakov Str., Yambol  
Rousinov Minko, 84 Tcherni vrah Str., Sofia  
Rousinov Spas, 10 Elha Str., Sofia  
Sabev Tzviatko, 6 K. Gueorgiev Str., Pazardjik  
Savov Sava, Bl. Osvoboghdenie, Kardgali  
Savov Stoyan, Emil Markov, bl. 22, Sofia  
Semerdjiev Boris, 8 Udovo Str., Sofia  
Semov Mincho, 13-17-A Ya. Veshin Str., Sofia  
Semov Mois, Krasna poliana, bl. 15-A, Sofia  
Simeonov Petko, 40 Stefanson Str., Sofia  
Simeonov Stefan, 32 Tzar Simeon Str., Sofia  
Simeonova Nikolina, Buxton 5-66, Sofia  
Slavkov Ivan, 7 Stamboliiski Str., Mikhailovgrad  
Slavkov Svetoslav, 5 Dukatska pl., Sofia  
Slavov Slavi, Tchervena zvezda, bl. 29-D, Sofia  
Sougarev Zdravko, 5 Victor Hugo Str., Sofia  
Spasov Dimitar, Momkova mahala, bl. 43, Sofia  
Spasov Dobrin, Hrizantema Str., 4, Sofia  
Spasovska Liliana, Istok, bl. 2-V, Sofia  
Staikov Zahari, Buxton, bl. 21-A, Sofia  
Stanev Stefan, 45 Graf Ignatiev Str., Sofia  
Stanchev Liuben, 68 Praga Str., Assenovgrad  
Statev Stoyan, 3-A Lenin Str., Haskovo

- Stefanov Anguel, 69 Moskva Str., Plovdiv  
Stefanov Gancho, 18 Kavala Str., Sofia  
Stefanov Georgi, 16 Denkoglou Str., Sofia  
Stefanov Ivan, 148-B Rakovski Str., Sofia  
Stefanov Ivan, 16 Yantra Str., Sofia  
Stefanov Kiril, 21 I. Drassov Str., Varna  
Stefanov Nikola, 15 Shipchenski prohod Str., Sofia  
Stoev Konstantin, 41 Tolbuhin Str., Sofia  
Stoev Stoyo, 2 Tintyava, Sofia  
Stoevski Vasil, 3 Komsomolska Str., Vratza  
Stoykov Atanas, 14 Galitchitza Str., Sofia  
Stoychev Anguel, Istok, bl. 40, Sofia  
Stoychev Todor, 30 V. Zaimov Str., Sofia  
Stoyanov Anguel, 5 San Stefano Str., Pleven  
Stoyanov Gueorgi, 24 G. G. Desh Str., Sofia  
Suikova Ivanka, 1 Roumyana Str., Sofia  
Tassev Vassil, Inst. of Agriculture, Rousse  
Tchakalov Boris, Buxton, bl. 13-B, Sofia  
Tchakarov Naiden, 11 Oborishte Str., Sofia  
Tchotchov Vassil, 38 Kofardgiev Str., Sofia  
Todorov Kostadin, Borovo, bl. 9-II, Sofia  
Todorov Nikolai, 15 San Stefano Str., Sofia  
Todorova Sasha, 40 Buzludga Str., Sofia  
Todorovitch Todor, 3 Aksakov Str., Sofia  
Tomov Peter, 24 G. Sofiiski Str., Sofia  
Tonev Liuben, 15 San Stefano Str., Sofia  
Toneva Zdravka, Mladost, bl. 27, Sofia  
Totev Anastas, 4 Tz. Tzerkovski Str., Sofia  
Traikova Krasimira, 20 G. G. Desh Str., Sofia  
Trendafilov Toncho, Buxton, bl. 14-G, Sofia  
Trendafilov Trandiu, 13 Gen. Kutuzov Str., Sofia  
Tropolova Yordanka, 68 Botev Str., Kazanlak  
Tzankov Tzanko, 6 Dimitrov Str., Rousse  
Tzankova Stella, 50 Gen. Gourko Str., Varna  
Tzekov Dimiter, Lenin, bl. 72, Sofia  
Tzolevski Boris, 18 Vela Blagoeva Str., Sofia  
Tzonev Venetz, 33-A Latinka Str., Sofia  
Valtchinov Ivan, 3 Hr. Matov Str., Vratza  
Vankov Vassil, 6 Dimitrov Str., Varna  
Vassilev Kiril, 5 Lenin Str., Sofia  
Vassilev Liuben, 3 Benkovski Str., Sofia  
Vassilev Radi, 6 Suhodolska Str., Sofia  
Vassilev Vesselin, 252-4 N. Kamenov Str., Sofia  
Vachev Todor, 70 Rakovski Str., Sofia  
Velikov Dimo, 18-A Koloni Str., Varna  
Velikov Gueorgi, 7 Dimitrov Str., Silistra  
Velikov Nikola, 19 D. Sourlev Str., Sofia  
Venedikov Anguel, 46 P. Evtimii Str., Sofia



Venedikov Yordan, 49 G. Guenov Str., Sofia  
 Vichev Vassil, 2 Krivolak Str., Sofia  
 Vladimirov Dimiter, 24 Gaitandgiev Str., V. Tirnovo  
 Vladov Hristo, 26 V. Aprilov Str., Sofia  
 Vlaev Petko, 2-A Dr. Baev Str., Sofia  
 Vlaikov Stoyan, 34 P. Napetov Str., Sofia  
 Voichev Stanislav, 2 Suhodolska Str., bl. 81, Sofia  
 Yahiel Nissim, 4-B P. Volov Str., Sofia  
 Yanakiev Miroslav, 2 Strumitza Str., Sofia  
 Yanakiev Roumen, 61 N. Rilski Str., Sofia  
 Yankov Alexander, 153 Rakovski Str., Sofia  
 Yordanov Kostadin, 3-8 Karl Marx Str., Dimitrograd  
 Zarcheva Liliana, E. Markov Str., bl. 232, Sofia  
 Zdravkov Petko, 21-A Shishman Str., Sofia

## CYPRUS

Attalides Michael, Dept. of Town Planning and Housing, Nicosia  
 Economou Marina, Ministry of Education, Nicosia  
 Moskos Charles, W.B.O. 4027, Nicosia  
 Papacosta Elengo, Ministry of Education, Nicosia

## CZECHOSLOVAKIA

Bakos Oliver, Mudronova 115, Bratislava  
 Bakosova Emilia, Mudronova 115, Bratislava  
 Baksa Jan, Lomonosovova E I-I, Nitra  
 Barta Milos, Parizska 17, Praha I  
 Bartek Karol, Steinerova 42, Bratislava  
 Bartova Eva, Pod Klikovkoo 4, Praha 5 Smichov  
 Bicik Lubomir, Pleteny Ujezd 93, Pleteny Ujezd  
 Brychna Vladimir, Praha  
 Bukovsky Miroslav, Na Zderaze 14, Praha 2  
 Bulicek Jaromir, Leninova 203, Praha 6  
 Cech Vladimir, Pilsen  
 Celko Jaroslav, Bezrucova 12, Bratislava  
 Charvat Frantisek, Anbrozova 13, Praha 3  
 Chlumsky Vladislav, Kolrimaska 5A, Praha  
 Cikler Jaroslav, U. Uranie 3, Praha 7  
 Darno Josef, Kauchova 6, Bratislava  
 Ezer Oldrich, Detska 2080, Praha 10  
 Fejt Miloslav, Olbrachtova 1060, Praha 4  
 Filipcova Blanka, Kladenska 81, Praha 6  
 Filipec Jindrich, Jilska I, Praha I  
 Formanek Miloslav, Praha

- Franco Dusan, Czech. Soc., Ul. 29 Augusta C. 42, Bratislava  
Greben Petr, Utvar Hlavniho Architekta Mesta Prahy, Praha  
Gronska Jana, Nam. Februaroveho Vitazstvall, Kosice  
Hajek Mojmir, Praha  
Helik Adam, Praha  
Herfurt Frantisek, Praha  
Hirner Alexander, Vcelarska Blok II, Bratislava  
Hirsl Miroslav, Lo-Strasnice Hostynska 2047, Praha  
Hodek, Podolska 28, Praha 4  
Horakova Eva, Praha  
Horska Vlasta, Czech. Soc. Soc., Rijazanska C. 56, Bratislava  
Hrabe Josef, Praha  
Hrbek Robert, Prazska 29/C, Bratislava  
Hromadka Milan, Nedzvezska II, Praha 10  
Hruskovic Michal, Riazanska 8, Bratislava  
Hrzal Ladislav, Praha  
Hulakova Marie, Zitna 32, Praha 2  
Hysek Jan, Choksha 29, Praha  
Jancovicova Jolana, Kraskova 8, Bratislava  
Janisova Helena, Dimitrovovo Nam. 12, Praha 7  
Janosik Jiri, Medzilaborecka 19, Bratislava  
Janousek Jaromir, Belomorska 139, Praha 6 — Brevnov  
Jiruska Karel, U. Remucenske Pojistovny 4, Praha I  
Jouska Jiri, Kunlova 194, Praha 3  
Kahuda Frantisek, K Mechurce 4, Praha 5  
Kajnak Frantisek, Ul. Februaroveho Vitazstva 49, Bratislava  
Kalab Milos, Belcicka 15, Praha 4 — Sporilov  
Kalivoda Vlastimil, Praha  
Kara Karel, Rybna 9, Praha I  
Karabin Stefan, Ovrucska 8, Bratislava  
Karasek Iozef, Legionarska 1/A, Bratislava  
Kohout Jaroslav, Praha  
Kolar Jaroslav, A. Staska 35, Praha 4  
Korinkova Ludmila, Na Ladvi 20, Praha 8  
Krejct Jaroslav, Marie Pujmanove 1552, Praha 4  
Krizova Eva, Jilska I, Praha 1  
Kucera Jaroslav, Biskupcova 95, Praha 3  
Kunstova Alena, Praha  
Kutta Frantisek, Zahradni mesto-Zapad, Narcisova 2850, Praha  
Kvasnicka Jan, Zahradnicka 2/A, Bratislava  
Lakomy Zdenek, Janovskeho 3, Praha 7  
Leskova Maria, Komenskeho 71, Kosice  
Librova Eva, Hradesinska 32, Praha 10  
Ludvikova Hana, Nusle-Horni 2, Praha  
Machacek Ladislav, Pusta 7, Bratislava  
Magala Josef, Maharova 112, Bratislava  
Mathe Svatoslav, Haitalova N. 8/102, Bratislava  
Mayol Premysl, Jilska I, Praha I



- Messesany Jan, Puskinova 5, Bratislava  
Mikulas Filip, Jesenna 10, Kosice  
Mozny Ivo, Tesnohlidkova 14, Brno  
Musil Jiri, Ujezd 15, Praha 5  
Narta Miroslava, Kladenska 557, Praha 6  
Nacaskova Milena, Jilska I, Praha 1  
Nemec Vaclav, Rotallova 1989, Praha 10 — Strasnice  
Nemessanyi Lvacany, Rue Puskin 5, Bratislava  
Obzina Jaromir, Odkreskym Lesem 24, Praha 4  
Ostrozlikova Miroslava, Kutiky, Pupavova 47, Bratislava  
Padevet Karel, Slezska 9, Praha 3  
Pasiak Jan, Heckova 14, Bratislava  
Paska Pavel, Go-Keho 10, Bratislava  
Patera Josef, Praha  
Pittner Miroslav, Leninova 507, Praha 6  
Plsko Stefan, Detva, Sturova 4, Okr. Zvolen  
Podzemsky Oldrich, Praha  
Poljak Ivan, Vodarenska 21-31, Bratislava  
Pospisilova Anna, Leningradska 26, Praha 10  
Prazakova Jana, Manesova 10, Praha 2  
Prochazka Zdenek, Praha  
Prokopec Jiri, Ministry of Social Affairs, Praha 2, Palackeho 4  
Provaznikova Jirina, Osadna 3, Bratislava  
Rehak Jan, Oldrichova 26, Praha 2  
Rehak Stefan, Ruzova Dolina 27, Bratislava  
Rejholec Vladimir, Zizkova 56, Bratislava  
Richta Radovan, Egyptska 65, Praha  
Rofmanek Miloslav, Zizkov Rehorova 7, Praha 3  
Rosko Robert, Zizkova 56, Bratislava  
Rychtarik Karel, Praha  
Safar Zdanek, Praha  
Sagara Dusan, Palisady 28, Bratislava  
Schimmerling Hanus, Inst. of Sociology Venkova, Manesova 75, Praha 2  
Skoda Ctirad, Psychiatric Research Inst., Praha 8 — Bohnice  
Skoda Jaroslav, Praha  
Skoda Kamil, Svetna 12, Praha 3  
Slavik Dusan, Kapounova 21, Brno 12  
Smyd Bohumir, Krizikova 66, Praha 8 — Karlín  
Soudkova Alena, Zamecka, Praha 4 — Modrany  
Soukup Miroslav, Gogolova 6, Praha 1  
Spanhelcs Josef, Cajdusova 51, Ostrava 1  
Stastny Zdenek, Prednadrizia-Leninova Trieda bl. 1/21, Nitra  
Stipek Jaroslav, Praha  
Stranai Karol, Lesna 353, Bratislava  
Stypka Vaclav, Vodickova 26, Praha 1  
Sulc Ota, Chorvatska 12, Praha 10  
Suran Karol, Stracia Cesta D/I, Nitra  
Svoboda Milos, Ohnivcova 483, Praha 4

Tomin Mikula, Kodauska 44, Praha 10  
 Tondl Ladislav, Jilska 1, Praha 1  
 Turek Milan, Herska 16, Liberec 14  
 Urbanek Edward, Nad. Uzlabinou 328, Praha 10  
 Urgon Josef, Zochova C. 3, Bratislava  
 Vacek Lubomir, Nad. Olsinami 2477, Praha 10  
 Vana Josef, Jablonecka 365, Praha 9 — Prosek  
 Vasko Tibor, Slezska 9, Praha 2  
 Vetavova Jarmila, Rude Armady 41, Praha 8  
 Wolekova Helena, Mierova 111, Bratislava  
 Wynnyczku Vladimir, Ministry of Social Affairs, Palackeho 4, Praha 2  
 Zamecnik Oldrich, Praha  
 Zemko Jan, Nam. Snp. 22, Bratislava  
 Zvara Jukay, Prazska 29/8, Bratislava

## DENMARK

Agersnap Torben, Jens Jeulsgade 15, 2100, Copenhagen  
 Bakka Jorgen Frode, Hvidehusvej 21, Allerod  
 Blegvad Britt Mari, Stranduej 95, Copenhagen  
 Blegvad Mogens, Stranduej 95, Copenhagen  
 Borup Nielsen Steen, Cand Polit, Hagens Alle 48, DK 2900 Hellerup  
 Bunnage David Anthony, Borgergade 28 V, 1300 Copenhagen  
 Carstensen Gitte, Inst. of Criminad Science, Rosenborggade 17, 1130 Copenhagen  
 Christensen Leif, Ved Stampedammen 57, 2970 Horsholm  
 Christensen Soren, Svanens Kvarter 150, 2620 Alberstslund  
 Friis Henning, Danish Nat. Inst. of Social Research, Borgergade 28, Copenhagen K  
 Friis Mrs. Henning, Danish Nat. Inst. of Social Research, Borgergade 28, Copenhagen K  
 Goldshmidt Gerd, Sobakkevej 18, 2840 Holte Copenhagen  
 Goldschmidt Verner, Sobakkevej 18, 2840 Holte Copenhagen  
 Israel Joachim, Dept. of Sociology, Rosenborggade 15, Copenhagen  
 Israel Ulla, Gyldenlundsvej 4, Copenhagen  
 Jensen Holger, Krogholmgardsvej 10, 2950 Vedbaek  
 Jorgensen Karen Margrethe, Society for Research on Future, Skovfaldet 2 S, DK — 8200 Aarhus N  
 Kuhl Paul Heinrich, Islandsvej 16, Lyngby  
 Kutschinsky Berl, Inst. of Criminal Science, Rosenborggade 17, 1130 Copenhagen K  
 Kutschinsky Susie, Inst. of Criminal Science, Rosenborggade 17, 1130 Copenhagen K  
 Nielsen Hans Jorgen, Solengen 7, 2990 Niva  
 Nielsen Bodil, Solengen 7, 2990 Niva  
 Pedersen Mogens Kuhn, Strandvejen 177, 2900 Hellerup, Copenhagen  
 Rasmussen Frode, Maribovej 14, 2500 Valby



Rishoj Tom, Lyngbalken 14, 3540 Lyngø  
 Salomonsen Per, Aldersrovej 3, 2950 Vedbaek  
 Sigsgaard Peter, Toemrergade 3, DK 2200 Copenhagen  
 Siune Karen, Mejlby, Hjortshos  
 Sorensen Arne, Skovfaldet 2 S, DK-8200 Aarhus N.  
 Svalastoga Kaare, Hegusvej 33, 2850 Naerum  
 Thomsen Kirsten, Holmose Vange 13, 2970 Horsholm  
 Ulf Moller Boel, Borgergade 28, Copenhagen  
 Webb Thomas W., Vaeldegaardsvej 23, 2820 Gentofte  
 Weis Bentzon Agnete, Jens Juelsgade, 15, 2100 Copenhagen

## FINLAND

Aalto Ritva, Runeberginkatu 30 B 22, Helsinki 10  
 Berndtson Erkki, Pohjoisranta 24 B 27, Helsinki 17  
 Blom Raimo, Kuusamakuja 2 C 21, Koivistonkyla  
 Brax Riitta, Ulvilantie 7 F 53, Helsinki 35  
 Elovainio Paivi, Vironkatu 5 A Y, Helsinki 17  
 Erasaari Leena, Osuuskunnantie 97, Helsinki 66  
 Erasaari Risto, Osuuskunnantie 97, Helsinki 66  
 Esko Kalimo, Tarkk Ampujank 18 A 12, Helsinki 15  
 Eskola Antti, Pellervonkatu 5 A, Tampere 8  
 Eskola Katarina, Liesipolku 5 A, Helsinki 63  
 Forsman Maria, Hakolahdentie 3 B 19, Helsinki 20  
 Gronholm Leo, Karstulantie 2 A 36, Helsinki 55  
 Gronholm Terhikki, Karstulantie 2 A 36, Helsinki 55  
 Gronow Jukka, Lumikintie 3 D, Helsinki 82  
 Gulin Susanna, Petersgatan 9 C 42, Helsingfors 15  
 Haavio Ari, Ylannekatu 16 A, Turku 3  
 Haavio Mrs. Ari, Ylannekatu 16 A, Turku 3  
 Haavio-Manila Elina, Iltaruskontie 4 G 11, Tapiola  
 Haranne Markku, Hiihtomaentie 32 A 1, Helsinki 80  
 Hautala Kristiina, Pihlajatie 7, Helsinki 27  
 Hautamaki Jarkko, Kornetintie 22, Helsinki 37  
 Heinila Kalevi, Puhurinpolku 6 F, Tapiola  
 Heinila Liisa, Puhurinpolku 6 F, Tapiola  
 Heiskanen Veronica Stolte, Inst. Sociology, Univ. Helsinki, Franzenin-  
 katu 13, Helsinki 50  
 Helkamaa Matti, Abrahaminkatu 13 B, Helsinki 18  
 Horkko Jorma, Luostarinkatu 6 A 6, Turku  
 Horkko Sirkka Liisa, Luorstarinkatu 6 A 6, Turku  
 Jaakkola Leena, Kauppiaankatu 6 C 33, Helsinki 16  
 Jaakkola Risto, Kauppiaankatu 6 C 33, Helsinki 16  
 Joenniemi Pertti, Kaupinkatu 20 B 48, Tampere  
 Joenniemi Sirpa, Kaupinkatu 20 B 48, Tampere  
 Jyrkila Faina, Gummeruksenkatu 3 A 19, Jyvaskyla  
 Kajannes Antti, Tempelikatu 13 A 7, Helsinki 10

- Kalaja Irma, Kadetintie 3 C 36, Helsinki 33  
Kalela Aira, Oikokatu 11 B 21, Helsinki 17  
Kalela Jaakko, Oikokatu 11 B 21, Helsinki 17  
Karvonen Elina, Pohj. Makasiinikatu 7 A 3, Helsinki 13  
Kirkkala Kari, Karstulantie 4 A 403, Helsinki 55  
Kiviahjo Pekka, Kilpoksenkatu 12 C 39, Jyväskylä  
Kiviharju Helja, Koroistentie 6 D 4, Helsinki 28  
Korhonen Erkki Antero, Mechelininkatu 22 A 35, Helsinki  
Korhonen Outi, Kanavamaki 4, Helsinki 84  
Koskelainen Leena, Satamasaarentie 2 G 49, Helsinki 98  
Koskelainen Osmo, Satamasaarentie 2 G 49, Helsinki 98  
Koskinen Helina, Pajamaentie 57 C 46, Helsinki 36  
Koskinen Tapio, Pajamaentie 57 C 46, Helsinki 36  
Kukkonen Marja Liisa, Iso Roobertinkatu 41 B 42, Helsinki 12  
Kulokari Hannu, Toolonkatu 11, Helsinki 10  
Kuurre Simo, Lusankatu 27 E, Helsinki 17  
Kuusela Jaakko, Saastopankinranta 10 C, Helsinki 53  
Kuusela Maria Leena, Saastopankinranta 10 C, Helsinki 53  
Laaksonen Hannu, Tuulitie 8, Helsinki 70  
Lagerbohm Mona, Koskelantie 9 E, Helsinki 61  
Lahelma Eero, Vironlatu 9 D 34, Helsinki 17  
Lammi Pentti, Isonvillasaarentie 1 A 7, Helsinki 96  
Lampikoski Kari, Punavuorenkatu 18 A 3, Helsinki 15  
Lehtimäki Liisa, Borgstrominkuja 4 D 36, Helsinki 84  
Lentonen Matti, Isoisten Kiertotie 10, Turku 29  
Lindroos Tuula, Urheilukatu 48, Helsinki 25  
Lotti Leila, Yliopistonkatu 12 A B 32, Turku  
Louhivaara Airi, Kivitorpantie 5, Helsinki 33  
Luukkonen Terttu, Hietaniemenkatu 14 AS 217, Helsinki 18  
Marin Marjatta, Heljas Linja 19 G 25, Helsinki 53  
Miemois Solveig, Overby Skola, Aurora  
Mikkonen Pirjo Maria, Pellervonkatu 9, Tampere 8  
Myllyniemi Rauni, Tunnelitie 12 A, Helsinki 32  
Okkola Irmeli, Toolonkatu 11, Helsinki 13  
Oranen Jyrki, Toinen Linja 25 A 26, Helsinki 53  
Orkamo Jarmo, Ulvilantie 27 E A 2, Helsinki 35  
Parjanen Matti, Pyyntikintori 8 A, Tampere  
Paukkula Erja, Maariankatu 2 C 74, Turku 28  
Paukkula Juha, Maariankatu 2 C 74, Turku 38  
Piepponen Paavo, Harjuviita 6 B, Topiola  
Rantalaiho Kari, Nasilinnank. 34 B 21, Tampere  
Rantalaiho Liisa, Nasilinnank. 34 B 21, Tampere  
Riihinen E. Olavi, Lepolantie 92, Helsinki 66  
Roinisto Anna Liisa, Makelaurinne 5 A 405, Helsinki  
Roos Helena, Franzenuikatu 13, Helsinki 50  
Salmelin Marta Helena, Skeppsredaregatan 4 D 36, Helsinki 14  
Salokoski Juuso, Sepankatu 17, Helsinki 15  
Salonen Mirja, Liisankatu 9 A 10, Helsinki 17



Sandborg Eila, Merikatu 5 G, Helsinki 14  
 Sankiaho Risto, Kyparapolku 4 H 42, Helsinki 94  
 Sarola Jukka Pekka, Ruotalammintie 3 G, Helsinki 55  
 Segerstrale Ulrika, Katajajarjuntie 4 B, Helsinki 20  
 Seppala Vesa, Kiillekuja 4 D 45, Helsinki 71  
 Sappanen Paavo, Louhentie 8 F 24, Tapiola  
 Sevon Cay, Rautalammintie 5 C 31, Helsinki 55  
 Snellman Simo, Rauhankatu 1 B 27, Turku  
 Sternberg Harriet, Museokatu 23 A 23, Helsinki 10  
 Storgards Johan, Rautalammintie 5 C 25, Helsinki 55  
 Tikkanen Juhani, Paikkalinnuntie 6, Hamevaara  
 Tikkanen Ulla, Paikkalinnuntie 6, Hamevaara  
 Timonen Leena, Rautalammintie 3 C, Helsinki 55  
 Tiuri Ulpu, Takojantie 1 F, Tapiola  
 Toivonen Timo, Vienolantie 7 1 7, Turku 24  
 Tuomarla Heimo, Laihurinkatu 35 A 11, Helsinki 15  
 Urimo Helena, Kuusmie 4 B 60, Helsinki  
 Uusitalo Jyrki, Koroistentie 9 A 15, Helsinki 28  
 Uusitalo Paavo, Kruunuhaankatu 2 E 59, Helsinki 17  
 Vainio Aune, Kunnallissairalantie 20, Turku 6  
 Valkonen Tapani, Minervankatu 4 A 12, Helsinki 10  
 Vapaoksa Pekka Juhani, Pakilantie 15 AS 8, Helsinki  
 Vesa Unto, Kuninkaankatu 36 A 10, Tampere  
 Viljakainen Kaija, Hameenkatu 23 B 24, Lahti  
 Walta Terhi, Kontiontie 7 A 6, Tapiola  
 Wartia Kaarina, Marjaniemi, Helsinki 93  
 Wegelius Tapani, Rautalammintie 3 C 811, Helsinki 55  
 Wiman Ronald, Louhikkotie 15 C 440, Helsinki 77

## FRANCE

Abdel-Malek Anouar, 107, Av. de Choisy, Paris  
 Agblemagnon Ferdinand N. Sougan, 5, rue de la Roseaie, 92-Meudon-la-Forêt  
 Almasy Elina, Inst. Soc. Science Council, UNESCO, 1, rue Miollis, Paris 15<sup>e</sup>  
 Ancelin Jacqueline, 63, Boul. Haussmann, Paris 8<sup>e</sup>  
 Ancian G., SEDES, 67, rue de Lille, Paris 7<sup>e</sup>  
 Antoine Jacques, C/O SEMA, 9, rue Georges-Pitard, 75-Paris 15<sup>e</sup>  
 Antoine Marie-Annette, C/O SEMA, 9 rue Georges-Pitard, 75-Paris 15<sup>e</sup>  
 Antunes Agustin, OTAM, 16, rue Jules-César, Paris 12<sup>e</sup>  
 Beaulleu, Ambassade de France, Sofia, Bulgarie  
 Bensimon Doris, 28, rue St.-Fargeau, 75-Paris 20<sup>e</sup>  
 Bertaux Daniel, 28, rue de Tanneries, Paris 13<sup>e</sup>  
 Besse Guy, Centre d'Etudes Marxistes, 64, Boul. Blanqui, 75-Paris 13<sup>e</sup>  
 Bessaiget Pierre-Octave, Directeur Centre Etudes Rel. Interethniques, 34, rue Verdi, Nice  
 Billiard Isabelle, 7 ter, rue d'Alesia, 75-Paris 14<sup>e</sup>

- Bisseret Noelle, 8, rue des Coquarts, 92-Bagneux  
 Boltanski Lug, 22, Impasse du Moulin-Vert, Paris 14<sup>e</sup>  
 Bonneau Robert, Ambassade de France, Sofia, Bulgarie  
 Boudon Raymond, 82, rue Cardinet, 75-Paris 17<sup>e</sup>  
 Bouet Michel, Faculté des Lettres et Sciences Humaines, Rennes  
 Bougnon Pierre, 6, Boul. de la Bastille, 75-Paris 12<sup>e</sup>  
 Bourdarias Françoise, 86, rue de la Couture, Châteauroux  
 Bourdieu Pierre, 24, Av. Aristide-Briand, 92-Antony  
 Burlen Catherine, 1, Square la Tour Manbourg, Paris 7<sup>e</sup>  
 Busch Charlotte, 8, Impasse des Deux Anges, 75-Paris 6<sup>e</sup>  
 Castel Robert, 9, Boul. de Reuilly, 75-Paris 12<sup>e</sup>  
 Castells Manuel, Lab. de Sociologie Industrielle, 54, Boul. Raspail, Paris 6<sup>e</sup>  
 Catrice Lorey Antoinette, I. S. S. T., 27, rue de Fleurus, Paris 6<sup>e</sup>  
 Chabrol Claude, 7, Av. Niel, Paris 17<sup>e</sup>  
 Chambre Henri, 15, rue Marcheron, 92-Vanves  
 Chobaux Jacqueline, Centre d'Etudes Sociologiques, 82, rue Cardinet,  
 75-Paris 17<sup>e</sup>  
 Chombart de Lauwe Paul-Henry, 129, rue des Rabats, 92-Antony  
 Clignet Remi, C/O St. Marie, Suisy Lefranc par Montmort, Marne  
 Coing Henri, 15, rue Marcheron, 92-Vanves  
 Coquery-Vidrovitch Catherine, A III, 8, rue CDT René-Mouchotte,  
 Paris 14<sup>e</sup>  
 Cornu Roger, 66, Cours Sextius, Aix-en-Provence  
 Crozier Michel, 20, rue Geoffroy-St.-Hilaire, 75-Paris 5<sup>e</sup>  
 Cuisenier Jean, Centre d'Ethnologie Française, Route de Madrid, 75-  
 Paris 16<sup>e</sup>  
 Dadoy Mireille, Le Montaiguët Zup, 9, rue des Frères-Wallon 13-Aix-  
 en-Provence  
 De Bonnault Françoise, 66, Cours Sextius, Aix-en-Provence  
 De Lapparent Henri, 16, Rue Janquoy, 75-Paris 14<sup>e</sup>  
 De Las Casas Roberto Decio, 5, rue Maillard, Paris  
 De Saint-Martin Monique, 80, Avenue de Suffran, Paris 15<sup>e</sup>  
 De Seve Michel, 26, rue Lacretelle, 75-Paris 15<sup>e</sup>  
 De Seve Micheline, 26, rue Lacretelle, 75-Paris 15<sup>e</sup>  
 De Vos van Steemwijk Alwine, 122, Av. du Général-Leclerc, 95-Pier-  
 relaye  
 Delamotte Jeanne, 5, rue Vital, Paris 16<sup>e</sup>  
 Delamotte Yves, 5, rue Vital, Paris 16<sup>e</sup>  
 Descloîtres Robert-Jean-Denis, CASHA, 46, Avenue Paul-Cézanne,  
 13-Aix-en-Provence  
 Desroche Henri, 7, Avenue Franco-Russe, Paris 7<sup>e</sup>  
 Dion Michel, 25, rue Clément-Ader, 94-Arcueil  
 Dogan Mattei, 38, Boul. St.-Jacques, 75-Paris 14<sup>e</sup>  
 Du Boisberranger Guy, 7, rue Gusto-Gervasoti, 38-Grenoble  
 Du Boisberranger M<sup>me</sup> Gui, 7, rue Gusto-Gervasoti, 38-Grenoble  
 Duchatelet Geneviève, 58, Avenue de Choisy, 75-Paris 13<sup>e</sup>  
 Dumazedier Joffre, 82, rue Cardinet, Paris 17<sup>e</sup>  
 Durand Claude, 14, Clos de Verrières, 91-Verrières-le-Buisson



- Durand Michel, 14, Clos de Verrières, 91-Verrières-le-Buisson  
 Durand-Drouhin Jean-Jouis, 5, rue Dorian, Paris  
 Fichelet Monique, 10/12, rue Richer, 75-Paris 9<sup>e</sup>  
 Fichelet Raymond, 10/12, rue Richer, 75-Paris 9<sup>e</sup>  
 Fichelet-Poitrey Françoise, 187, Boul. Bineau, 92-Neuilly  
 Fisera Joseph, 9, rue Mathurin-Régnier, Paris 15<sup>e</sup>  
 Fisera Vladimir, 9, rue Mathurin-Régnier, Paris 15<sup>e</sup>  
 Fraisse Robert, 8, rue François-Moreau, 93-Fontenay-aux-Roses  
 Freiberg Walter, 54, Boul. Raspail, 75-Paris 6<sup>e</sup>  
 Freiberg Mme Walter, 54, Boul. Raspail, 75-Paris 6<sup>e</sup>  
 Friedman Samy, Ciss, 1, rue Miollis, Paris 15<sup>e</sup>  
 Frisch Jacqueline, 60, rue Hoche, Malakoff  
 Genin Marie-Thérèse, 19, rue Monsieur, Paris 7<sup>e</sup>  
 Gingras François-Pierre, 58, rue Rodier, Paris 9<sup>e</sup>  
 Gingras Jeannine, 58, rue Rodier, Paris 9<sup>e</sup>  
 Gubbiotti Gerard, 274, Avenue de Verdun, Frejus  
 Guilbert Madeleine, 11 c, Allée d'Honneur, 92-Sceaux  
 Guinchat Claire, 18, rue Dantzig, 75-Paris 15<sup>e</sup>  
 Harari Denyse, 22, Place Vendôme, Paris  
 Herth Hans, Centre Psychiatrie Sociale, 8, Boul. des Invalides, 75-Paris 7<sup>e</sup>  
 Hurel Robert, 20, rue Chalgrin, Paris 16<sup>e</sup>  
 Imbert Maurice, 7, rue Claude-Matrat, 92-Issy-les-Moulineaux  
 Isambert Vivianne, 82, rue Cardinet, 75-Paris 17<sup>e</sup>  
 Jenny Jacques, 65, rue Henri-Barbusse, 91-Yerres  
 Jonas Serge, 95, Boul. St.-Michel, Paris 5<sup>e</sup>  
 Kalogeropoulos Dimitri, 2, Impasse de la Photographie, Paris 5<sup>e</sup>  
 Kukawka Pierre, 17, rue Henri-Duhamel, Grenoble  
 Labica Georges, Centre d'Etudes Marxistes, 64, Boul. Blanqui, 75-Paris 13<sup>e</sup>  
 Lagneau Gerard, 38, rue de Crimée, 75-Paris 19<sup>e</sup>  
 Lagneau Janina, 38, rue de Crimée, 75-Paris 19<sup>e</sup>  
 Lanfant Marie-Françoise, 226, rue Marcadet, 75-Paris 18<sup>e</sup>  
 Lantz Pierre, 20, rue Chopard, 25-Besançon  
 Lautman Jacques, 20, rue Curie, Paris 5<sup>e</sup>  
 Lautman Mme Jacques, 20, rue Curie, Paris 5<sup>e</sup>  
 Lecuyer Bernard-Pierre, 31, Av. du Général-Sarrail, Paris 16<sup>e</sup>  
 Ledrut Raymond, 15, rue des Narcisses, 31-Toulouse  
 Legotien H., SEDES, 67, rue de Lille, Paris 7<sup>e</sup>  
 Lemaire Gerard, 11, rue des Ursulines, Paris 5<sup>e</sup>  
 Lucas Yvette, 15, rue de Paquerettes, 31-Toulouse 01<sup>e</sup>  
 Marengo Claudine, 125, rue Losserand 75-Paris 14<sup>e</sup>  
 Martins Luciano, 4, rue Régis, Paris 6<sup>e</sup>  
 Marzocchi Rene, 13, rue Ernest Cresson, 75-Paris 14<sup>e</sup>  
 Matarasso Michel, 14, Allée Mouilleboeuf, 92-Chatenay-Malabry  
 Mathieu Nicole, 3, rue Bézout, Paris  
 Maurice Marc, Résidence F. Mistral, Av. Jules-Ferry, 13-Aix-en-Provence  
 May Nicole, 7, rue Broca, Paris 5<sup>e</sup>  
 Meistersheim Anne-Monique, OTAM 16, rue Jules-César, Paris 12<sup>e</sup>  
 Menke-Gluckert Peter, OECD, 2, rue André-Pascal, Paris

- Meyriat Jean, 27, rue Saint-Guillaume, 75-Paris 7<sup>e</sup>  
 Michel Andree, 16 ter, rue Baudin, Montreuil (Seine)  
 Mollo Suzanne, Allée de Sapin-Bleu, 92-Ville-d'Avray  
 Morin Edgar, 38, rue des Blancs-Manteaux, Paris 3<sup>e</sup>  
 Naraghi Ehsan, 6, rue Dupont-des-Loges, Paris 7<sup>e</sup>  
 Neves Helena, Paris  
 Noreng Oystein, 4, rue Marie-Davy, 75-Paris 14<sup>e</sup>  
 Ouy Suzanne, 2 bis, Bd. Casnor B 44, 94-Alfortville  
 Pasquarelli Nicolas, Centre d'EtudesMarxistes, 64, Boul. Blanqui, 75-Paris 13<sup>e</sup>  
 Perroux François, 9 ter, rue Paul-Féval, Paris 18<sup>e</sup>  
 Picon Bernard, Blanchon, Langoiran  
 Picon Nicole, Blanchon, Langoiran  
 Pitrou Agnes, Cerau, 147, Avenue Victor-Hugo, Paris 16<sup>e</sup>  
 Poisson Jean-Paul, 3, Avenue Vavin, Paris 6<sup>e</sup>  
 Poremsky Vladimir, 125 bis, rue Blomet, Paris 15<sup>e</sup>  
 Pouget Henri, Centre d'Etudes Marxistes, 64, Boul. Blanqui, 75-Paris 13<sup>e</sup>  
 Pronteau Jean, 95, Boul. St.-Michel, Paris 5<sup>e</sup>  
 Quarre Françoise, 168, rue de Grendes, Paris 7<sup>e</sup>  
 Raybaut Paul, Ass. Centre Etudes Interethniques, 34, rue Verdi, Nice  
 Rennes Aline, 15, rue de la Cépède, Aix-en-Provence  
 Riffault Marie-Cecile, 125, Cours Gambetta, Résidence Gambetta B,  
 App. 76, 33-Talence  
 Roussel Louis, 16, Clos de Verrières, 91-Verrières-le-Buisson  
 Saada Lucienne, 17, rue de Glantes, Paris  
 Samuel Nicole, 3, Avenue du Lycée Lakanal, 92-Bourg-la-Reine  
 Santos Estela, 2, rue de St.-Simon, Paris 7<sup>e</sup>  
 Scardigli Victor, 45, Boul. de la Gare, 75-Paris 13<sup>e</sup>  
 Schein Pierette, 50, rue des Carrières, 92-Suresnes  
 Sella Haim, 4, rue des Ciseaux, Paris 6<sup>e</sup>  
 Sicard Emile, Faculté des Lettres, 20, Cours Pasteur, 33-Bordeaux  
 Stendenbach Franz, OECD, 2, rue André-Pascal, 75-Paris 16<sup>e</sup>  
 Stoetzel Jean, Université de la Sorbonne, Paris  
 Sullerot Evelyne, 95, Boul. Saint-Michel, Paris 5<sup>e</sup>  
 Tanguy Mme, 59, Avenue de Stalingrad, 92-Antony  
 Thibault Georges, 10, rue Quintin, Bordeaux  
 Thoenig Jean-Claude, 115, Avenue du Maine, Paris 14<sup>e</sup>  
 Thomas Louis-Vincent, 63, Avenue St.-Maude, Paris 12<sup>e</sup>  
 Tillmann Alexandre, 27, rue Charles-Fourier, Paris 13<sup>e</sup>  
 Touraine Alain, 2, Allée du Cèdre, 92-Chatenay-Malabry  
 Touraine Mme Alain, 2, Allée du Cèdre, 92-Chatenay-Malabry  
 Urvoy Jacques, 125, rue Lasserand, 75-Paris 14<sup>e</sup>  
 Van Bockstaele Maria, 19, rue de Javel, 75-Paris 15<sup>e</sup>  
 Waissnan René, 117/119, rue Raymond — Lasserand, Paris 14<sup>e</sup>  
 Willener Alfred, 47, Bd. Montparnasse, Paris 6<sup>e</sup>  
 Wresinski Joseph, 122, Avenue Général-Leclerc, 95-Pierrelaye  
 Zavalloni Marisa, 4, rue de Chevreuse, Paris  
 Zghal Abdel Kader, 16, rue des Boulangers, 75-Paris 5<sup>e</sup>



## GERMAN DEMOCRATIC REPUBLIC

- Arnold Otfried, Springbornstr. 8, 1197 Berlin  
Assmann Georg, Boxhagener Str. 7, 1034 Berlin  
Berger Horst, Schönfliesser Str. 32, 1405 Glienicke  
Bohring Günter, Berggartenstr. 14, 7022 Leipzig  
Braunreuther Kurt, Otto-Nuschke-Str. 22, 108 Berlin  
Brehme Gerhard, Ferdinand Lassalle Str., 701 Leipzig  
Buggel Ehrenfried, Kopenicker Str. 108, 102 Berlin  
Butter Werner, Parkstr. 12, 126 Strausberg  
Dahn Ingeborg, Karl-Marx-Allee 87, 1017 Berlin  
Dohnke Dieter, Rethelstr. 10, 1193 Berlin  
Edeling Herbert, Scheffelstr. 8, 1272 Neuenhagen  
Erbach Günter, Erich-Feigner-Allee 21A, 7031 Leipzig  
Gras Fred, Elsterstr. 8, 701 Leipzig  
Hahn Erich, Prenzlauer Promenade 165A, 110 Berlin  
Hahn Gerhard, Rudolf-Breitscheidstr. 170, Potsdam-Babelsberg 1502  
Heinze Alfred, Weydinger Str. 20, 102 Berlin  
Hüttner Hannes, Barnimstr. 14, 1017 Berlin  
Jeizschman Horst, Mollstr. 3, 102 Berlin  
Klaus Ernst, Maurice-Thorez-Str. 108, 7031 Leipzig  
Kosin Jmhilo, Karl-Marx-Allee 38, 102 Berlin  
Kossok Manfred, Prendelallee 102, 7027 Leipzig  
Krambach Kurt, Heinrich-Heine-Str. 12, 102 Berlin  
Krüger Manfred, Vogel-Grip-Weg 16, 25 Rostock  
Kuhrig Herta, Mollstr. 17, 102 Berlin  
Kulow Hans, Fischerinsel 2, 102 Berlin  
Loeser Franz, Koblenzer Str. 14, 1272 Neuenhagen  
Lötsch Manfred, Rembrandtstr. 66, 7805 Grossraschen  
Maltusch Wernfried, Stubernauchstr. 47, 1197 Berlin  
Manz Günter, Eitelstr. 28, 113 Berlin  
Maretzki Hans, Potsdam-Bornstedt  
Mertsching Günter, Schönhauser Allee 59 B, 1058 Berlin  
Meyer Hansgünter, Philippstr. 19, 104 Berlin  
Miehlke Günter, Strassburger Str. 57, 1034 Berlin  
Mueller Gerhart, Am. Friedrichshain 22, Berlin  
Pfoh Werner, Kollwitzstr. 66, 1058 Berlin  
Puschmann Manfred, Gehsener Str. 89, 117 Berlin  
Rittershaus Joachim, Balatonstr. 16, 1136 Berlin  
Röder Hans, Bahnhofstr. 1, 90 Karl-Marx-Stadt  
Schellenberger Gerhard, Hofmannstr. 30, Karl-Marx-Stadt  
Schirmann Siegfried, Albin-Kobis-Ring 10, 126 Strausberg  
Schmidt Hans, Schöneicher Str. 2, 1125 Berlin  
Schulze Robert, Mothesstr. 3, 7021 Leipzig  
Schulze Karl-Heinz, Nürnberg Str. 3, 801 Dresden  
Schneider Kaus, Otto-Francke-Str. 40, 8028 Dresden  
Staufenbiel Fred, Hans-Loch-Str. 227, 1136 Berlin  
Steiner Helmut, Bolschestr. 27/28, 1162 Berlin

Stollberg Rudhard, Lafontainestr. 28, 402 Halle/Saale  
 Susse Heinz, Wilhelm Sammet Str. 12 Leipzig  
 Taubert Horst, Ermlandische Str. 20, 1055 Berlin  
 Waltenberg Ingolf, Grabbe-Allee 52, III Berlin  
 Weidemann Diethelm, Stahnsdorferstr. 72, Potsdam — Babelsberg 1502  
 Weidig Rudi, Leninallee 206, 1017 Berlin  
 Winter Kurt, Ottomar — Geschke-Str. 42, 117 Berlin—Köpenick  
 Wolf Herbert F., Stephanstr. 20, 701 Leipzig  
 Wustneck Klaus Dieter, Zum langen See 39, Berlin 117

## GERMAN FEDERAL REPUBLIC

Abadan Nermin, c/o Schmidmer, Rindermarkt 17, 8 München 2  
 Ahlberg Rene, Garystr. 55, 1 Berlin 33  
 Albrecht Günter, Forschungsinst. für Soziologie, Köln  
 Allerbeck Klaus, Arnulfstr. 23, 5 Köln 41  
 Artemoff Alexander, Flurscheideweg 15, 6 Frankfurt/Main 80  
 Bahr Lutz Amand, Bernkasteler Str. 65, 53 BN — Bad Godesberg  
 Baumann Hans-Werner, Helfensteinstr. 48, Kassel  
 Behrmann Günter Conrad, Panoramastr. 35, 7401 Hageloch  
 Bellebaum Alfred, Zasiusstr. 118, 78 Freiburg  
 Benninghaus Hans, Forschungsinst. für Soziologie, Universität, Köln  
 Bernsdorf Wilhelm, Fredericiastr. 27, 1 Berlin 19  
 Bilden Helga, Biedersteiner Str. 59, 8 München 23  
 Bilzer Friedrich, Jabenstr. 1, 1 Berlin 10  
 Bimmer Brigitte, Markt 11, 355 Marburg an der Lahn  
 Bimmer Andreas, Markt 11, 355 Marburg an der Lahn  
 Bindereif Elisabeth Maria, Überlingerstr. 9, 7750 Konstanz  
 Bodenstedt Andreas, A. Kurfürsten-Anlage 59, 69 Heidelberg  
 Bogdahn Jurgen, Nazaveth Kirchstr. 36, D 1 Berlin 65  
 Bolder Axel, Bachemer Str. 276, 5 Köln 41  
 Bonac Doerte, Sellberg 58, 5628 Heiligenhaus  
 Bonac Vladimir, Sellberg 58, 5628, Heiligenhaus  
 Brandenburg Alois, Dortmunderstr. 6, Berlin 21  
 Brockmann Jurgen Garystr. 55, 1 Berlin 33  
 Coulborn Imogen Seger, 6719 Honingen, Pfalz  
 Damm Friderike Erika, Univ. Konstanz, Eichornstr. 9, 775 Konstanz  
 Dias Patrick V., Erbprinzenstr. 18, Freiburg 1 Br.  
 Ehrmann Peter, Jabenstr. 1, 1 Berlin 10  
 Erbsloeh Eberhard, Grosse Witschgasse 2, 5 Köln 1  
 Etienne Udo, Inst. für Mittelstandsforschung, Barbarossaplatz 2, 5 Köln  
 Fehr Helmut, Henriette Furth Str. 1, 6 Frankfurt/Main  
 Fink Hans Jurgen, Am Eichkamp 9, 53 Bonn 1  
 Fischer Mechtild, Kepunerstr. 93, Köln 41  
 Flechtheim K., Rohlfstr. 15, 1 Berlin 33  
 Francis Emerich K. Konradstr. 6, 8000 München 13  
 Freiherr von Bredow Wilfried, Balduinstr. 20, 5 Köln



- Friebel Harry, Jabenstr. 1, 1 Berlin 10  
 Fuchs Riet, Lindenbürgerallee 15, Köln  
 Funk Sybille, Vogelsang 4, 1 Berlin 33  
 Gantzel Klaus Juergen, Berliner Str. 17, D 6236 Eschborn  
 Gerhardt Uta, Brandenburger Str. 18, 775 Konstanz  
 Grabowski Klaus H. Harbigstr., 1 Berlin 19  
 Grothe-Jung Dietrich, Jabenstr. 1, 1 Berlin 10  
 Grumer Karl Wilhelm, Lindenbürgerallee 15, Köln  
 Handle Christa, Vogelsang 4, Berlin 33  
 Hans Theodor, Erbprinzenstr. 18, Freiburg 1. Br.  
 Harder Theodor, Universität, 48 Bielefeld  
 Hartig Matthias, Univ. of Frankfurt, Seminar für Gesellschaftslehre,  
 Frankfurt/Main  
 Heckmann Friedrich, Unterck Kreuzgasse 25, Nürnberg  
 Heimer Franz-Wilhelm, Erbprinzenstr. 18, Freiburg 1. Br.  
 Heimer Marie De Lourdes, Rohrgraben 4, 78 Freiburg  
 Herz Thomas A., Univ. Zentralarchiv emp. Sozialforschung, Bachemer  
 Str. 40, Köln Lindenthal  
 Hoerning Karl, Ruhr Univ., Inst. für Soziologie, D 463 Bochum  
 Hübner Helmut, Schorlemerallee 36, Berlin  
 Huttner I., Deutsche Akademie für ärztl. Vorbildung, Noldner str. 40/42  
 Berlin—Zichtenberg  
 Jures Ernst August, Rheinallee 35, 53 Bonn, Bad Godesberg  
 Kaase Max, Univ. of Mannheim, 68 Mannheim Schloss  
 Karbe Klaus, Bundesministerium des Intern, 53 Bonn  
 Karhausen Mark Otto, Univ. Zentralarchiv emp. Sozialforschung, Bache-  
 mer Str. 40, Köln Lindenthal  
 Kasch Sylvia, Aducht Str. 11, 5 Köln 1  
 Kaupen Hass Heidrun, Am Dinghaus 9, 5354 Weilenwist  
 Kaupen Wolfgang, Am Dinghaus 9, 5354 Weilenwist  
 Kellner Hansfried, 19 Jahnstr., Frankfurt  
 Kiss Beate, Markstr. 258, 463 Bochum  
 Kiss Gabor, Markstr. 258, 463 Bochum  
 Kjolseth Rolf, Ludwig Thoma Str. 26, 8411 Undorf  
 Kjolseth Silvia, Ludwig Thoma Str. 26, 8411 Undorf  
 Klages Helmut, Ernst Reuter Platz 10, Berlin  
 Kleining G., c/o H. F. and Ph. F. Reemtsma, Parkstr. 51, 2 Hamburg 52  
 Klingemann Hans Dieter, Univ. Zentralarchiv emp. Sozialforschung,  
 Bachemer Str. 40, Köln Lindenthal  
 Koch Hartmut, Arbeitsrecht Inst., Goethe Univ., 6 Frankfurt/Main  
 Kreckel Reinhard, Nordenstr. 1 A, 8 München 13  
 Kress Gisela, Berliner Str. 17 D, 6236 Eschborn  
 Kruschel Sergey, Postfach 3163, 6 Frankfurt/Main 1  
 Kurz Ursula, Grosse Hufe 2, Hanau  
 Kussau Jurgen, Jacob Burckhardt Str. 6, Konstanz  
 Kutsch Thomas, Elisenstr. 22 D, 5 Köln 1  
 Lamm Trommsdorff Gisela, Universität Mannheim, 68 Mannheim  
 Langenheder Werner, Schultheissalle 38, 85 Nürnberg

- Lepsius M. Reiner, Univ. of Mannheim, Mannheim  
 Lipp Gisela, Hustadtring 75, 463 Bochum  
 Lipp Wolfgang, Hustadtring 75, 463 Bochum  
 Lompo Klaus, Decksteiner Str. 1 A, 5 Köln 41  
 Luckmann Thomas T, 6391 Laubach  
 Lukatis Ingrid, Falkenstr. 14, 85 Nürnberg  
 Lukatis Wolfgang, Falkenstr. 14, 85 Nürnberg  
 Mackensen Rainer, Lehrstuhl II f. Soziologie, Ernst-Reuter Platz 10, 1  
 Berlin 10  
 Matthes Frauke Geb Sasse, 4801 Babenhausen B, Bielefeld  
 Matthes Joachim, 4801 Babenhausen, Bielefeld  
 Mayer Karl Ulrich, Seminar für Gesellschaftslehre, Frankfurt/Main  
 Mayntz Trier Renate, 20 21 Kenesebeckstr., 1 Berlin 12  
 Mochmann Ekkehard, Univ. Zentralarchiv emp. Sozialforschung, Bache-  
 mer Str. 40, Köln Lindenthal  
 Müller Julius Otto, Von Siebold Str. 4 6 D, 34 Göttingen  
 Müller Manfred, Bürgerbuschweg 18, Opladen  
 Müller Walter, Univ. Konstanz Fachbereich Soziologie, 775 Konstanz  
 Müller-Plantenberg Clarita, Lorenzstr. 65, 1000 Berlin 45  
 Neidhardt Friedhelm, Wolosenweg 13, Hamburg 20  
 Neuloh Otto, Kossmannstr. 1, 66 Saarbrücken  
 Niemann Bernhard, 6078 Neu Isenburg 2  
 Otte Jurgen, Alftererstr. 64, 53 Bonn  
 Pamitschka Silvia, Harbigstr., 1 Berlin 19  
 Pankoke Eduard, Mozartstr. 6, Recklinghausen  
 Pappi Franz Urban, Univ. Zentralarchiv emp. Sozialforschung, Bachemer  
 Str. 40, Köln Lindenthal  
 Pfeil Elisabeth, Akademie für Wirtschaft und Politik, Hamburg  
 Pfetsch Frank, Gaisbergstr. 91, 69 Heidelberg  
 Pfitzer Ulrihe, Von Siebold Str. 4/6 D, 34 Göttingen  
 Pflanz Manfred, Berliner Allee 20 D, 3000 Hannover  
 Pintar Rudiger, Nussbaumer Str. 74, 5 Köln 30  
 Prahl Hans Werner, 2412 Nüsse  
 Prosenc Karin, Oberstr. 107, 2 Hamburg 13  
 Prosenc Miklavz, Oberstr. 107, 2 Hamburg 13  
 Reh binder Manfred, Fakultät Rechtswissenschaft der Univ., 48 Bielefeld  
 Reichwein Roland, Dieckhardstr. 41, Berlin 41  
 Ronneberger, c/o Stud. Zeitgeschichtliche Fragen, Franz Goethestr. 35,  
 8520 Erlangen  
 Rose Erwin, Univ. Zentralarchiv emp. Sozialforschung, Bachemer Str.  
 40, Köln Lindenthal  
 Rosner Alois, Arnulfstr. 15, 5 Köln 41  
 Rothschild Thomas, Univ. Inst. Literatur Lehrstuhl Linguistik, Postf.  
 560, D-7000 Stuttgart 1  
 Sallen Herbert A., Aducht Str. 11, 5 Köln 1  
 Sandberger Johann Ulrich, Kronbühlweg 13, 7762 Ludwigshafen  
 Savramis Demosthenes, Am Johanneskreuz 2, 53 Bonn  
 Schenk Monika, Mozartstr. 6, Recklinghausen



- Scheuch Erwin Kurt, Tannenweg 2, 5032 Efferen  
 Scheuch Joyce-Ann, Tannenweg 2, 5032 Efferen  
 Schlosser Otto, Ludwigkirchstr. 4, 1 Berlin 15  
 Schmidt Relenberg Norbert, Ottersbellallee 15, 2 Hamburg 19  
 Schneider Margarete, Lessingweg 13, 4816 Sennestadt  
 Schneider Siegfried, Lessingweg 13, 4816 Sennestadt  
 Schnorrenberg Josef, c/o Univ. Inst. für Phonetik, Greinstr. 2, Köln 41  
 Schober Peter, Auf der Plette 4, Regensburg  
 Schubert Hans Achim, Wiesweg 8, 7403 Pfaeffingen  
 Schumacher Friedrich, Palanterstr. 35, 5 Köln 41  
 Schwefel Detlef, Koblenzer Str. 20, Berlin 31  
 Schwefel Erika, Koblenzer Str. 20, Berlin 31  
 Seidenspinner Gerlinde, Kaiserplatz 5, 8 München 23  
 Sen Gupta Badal, Kaiserstr. 21, Nürnberg  
 Seyfarth Constans, Max Weber Inst. Univ., Konradstr. 6, München  
 Simon Walter, Bachemer Str. 40, 5 Köln 41  
 Sodeur Wolfgang, Gyrhofstr. 4, 5 Köln 41  
 Sotelo Ignacio, Sybelstr. 66, Berlin  
 Stegemann Eva-Maria, Severinstr. 93, 5 Köln 1  
 Stegemann Hagen, Univ. Zentralarchiv emp. Sozialforschung, Bachemer  
 Str. 40, Köln Lindenthal  
 Stegmann Hagen, Severinstr. 93, Köln  
 Terhorst Hermann, Czemensstr. 15, München 23  
 Tonges Heidrun, Laufenerstr. 13, 78 Freiburg  
 Treinen Heiner, Am Duffersbacs 23, Köln  
 Ürbat Frank, Inst. für Mittelstandsforschung, Barbarossaplatz, 5 Köln  
 Vogel Irmgard, 68 Mannheim  
 Von Alemann Heine, Zulpicher Str. 187, 5 Köln 41  
 Von Cranach Michael, Univ. Nervenlinik Ortenbergstr., 355 Marburg Lahn  
 Werle Raymond, Inst. für Mittelstandsforschung, Barbarossaplatz 2, 5 Köln  
 Wewer Heinz, Fahrenheitstr. 9, 1 Berlin 45  
 Wilmanns Gerda, Osterwaldstr. 50 A, 8 München 23  
 Wilmanns Hergart, Osterwaldstr. 50 A, 8 München 23  
 Wirth Rainer, Hardstr. 2, 5 Köln 41  
 Zeidlev Klaus, Fleischmannplatz 9, 85 Nürnberg  
 Zenz Gisela, Arbeitsrecht Inst., Goethe Univ., 6 Frankfurt/Main  
 Zicke Burckhard, JLZ Str. 3 A, 84 Regensburg

## GREAT BRITAIN

- Abrams Philip, Peterhouse, Cambridge  
 Allen Sheila, School Social Sciences Univ., Bradford, Yorkshire  
 Allen Victor Leonard, School Economic Studies, Univ. Leeds, Leeds  
 Andrusz Barbara, 8 Celia Rd., London N. 19  
 Andrusz Gregory David, 9 Celia Rd., London N. 19  
 Barker Geoffrey Russell, Stirling Court, Stirling Rd., Birmingham 16  
 Barnes Jack, 18 Tarnwood Park, London

- Bell Colin Roy, 53 Dunthorne Rd., Colchester, Essex  
 Bernbaum Gerald, 21 Univ. Rd., Leicester  
 Brand John Arthur, Dept. of Politics, Univ. of Glasgow C 1  
 Brittlar Arthur Maurice, Cranham 5, Allerton Drive, Upper Poppleton, York  
 Broady Maurice, 80 Highfield Lane, Southampton  
 Brookes Christopher Peter, Dept. of Sociology, Univ., Leicester  
 Brown Roger Langham, 104 Regent Rd., Leicester  
 Bryant Christopher Gordon, Dept. of Sociology, Univ. of Southampton, Southampton 509 5nh  
 Cartwright Ann, Inst. of Community Studies, 18 Victoria Park Square, London E 2  
 Catlin George, 4 Whitehall Court, London S. W. I.  
 Chalmers Alistair Douglas, School Soc. Studies, Univ. Sussex, Brighton  
 Clarke Derek Ashdown, Houghton Str., London WC 2 AE  
 Cohn Steven, Univ. of Glasgow, Glasgow  
 Coulson Margaret Anne, Dept. Language Soc. Stud. Harris College, Corporation St. Preston Lancs  
 Criper Clive, Dept. of Linguistics, 14 Buccleugh Place, Edinburgh 8, Scotland  
 Cruise Obrien Rita, Inst. Development Studies Univ. Sussex, Falmer Brighton, Sussex  
 Duncan Jones Paul, Nuffield College, Oxford  
 Eggleston Samuel John, Dept. of Education, Univ. of Keele, Staffordshire  
 Elias Norbert, Dept. of Sociology, Univ. Leicester, Leicester  
 Filmer Paul Anthony, 18 Dalmeny Mansions 77 Anson Rd., London N 7  
 Forster Peter Glover, Dept. of Sociology, Univ. of Hull, Yorkshire  
 Frankenberg Helen, Univ. of Keele, Keele, Staffordshire St. 5, 5BG  
 Frankenberg Ronald Jonas, Univ. of Keele, Keele, Staffordshire St. 5  
 Frederick John, 40 Ferngiff Rd, E 8, London  
 Geach Lilian Elma, 157 West Heath Rd., London N. W. 3  
 Gill Derek Godfrey, Centre for Social Studies, Westburn Rd., Aberdeen A 89 2Z, Scotland  
 Glass David Victor, London School of Economics, London WC 2  
 Glass Ruth, 87 Gower Str., London WC IE 6AA  
 Goldthorpe John, Nuffield College, Oxford  
 Goody John Rankine, St. Jons College, Cambridge  
 Hall John Fisher, 16 Shenstone Av., Halesowen, Worcestershire  
 Halmos Paul, Sociology Dept., Univ. College Cardiff, Cardiff  
 Herne Peter, 10 Kingston Ct. Abdon Ave., Birmingham  
 Herne Susanne Morgan, 10 Kingston Court, Abdon Ave., Birmingham  
 Hirsch Steven, 1 The Dell, London SE 19  
 Horobin Gordon William, 29 Desswood Place, Aberdeen AB2 4EE, Scotland  
 Hutton Caroline Rose, 203 Church Plantation Flats, Univ. of Keele, Keele, Staffs St. 55AX  
 Isenberg Elliott Stephen, 54 Howitt Rd., London NW3  
 Kolankiewicz J. M., Univ. of Essex, Dept. of Sociology, Colchester, Essex



- Ladron de Guevera C. Laureano, Dept. of Sociology, Univ. of Essex,  
Wivenhoe Park, Colchester Essex
- Lane David Stuart, University of Essex, Dept. of Sociology, Colchester
- Linden Shirley, Central Statistical Office Room 1310/1, Great George  
Street, S. W. I. London
- Lopasic Alexander, 53 Leighton Court, Pepper Lane, Reading
- Mac Rae Donald Gunn, London School of Economics; Houghton St.  
Aldwych, London WC 2
- Marris Peter, Institute of Community Studies, 18 Victoria Park Square,  
London E 2
- Mast Robert, Inst. of Race Relations, 36 Jermyn 54, London SW1
- Mathews Mervyn, 83 Belgrave Road, London S. W. I.
- McIntosh Mary, 23 Haverstock Street, London N 1
- Mackinlay Robert Davison, 19 Belle Vue Street, York
- Minns Amina, 28 Carlingford Road, London NW 3
- Mumford Enid, 38 Rockbourne Avenue, Liverpool 25
- Murcott Anne, Dept. of Sociology Univ. College Cardiff, P. O. Box 78,  
Cardiff CFI IXL United Kingdom
- Nagel Julian, Dep. of Sociology Univ. of Birmingham, Birmingham 15
- Newton Kenneth, Fac. Comm. and Soc. Science Univ. Birmingham, Birmin-  
gham 15
- Ocullen Ian, Inst. for Planning Research, Tottenham Court Road, WIP  
OBS London
- Pahl R. E., Rutherford College Univ. Canterbury, Canterbury Kent
- Parker Stanley Robert, 46 Hurstwood RD, London NW II
- Rapoport Robert, 7 Kidderpore Ave., London NW 3
- Rees Martin, Dept. Soc. Univ. of Southampton, Southampton
- Richmond Anthony N., c/o 19 Glebe Road, London N 8
- Richmond Freda, 19 Glebe Road, London N. 8
- Riddell David Stuard, Dept. Soc. Lancaster Univ., Lancs.
- Robertson Jenny, Dept. of Soc. Univ. of York, York
- Robertson Roland, Dept. of Soc. Univ. of York, York
- Rose Richard, Politics Dept. Univ. of Strathclyde, Glasgow C. I Scotland
- Rycroft Charlotte Susanna, British Embassy, Sofia, Bulgaria
- Seglow Peter, 98 Greencroft Gardens, London NW 6
- Sharmann Anne Clark, School of Social Studies, Univ. of East Anglia,  
Norwich Nor 88C
- Simpson Hilda Marjorie, 96 George V Avenue, Pinner Middlesex
- Smith George Antony Noel, 23 Cromwell Rd., Mexborough Yorks
- Smith Michael Alfred, Univ. of Salford, Salford Lacs.
- Stander Simon, Enfield College of Technology, Enfield, Middlesex
- Strickland Andrew James, Centre for Russian Europ. Stud., Birmingham 15
- Thompson A.M.C., 86 George V Avenue, Pinner Middlesex
- Thompson Kenneth Alfred, The Open University, Bletchley Bucks
- Ticktin Hillel Herschel, 31 Clevedon Road, Glasgow W. 2
- Tunstall C. Jeremy, Meadow Cottage, Ardleigh Heath, Colchester, Essex
- Turner Louis Mark, Dept. Soc. Salford Univ., Salford 5, Lancashire
- Urwin Derek, Politics Dept., Univ. of Strathclyde, Glasgow C. 1, Scotland

- Vida Nichols, Inst. for Planning Research, Tottenham Court Rd., WIP  
OBS London
- Walker Alan, IA Fontaine Rd., Streatham, London
- Weinberg Elizabeth, London School Economics and Pol. Science, Hough-  
ton Str., London W.C.
- Weinstein Krystyna, Manchester School Hilton House, Hilton Str., Man-  
chester
- Wellesley Wesley James Frank, C/O Bank of Scotland, 30 Bishopsgate,  
London E.C. 2
- Wellesley Wesley Mrs. James, C/O Bank of Scotland, 30 Bishopsgate,  
London E.C. 2
- Whiteside Michael Thomas, 21 Univ. Rd., Leicester
- Whitley Richard D., Manchester Business School, Hilton Str., Manche-  
ster M I 2FE
- Wilder-Okladek Friederike, fl. 8, 39 Burlington Rd., London W 4
- Wilson Bryan, All Souls College, Oxford
- Wolpe Harold, North Western Polytechnic, 62-66 Hichbury Grove, London 5
- Yasin Simon, Social Science Research Council, State House, High Holborn,  
London W. C. 1
- Zubaida Salman, 6 Albert Terrace, London N. W. 1

## GREECE

- Constas Helen, 41 Lezvou Str., 807 Athens
- Diamantis Evangelia, National Centre of Social Research, Sofocleous  
Str. 1, 122 Athens
- Dimitras Elie, National Centre of Social Research, Sofocleous Str. 1, 122  
Athens
- Mouzelis N., Mavromateon 31, Athens
- Sakka Sophia, National Centre of Social Research, Sofocleous Str. 1, 122  
Athens
- Teperoglou Aphrodite, National Centre of Social Research, Sofocleous  
Str. 1, 122 Athens
- Tsakonas Demetrius, 3 Ilidos Str., 608 Athens
- Tzavelas Maria, Narkisson 15, Filothei, Athens
- Zavos Aristides, National Centre of Social Research, Sofocleous Str. 1,  
122 Athens

## HUNGARY

- Adam Gyorgy, V. Nagy Sandor U. 6, Budapest
- Agh Attila, V. Szemere Utca 10, Budapest
- Akszentivics Gyorgy, Budapest
- Andevko Janos, Budapest
- Andorka Rudolf, Kelenhegyi Ut. 75, Budapest
- Angelusz Robert, I. Gellerthegy Ut. 6, Budapest



- Balogh Jozsef, Ajtosi Durer Sor 21, Budapest 14  
 Balvi Istvan, Alkotás 35, Budapest  
 Banlaky Pol, T. Vermezo Ut. 8, Budapest  
 Bekes Ferenc, Rath Gyorgy Ut. 60, Budapest 12  
 Bohm Antal, Budapest  
 Buda Bela, I. Batthyany Ut. 3, Budapest  
 Cseh-Szombathy Laszlo, Keleti Str. 5-7, Budapest 11  
 Csepregi Stephen, 93 Bartok Bela Str., Budapest  
 Erdei Ferenc, 44 Benczur Str., Budapest  
 Erdei Sara, 44 Benczur Str., Budapest  
 Farkas Janos, Uri Ut. 49, Budapest 1  
 Ferge Susan, Uri Ut. 49, Budapest 1  
 Fukasz Gyorgy, Ifjumunkas 22, Budapest 9  
 Furedi John, 118 Voroshadeseveg, Budapest  
 Gazso Ferenc, Horvath Michaly Ter 8, Budapest 8  
 Gero Suzanne, Thokoly Ut. 150, Budapest 14  
 Gomba R. Csaba, Kisz Lt. D/4. III., Budapest 18  
 Gorgengi Ferenc, Budapest  
 Gyenes Antal, Alkotmany 25, Budapest 5  
 Hainal Albert, Munnich Ferenc U. 9/13, Budapest 5  
 Havas Anna, V. Szabadsag Ter 15, Budapest  
 Hegedus Andreas, V. Szechenyi Rpt. 3, Budapest  
 Hegedus Julius, 93 Bartok Bela St., Budapest 11  
 Hrruczi Laszlo, Hajnoczy Ut. 1, Szeged  
 Hrubos Ildiko, Szakasits A. U. 50/A, Budapest 11  
 Husiar Tibor, Csaba 10, Budapest 12  
 Illes Janos, Ajtosi Durer Sor 23, Budapest 14  
 Jakab Zoltan, Kresz Gera Ut. 42, Budapest 13  
 John Ede, Szajko Ut. 8, Budapest 1  
 Jozsa Peter, Corvin Ter 8, Budapest 1  
 Kadar Istvan, Tarogato Ut. 2, Budapest 2  
 Kalra Frendl, Esze Tama S 2, Myergesusfala  
 Kemeny Istvan, Kozponti Statisztikai Hivatal, Keleti K-U 5/7, Budapest 2  
 Kende Laszlo, Majakovszkij Ut. 108, Budapest 6  
 Keresz Gyula, Rath Gyorgy Ut. 60, Budapest 12  
 Kovacs Denes, Szakasits Arpad Ut. 16, Budapest 11  
 Kovacs Ferenc, Ajtosi Durer Sor 23, Budapest 14  
 Kulcsar Kalman, Uri Ut. 49, Budapest 1  
 Kunszabo Ferenc, Kada Elek-Ut. 11, Kecskemet  
 Laky Terez, Puszx Iasleri Ut. 72, Budapest 2  
 Laky Zoltan, Alkotás Ut. 23 IV E. 13, Budapest 12  
 Losonczy Agnes, Uri Ut. 49, Budapest 1  
 Modra Laszlo, Egressy Ut. 73/C, Budapest 14  
 Molnar Julia, Nagy Lajos Kiraly 98, Budapest  
 Molnar Laszlo, Ajtosi Durer Sor 21, Budapest 14  
 Nagy Emil, Ker Hungaria Kri 7sz. 9 ep., Budapest 10  
 Nemes Ferenc, Daniel Ut. 23/E, Budapest 12  
 Papp Ignac, Berzsényi Ut. 1/8, Szeged

Papp Zsolt, Varsanyi Iren Ut. 17, Budapest 2  
 Pataki Ferenc, Szondi Ut. 83/85, Budapest 6  
 Patyi Gyorgy, Konyves K. Krt 76, Budapest 8  
 Kohanszky Michaly, Titan Ut. 9, Budapest 2  
 Sas Gyorgy, Altosi Durer Sor 21, Budapest 14  
 Somogyi Zoltan, Szemere Ut. 10, Budapest 5  
 Sos Molnar Edit, Harsca U. L., Budapest 2  
 Szabady Egon, Keleti-Str. 5-7, Budapest 2  
 Szabo Ilona, G. Lenin Krt. 67, Budapest  
 Szalai Alexander, Sol United Nations Plaza, New York, USA  
 Szalai Belane, Ajtosi Durer Sor 19/21, Budapest 14  
 Szecske Tamas, Pasareti Ut. 125, Budapest 2  
 Szeleny Ivan, Uri Ut. 49, Budapest 1  
 Szentpeteri Istvan, Lenin Krt 36/38, Szeged  
 Szesztay Andras, Uri Ut. 49, Budapest 1  
 Szigeti Katalin, Szabadsag Tem 11, Budapest 5  
 Tahin Thomas, 15/A Kodaly Str., Pecs  
 Tarjan Imre, Pusztaszeri Ut. 38. I Em., Budapest  
 Toth, Ildiko, Allatkerii Ut. 11 5, Budapest 14  
 Vagvolgyi Andras, Partizan Ut. 1, Szeged  
 Varady Geza, Ganz-Mavag, Konyves K. Krt 76, Budapest 8  
 Varga Ivan, P. O. Box 35043 Dar es Sala-am, Tanzania  
 Veszi Bela, Ajtosi Durer Sor ZL., Budapest 14  
 Volczer Arpad, J. Egyetem Ter 1/3, Budapest  
 Wirth Adam, Ajtosi Durer Sor 19/21, Budapest 14  
 Zsille Zoltan, Airzicska Ut. 3/6, Budapest

## ITALY

Amaechi Patrick, Collegio Universitario, Trento  
 Amendola Giandomenico, Via Rosselli 24, Bari  
 Ammassari Paolo, Via A. Govoni 35, Roma  
 Ammassari Elke, Via A. Govoni 35, Roma  
 Amoroso Francesca, c/o Facultà Scienze Statistiche, Piazzale Scienze  
 5, 00185 Roma  
 Ardigo Achille, Bellinzona 5, Bologna  
 Arena Giuseppe, Via Umberto 88, Centuripe Enna  
 Aureli Cutillo Enrica, Via Lovanio 24, Roma  
 Baglioni Guido, Via Crimea 3, Milano  
 Baraldi Raffaella, Via S. Bartolomeo de Vaccinari 16, Roma  
 Bellacicco Antonio, Via della Villa di Lucina 38, Roma  
 Bellasi Pietro, Via Belluzzi 3, 40135, Bologna  
 Belloni Aligi, Via Pisani Dossi 53, Milano  
 Benini Emilio, Via Grotta 79, 38050 Villazzano, Trento  
 Bettoni Franco, Viale Repubblica 6, Mantova  
 Bisi Trentino Simona, Via Blumenstihl Bernardo 52, Roma  
 Bisogni Menchinelli Aurora, Via Mario Fani 127, Roma



- Boffi Mario, Via M. Gioia 181, Milano  
 Boileau Anna Maria, I.S.I.G. Via Diaz 6, Gorizia  
 Bonani Giampaolo, Via 20 Settembre 1, 00198 Roma  
 Bondi Guido, Cons. Amm. Ist. Sup. Scienze Sociali, Via G. Verdi 26, Trento  
 Braghin Maschietto Luciana, Via Bergognone 31/1, Milano  
 Braghin Paolo, Via Bergognone 31/3, Milano  
 Bratina Darko Diodato, Corso Unione Sovietica 217, 10134 Torino  
 Bravo Gian Luigi, Viale Partigiani 15, Asti  
 Brazzali Marco, Viale Verona 16/A, Trento  
 Brazzoduro Marco, c/o Facoltà Scienze Statistiche, Piazzale Scienze  
 5, 00185 Roma  
 Butera Federico, Olivetti S.P.A., Via Jervis 24, 10015 Ivrea  
 Caccamo Rita, Via Ipponio 14, Roma  
 Caielli Maria Luisa, Via Pellegrino Rossi 1, Milano  
 Calisi Romano, Piazza San Domenico 2, Spoleto  
 Calzavara Elisa, Via Caverni 6, Roma  
 Capecchi Vittorio, c/o Ist. Cattaneo, Via S. Stefano 6, 40125 Bologna  
 Casiccia Alessandro, Via Legnano 28, Milano  
 Castellano Vittorio, Viale Ippocrate 79, Roma  
 Cattani Eugenio, Via Padre Lino 16, Parma  
 Cattarinussi Bernardo, I.S.I.G. Via Diaz 6, Gorizia  
 Cavalli Alessandro, Via Stampa 4 A, 20123 Milano  
 Cecilia M. Pia, c/o Facoltà Scienze Statistiche, Piazzale Scienze 5, 00185  
 Roma  
 Cerase Francesco Paolo, Via Eleonora D'Arborea 9, 00162 Roma  
 Cesare Bianca Maria, Via Ludovico di Savoia 10, Roma  
 Ciacci Margherita, Via Solferino 28, 50123 Firenze  
 Cicardi Ferrari Carla, Corso Sempione 9, Milano  
 Coen Anna, Via Brescia 29, Roma  
 Cofini Stefano, Via Mauro Macchi 67, Milano  
 Colucci Celestino, Via Nov ti 2, Pavia  
 Consoli Francesco, Via Macedonia 37, Roma  
 Coyaud Sylvie, Via Belfiore 9, 20145 Milano  
 Crespi Franco, Istit. Sociologia Univ. Internaz. Pro Deo, Viale Pola 12,  
 00198 Roma  
 Dalavecureas Teodoro Enrico, Via San Martino 7, 20122 Milano  
 De Benedetti Fabrizio, CESDI, Via Fabio Massimo 60, Roma  
 De Cesari Patrizia, Via Mameli 19, Milano  
 De Lillo Antonio, Via Ponte Seveso 30, Milano  
 De Masi Domenico, I.F.A.P. Piazza della Repubblica 59, 00185 Roma  
 De Masi Franca, Corso Vittorio 209, Roma  
 Demarchi Franco, I.S.I.G. Via Diaz 6, Gorizia  
 Demarco Domenico, Via G. B. Ruoppolo 69, Napoli  
 Derossi Flavia, Cris Via Massena 20, Torino  
 Di Simone Giovanni Maria, Via 20 Settembre 1, Roma  
 Di Simone Johanna Maria, Via 20 Settembre 1, Roma  
 Diena Vittorio, Olivetti S.P.A., Via Jervis 24, 10015 Ivrea  
 Digilio Mario, Via R. Bonghi 19 A, 00184, Roma

- Dossoni Mario, Via Grotta 79, 38050 Villazzano, Trento  
 D'Amario Norberto, Via Trieste 36, Magenta, Milano  
 Fabris Giampaolo, Viale Bianca Maria 25, Milano  
 Farneti Paolo, Via Balbo 41, Torino  
 Fasola-Bologna Alfredo, Via Claudio Monteverdi 15, Roma  
 Fassio Bonanni Amalia, Via Nemea 70, Roma  
 Faveretto Tito, ISDEE, Corso Italia 27, Trieste  
 Ferraresi Franco, Via v Monti 25, 20123 Milano  
 Ferrari Vincenzo, Corso Sempione 9, Milano  
 Ferrario Mario Carlo, Via Moise Loria 76, Milano  
 Ferrarotti Franco, Via Appennini 42, 00198 Roma  
 Garbagnati Furio, Via N. Bixio 2, Milano  
 Gasparini Alberto, Viale S. Marco 60, Monfalcone, Gorizia  
 Gaudenzi Giuseppina, Via Arezzo 26, Roma  
 Germano Gemma, Via Lucrino 5, Roma  
 Giasanti Alberto, Via da Guissano 7, Milano  
 Giglioli Ann, Via Santa Reparata 63, Firenze  
 Giglioli Pier Paolo, Via Santa Reparata 63, Firenze  
 Giorgi Vittoria, Via Tarquinio Prisco 87, Roma  
 Grazia Resi Bruno, Via Ruffini 2 A, Roma  
 Gros-Pietro Gian Maria, Corso Siracusa 112, Torino  
 Gros-Pietro Giovanna, Corso Siracusa 112, Torino  
 Grumelli Antonio, Via Liberazione 53, 66100 Chieti  
 Gubert Renzo, I. S. I. G. Via Diaz 6, Gorizia  
 Guidicini Paolo, Via Bentini 14, Bologna  
 Hill Ellen, Via Titta Scarpetta 28/B, Roma  
 Imperiale Claudio, Via Suor Celestina Donati 139, Roma  
 Izzo Alberto, V. B. Cellini 18, Bologna  
 Lazzari Rosa Maria Cristina, Via Novati 2, 27100 Pavia  
 Levi Franco, Corso Pascoli 1, Torino  
 Levi Momigliano Lucetta, Corso Pascoli 1, Torino  
 Lombardi Satriani Luigi, Via Aurora 39, Roma  
 Lorenzetto Anna, Unione Naz. Lotta Contro l'Analfabetismo, Palazzo  
 della Civiltà del Lavoro, Roma  
 Lorenzi Guido, Assessore per la Cultura, Provincia Autonoma, Trento  
 Losano Mario G., Ist. di Filosofia e Sociologia del Diritto, Univ. di Milano,  
 Via Festa del Perdono 7, Milano  
 Luciano Adriana, Via Alberto Nota 6, 10122 Torino  
 Lucini Giuseppe, Via Mazzini 111, 20079 S. Angelo Lodigiano  
 Mannheimer Renato, Via S. Croce 1, Milano  
 Marchese Ernesto, Pollina Palermo  
 Marciani Antonella, c/o Facoltà Scienze Statistiche, Piazzale Scienze 5,  
 00185 Roma  
 Marotta Michele, Via del Casale Guiliani 80, 00141 Roma  
 Martinelli Alberto, Via Cernuschi 1, 20129 Milano  
 Martinotti Guido, ISA, Via Daverio 7, Milano  
 Massucco Costa Angiola, Via S. Ottavio 20, 10124 Torino  
 Melchiori Mario, Via Innerhofer 6, Merano



- Meldolesi Stame Nicoletta, Via Urbana 145, Roma  
Melotti Umberto, Via G. B. Morgagni 39, 20129, Milano  
Micheli Giuseppe, Piazza Stuparich 4, Milano  
Milletti Rosella Annalisa, Viale di Monte Brianzo 56, Roma  
Mingione Terenzio, Viale Piave 27, Milano  
Moscati Roberto, Via tre Orologi 6, 00197 Roma  
Mura Anna, FORMEZ, Palazzo Congressi Mostra d'Oltremare, Napoli  
Mutti Antonio, Via S. Giovannino 19, Pavia  
Oppo Anna, c/o Ist. Cattaneo, Via S. Stefano 6. 40125 Bologna  
Orviati Silvio, I. S. I. G., Via Diaz 6, Gorizia  
Paci Agostino, Via Veneto 89, Roma  
Pagani Angelo, ISA, Via Daverio 7, Milano  
Pagani Oriana, Via degli Odescalchi 22, Milano  
Pagani Isa, Via degli Odescalchi 22, Milano  
Palmeri Paolo, Via Carreca 24, Trapani  
Paluzzi Antonio, Via Z. Massa 112, 18038 San Remo  
Panizzi Giorgio, Formez Via Salaria 229, 00199 Roma  
Pasqualini Rita, c/o Facoltà Scienze Statistiche, Piazzale Scienze 5, 00185  
Roma  
Pece Luisa, c/o Soc. Ed. Il Mulino, Via S. Stefano 6, 40125 Bologna  
Pennacchietti Francesca, Via Massena 20, Torino  
Pocar Valerio, Via Litta 2, 20122 Milano  
Poli Oddone, Via Meravigli 7, 20123 Milano  
Pollastrini Barbara, Via Washington 10, Milano  
Ragucci Craciela Ines, c/o Tattoli, Via delle Alpi 27, 00198 Roma  
Rapisarda Michele, Via Morosini 19, Milano  
Ronchi Bruno, c/o Veronese Rodolfo, Via Pasteur 16, Milano  
Rosa Constantino, Via Martelli 6, 26041 Casalmaggiore, Cremona  
Rosa Luigi, Piazza S. Fedele 4, 20100 Milano  
Rositi Franco, Via Giovanni Cantoni 6, 20144 Milano  
Rossella Annalisa, c/o Facoltà Scienze Statistiche, Piazzale Scienze 5,  
00185 Roma  
Saccomani Salvadori Edda, Via Cernata 38, Torino  
Salvemini Tommaso, Via A. Vallisneri 7, Roma  
Sambri Claudio, I. S. I. G., Via Diaz 6, Gorizia  
Sassi Carla, Via Pasteur 16, Milano  
Savona Ernesto Ugo, Via C. Dossi 15, Roma  
Scaglia Antonio, Trento  
Scarpati Rosario, ISVET, Via Nizza 154, 00198 Roma  
Scartezzini Riccardo, Via S. Antonio 6, Trento  
Segalini Franca, Viale Bianca Maria 25, Milano  
Selan Valerio, I. R. E. A., Via 20 Settembre 1, 00187 Roma  
Sgritta Giovanni, Via Lancieri 15, Roma  
Sinigoi Lilia In Gentilcore, ISDEE, Corso Italia 27, Trieste  
Sivini Ada, Via Madonnetta 46, Ancona  
Sivini Giordano, Via Madonnetta 46, Ancona  
Spaventa De Novellis Lydia, Viale Ippocrate 79, Roma  
Statera Gianni, Via dei Giornalisti 40, Roma

- Statera Simonnetta, Via dei Giornalisti 40, Roma  
 Stefanucci Luciana, Via M. P. Danieli 19, Roma  
 Stolfi Astolfo, Via Mac Mahon 16, Milano  
 Stroppa Claudio, Via Monte Leone 2, Milano  
 Tabacchi Claudio, Viale Marche 21, Milano  
 Talamo Magda, Cris 20 Via Massina, Torino  
 Terenziani Eduardo, Via G. Matteotti 52, 42027 Montecchio E., Reggio Emilia
- Tomazzoni Giancarlo, Consiglio Amm. Ist. Sup. Scienze Sociali, Via G. Verdi 26, Trento  
 Tomeo Vincenzo, Piazza Crivellone 13, 20149 Milano  
 Tosi Michelina, Via S. Teodoro 18, Roma  
 Tralli Nella, Via Gorizia 6, Brescia  
 Trentino Marcello, c/o Facoltà Scienze Statistiche, Piazzale Scienze 5, 00185 Roma
- Treves Renato, Via Lusardi 2, Milano 20122  
 Treves Lisa, Via Lusardi 2, Milano 20122  
 Treves Tullio, Via Lusardi 2, Milano 20122  
 Urbaez Molina Jose Rafael, Via Antonio Cerasi 24 A Int. 5, Roma  
 Vallauri Carlo, Via Trionfale 6551, 00135 Roma  
 Varotti Adriano, Via S. Bartolomeo de Vaccinabi 16, Roma  
 Veronese Rodolfo, Via Pasteur 16, Milano  
 Vianello Mino, Via Senafe 19, 00199 Roma  
 Viterbi Mario, Via Piffetti 16, Torino  
 Volpatto Giorgio F., Via Forlanini 7, 10134 Torino  
 Volpatto Oreste, Via Forlanini 7, 10134 Torino  
 Zagonel Carlo, San Martino di Castrozza  
 Zajczyk Francesca, Viale Papiniano 50, Milano  
 Zanotti Karp Angela, Via S. Bartolomeo de Vaccinari 16, Roma  
 Zonca Giuseppe, Via Francesco Nullo 46, Bergamo  
 Zonta Coraglia Liliana, Via S. Ottavio 20, 10124 Torino

## IRELAND

- Dessaint William, Univ. of Ulster, Coleraine Londonderry, Northern Ireland  
 Fogarty Michael, Econom. Social Research Inst., 4 Burlington Rd., Dublin 4  
 Fogarty Phylla, Econom. and Social Research Inst., 4 Burlington Rd., Dublin 4  
 Nannam Damian, Econom. and Social Research Inst., 4 Burlington Rd., Dublin 4  
 Jackson John Archer, Dept. of Social Studies, Queen's Univ., Belfast, Northern Ireland  
 Roseingrave Tomas, 26 Highfield Park, Dundrum Rd., Dublin 14  
 Roseingrave Mrs. Tomas, 26 Highfield Park, Dundrum Rd., Dublin 14  
 Smith Lous, Univ. College of Dublin, Dublin



## NETHERLANDS

- Abraham Eva Elisabeth, Landhuis Van Engelen, Curaçao, Antilles  
 Alberts P., Lodewisk Tripstr. 2 III, Amsterdam  
 Baerwaldt Camiel, Son, Amstellaan 14  
 Beeker H. A., Woestduinlaan 65, Doorn  
 Boelmans Kleinjan Aadje, Gen Foulkesweg 86, Wageningen  
 Boesjes Hommes Regina, Homeruslaan 4, Olgstgeest  
 Bornkamp Arie, 5 Machtegaallaan, The Hague  
 Brandsma Piet, Bankaplein I A, The Hague  
 Breman Jan, Oranjelaan 22 A, Rotterdam  
 Buitendam Arend, Gravenstr. 7, Geldrop  
 Cassee Ewout Theodoor, Wassenaarseweg 56, Leiden  
 De Boer Tjeerd, Reuvenlaan 53, Voorburg  
 De Sitter L. U., Emmalaan 45, Oegstgeest  
 De Vries-Van Der Zee Ariena Klasine, Opaalstr. 128, Leiden  
 Dekker Evert, Ocarinalaan 132, Ryswyk  
 Dekker Jan, Zinnebloemstr. 55, S-Gravenhage  
 Den Hollander Arie Nicolaas Jan, 46 Watteanstr., Amsterdam  
 Dessaur Catharina, Mozartstr. 209, Leiden  
 Drop Maria Johanna, Frans Halslaan 129, Oegstgeest  
 Dykhuis Gerhard, Ch. de Bourbonlaan 12, Oegstgeest  
 Dykhuis Potgieser, Ch. de Bourbonlaan 12, Oegstegeest  
 Edema Johanna, Churchillweg 90, Wageningen  
 Geyer Rudolf Felix, Siswo 0 2 Achterburgwal 128, Amsterdam  
 Glastra Van Loon Jan, Inst. of Social Studies, 27 Molenstr., The Hague  
 Goudsblom Johan, J. J. Viottastr. 13, Amsterdam  
 Halbertsma Herre, Kromboomssloot 28, Amsterdam 1001  
 Heinemeyer Willen, Victorieplein 21 A, Amsterdam  
 Hesseling Pjotr Gerardus Maria, Floralaan West 203, Eindhoven  
 Heuvel Van Den Wilhelmus, Willem Degenstr. 48, Nijmegen  
 Hirs Wilhelmus, Heemskerklaan 68, Naarden  
 Hoekema Andreas Jan, Bickergracht 74, Amsterdam  
 Houben Claessen, Weerdesteinstr. 19, Breda  
 Houben P. P., Weerdesteinstr. 19, Breda  
 Huizing Buchli Klara Eliza, Emmaplein 5, Oegstgeest  
 Huttner Harry, Antoniusstr. 55, Mook L  
 In T. Veld Henny, Meyerskade 12, Leiden  
 Jolles Hidido Michiel, Kraayveld 27, Badhoevedorp  
 Kalk Eisse, Juliana von Stolberglaan 64, Voorschoten  
 Kels James, Elsevier Publishing Company, P.O. Box 211, Amsterdam  
 Kooy Gerrit Andries, Herenstr. 25, Wageningen  
 Kooy Mrs. Gerrit, Herenstr. 25, Wageningen  
 Korstanje Bernard, 1709 Laan v. Meerdervoort, The Hague  
 Korstanje Stoop Francisca, 1709 Laan v. Meerdervoort, The Hague  
 Krinkels Marinou, Wittemerallee 32, Wittem L  
 Kroes Rob, Berkenlaan 19, Maarn  
 Kruijt Cornelis Simon, Chopinlaan 8, Voorschoten

- Kuysten Antonie Cornelis, Het Laagt 72, Amsterdam  
 Lammers Cornelis Jacobus, Aert van Neslaan 115, Oegstgeest  
 Lijftogt Siebe, Fr. Halsstr. 49 B, Utrecht  
 Lijphart Arend, Anemonenweg 42, Wassenaar  
 Lyphart Mehans Petronella, Vreewykstr. 5, Leiden  
 Matthissen M. A., O. Z. Achterburgwal 128, Amsterdam  
 Merwe Van De Casparus, 49 Middleweg, Wassenaar  
 Mok Albert Luis, O. Z. Acherburgwal 128, Amsterdam  
 Nauta Arie, Voorhamstr. 11 A, Zoetermeer  
 Nelissen Nicolas, Prof. V. D. Heydenstr. 39, Nijmegen  
 Nyhof Gerhard, Hugo van Voorneweg 16, Heenvliet  
 Oorburg Anna, 21 A Verl Hereweg, Groningen  
 Oorburg Jan, 21 A Verl Hereweg, Groningen  
 Papelard Lucia, Buiten Wieringerstr. 1, Amsterdam  
 Persoon J. M. G., Staringstr. 1, Nymegen  
 Peters Reinier, Rentmeesterlaan 22, Nymegen  
 Philipoom Johannes, Beatrix Laan 132, Best  
 Rebergen Johan, Opaalstr. 108, Leiden  
 Riesthuis Gerhard, Laan 1954, NR. 10, De Meern  
 Roling Niels, Heerenstr. 27, Wageningen  
 Ruys Johan, Morssingel 11, Leiden  
 Saal Cornelis Dirk, Houtwallen 27, Vries  
 Sterk Johannes Gerardus Maria, Siswo 0 2 Achterburgwal 128, Amsterdam  
 Stokvis Rudolf, Soc. Inst., Korte Spinhuissteeg 3, Amsterdam  
 Stokvis Verena, Soc. Inst., Korte Spinhuissteeg 3, Amsterdam  
 Stouthard Philippe, Willem Elsschothof 4, Tilburg  
 Swanborn Peter Gustaaf, Burg Haefkensstr. 10, Houten  
 Teitler Ger, Het Hoogt 305, Amsterdam  
 Ten Have Paul, Rottumerstr. 11, Amstelveen  
 Teulings Ad., P/A Stationsplein 242, Leiden  
 Tienk J. A. M., Bonaireplein 6 II, Amsterdam 1017  
 Tielman Rob, I. B. Bakkerlaan 135—1406, Utrecht  
 Tulkens Johannes, Juffermansstr. 23, Oegstgeest  
 Uri Jan Pieter, Schietbaanstr. 12, The Hague  
 Van Berkel Pieter, Van Ostadelaan 18, Waalre  
 Van Den Ban Anne Willem, Dept. of Extension Education, Heerenstr.  
 25, Wageningen  
 Van Dyck Jules, Frans Erenslaan 16, Geleen  
 Van Gemund Johannes, I Brandenburgerweg 1, De Bilt  
 Van Heck Bernardus, Joh. V/D Waalsstr. 10, Amsterdam  
 Van Hulten Michael, Jan van Goyenkade 5, Amsterdam  
 Van Leent Jan, Selterskampweg 69, Bennekom  
 Van Nieuwenhuijze Christoffel, 27 Molenstr., The Hague  
 Van Nieuwstadt Jacques, Bilderdijklaan 95, Groningen  
 Van Oers Mart, Frans Halsplantsoen 3, Voorschoten  
 Van Tienen Aloysius, Spotvogellaan 15, The Hague  
 Van Vonderen Maryke, Elzentlaan 27, Eindhoven  
 Van Westerlaak Johannes, Csardasstr. 9, Nymegen



Vandoorn Jaques, Prinses Julianalaan 26, Rotterdam 16  
 Verschuur Basse Denyse, Steenakker 5, Blaricum  
 Vinke Peter, Lange Voort 54, Oegstgeest  
 Wermer Frans, Alkenoord 11, Capelle A/D Yssel  
 Wippler Reinhard, Van Lenneplan 217, Groningen  
 Wouters Cas, I/E Jan V. D. Hydenstr. 90 I, Amsterdam  
 Zwaan Vander, Kaakstr. 156, Eindhoven

## NORWAY

Aagaard Grethe, Inst. of Sociology, Christiegst. 19, 5000 Bergen  
 Aarebrot Frank H., Inst. of Soc. Univ. of Bergen, Bergen  
 Aas Berit, Jorstadveien 30, Nesbru  
 Aas Dagfinn, Jorstadveien 30, Nesbru  
 Aubert Vilhelm, Bjerkasen 35, Blommenholm  
 Bae Berit, Majorstuveien 17, Oslo  
 Cohen Michael, Sociologisk Institut, Bergen  
 Gran Anne, Dokkeveien 1 A, 5000 Bergen  
 Gran Thorvald, Inst. of Soc., Christies Gt., 5000 Bergen  
 Grande Odd, Box 33, 1432 Vollebakk  
 Gronseth Erik, Jorstadun 6, Nesbru  
 Halle Nils Herman, Chrisiesgt. 19, Bergen  
 Helland Rometveit Turid, Inst. of Soc., Univ. of Bergen, Bergen  
 Hem Lars, Nils Henrik Abelsv. 31 B, Oslo 8  
 Henrichsen Bjorn, Inst. of Soc., 5000 Bergen  
 Holter Harriet, Nils Henrik Abelsv. 31 BB, Oslo 8  
 Jansen Ale-Inge, Inst. Sociologi, Christiesgt. 19, 5000 Bergen  
 Kolltveit Eivind, Norsk Byggforskningsinstitut, Forskningsvn 3B, Oslo 3  
 Kuhnle Stein, Inst. of Soc., Christiegst. 19, 5000 Bergen  
 Larsen Stein Ugelvik, Christiesgt. 19, Bergen  
 Lumsden Malvern, Biornevegen 33, N 5045 Skjoldtun  
 Moum Torbjorn, Drammensvn. 110 H, Oslo  
 Mydske Per Kristen, Munthesgt. 31, Oslo 2  
 Nils Petter Gleditsch, Ovre Skogvei 12, Oslo 2  
 Nypan Astrid, Box 1096 Univ. of Oslo, Oslo 3  
 Osterud Oyvind, Sosiologisk Institut, Christiesgt. 19, Bergen  
 Oyen Else, Institute of Sociology, Christiesgt. 19 N. 5000 Bergen  
 Oyen Orjar, Inst. of Soc. Christiegst. 19, N. 5000 Bergen  
 Rogoff Ramsøy Natalie, Minister Ditleffsvei 8, Oslo 8  
 Rokkan Stein, Inst. of Soc. Univ. of Bergen, Christianesgt. 19, Bergen  
 Rommetveit Kaare, Inst. of Soc. Univ. of Bergen, Bergen  
 Saetren Harald, Christiegst. 19, Bergen  
 Skoie Hans, Navf Akersgt. 49, Oslo 1  
 Skoie Lisbeth, Navf Akersgt. 49, Oslo 1  
 Skrede Kari, Ovre Skogvei 12, Oslo 2  
 Strand Torodd, Fossasen 21, 5084 Tertnes  
 Thorsen Kirsten, 2632 Studentbyen Sogn, Oslo 8

Torgersen Ulf, Frysja 3, Oslo  
 Vaa Mariken, Inst. of Soc. Bodes 1096 Blindern, Oslo 3  
 Vogt Eduard D., P. O. Box 5001, Bergen  
 Voll Jnge Sigmund, Munthes Gt. 31, Oslo 2  
 Wigtil Steinar, 8350 Studbyen Sogn, Oslo 8

## POLAND

Adamczyk Maria, Zwirki i wigury 95/97, Warszawa  
 Adamska Helena, Grojecka 34 M 10, Warszawa  
 Adamski Wladyslaw, Grojecka 34 M 10, Warszawa  
 Balcerek Jozef, Rakoniecka 6, Warszawa  
 Baran Jozef, Centralna Szoia Partyjna, Bagatela 2, Warszawa  
 Barinik Maria, Krakow  
 Bejnarowicz Janisz, Warszawa  
 Bialecki Jan, Instytut Zachodnio-Pomorski, Szczecin  
 Bobinska-Los Maria, Koziatulskiego 8 M B, Warszawa  
 Boroicka-Arctowa Maria, Lobzowska 59M2, Krakow  
 Chalasinski Josef, Marszalkowska 10/16M19, Warszawa  
 Ciupak Zofia, Swietojanska 31ML, Warszawa  
 Czorba Helena, Moroiowska 26 M 64, Warszawa  
 Czorba Tibor, Mokotowska 26 M 64, Warszawa  
 Czerwinski Marcin, Sarbiewskiego ZML 13, Warszawa  
 Denek Emilia, Poznan  
 Depczynska Jadwiga, Langiewicza 17 M 330, Lublin  
 Depczybski Wlodzimierz, Warszawa  
 Dobieszewski Adolf, Warszawa  
 Dobkowolska Danuta, Solec 66 M 1, Warszawa  
 Doktor Kazimierz, Karmelska 15 M 41, Warszawa  
 Dulczewski Zygmunt, Grochowska 11, Poznan  
 Dyoniziak Ryszard, Gnielnienska 24/48, Krakow-Azory  
 Dziabata Stefan, Baszty 24 M 8, Warszawa  
 Falewicz Izabela, Lewartowskiego 4 M 4, Warszawa  
 Firkowska-Mankiewicz Anna, Warszawa  
 Galeski Boguslaw, Gonczewska 12 M 43, Warszawa  
 Garczorz Barbara, Mordzewskiego 19 M 3, Krakow  
 Gardowska Barbara, Warszawa  
 Garyga Boleslaw, Berenta 3 M 3, Wroctan  
 Gawron Witold, Warszawa  
 Gensek Jan, Putawska 24 M 5, Warszawa  
 Gulejko Leszek, Ministry of Higher Education, Warszawa  
 Gockowski Janusz, Vlanowskiego 2/4 M 20, Wroclaw  
 Golebiowski Bronislaw, Witeza 33 M 27, Warszawa  
 Gorski Jan, Warszawa  
 Gosikowski Zygmunt, Kosciuski 92/4, Lodz  
 Graczyk Josef, Anielewicza 31 M 94, Warszawa



- Gazerak Zdzislaw, Mickow 16, Warszawa  
 Halina Krisantka, Warszawa  
 Halpean Figeniusz, Grunwadzka Z8 M 94, Krakow  
 Henschke Kornel, Snezen 13, Sofia  
 Herco Czeslaw, Central High School Central Committee, Polish United  
 Party, Warszawa  
 Indisow Longin, Gdanska 74 M 35, Lodz  
 Indulski Janosz Anatol, Narutowicza 96, Lodz  
 Jagiello-Lystowa Eugenia, Al. Zwirki I Wigory 57 M 4, Warszawa  
 Jarosinska Maria, Opaczewska 22 M 15, Warszawa  
 Jakubczak Frantyszek, Juliana Bruna 22 M 167, Warszawa  
 Jalowiecki Bohdan, Skardi 9/13, Wroclaw  
 Janicki Janusz, Warszawa  
 Janiszewski Ludwik, Langiewicza 12/8, Szczecin  
 Jasiewicz Krzysztof, Mlynarska 37 M 41, Warszawa  
 Kacpura Zygmunt, Wilenska 21, Ostrow Mazowiecka  
 Kadzielska Krysztyna, Anielewieza 24 M 42, Warszawa  
 Kadzielski Jozef, Anielewieza 24 M 42, Warszawa  
 Kaspro Ewa, Arum Czerwonej 22 M 70, Katowice  
 Kijak Roman, Pl. Grunwaluzkiej 1 M 2, Szczecin  
 Kloskowska Antonina, Uniwersytecka 3, Lodz  
 Knobelsdorf Wlodzimierz, Sikorek 3, Katowice-Brynow  
 Kolarska Lena, Niegolewskiego 13 M 1, Warszawa  
 Komendeva Antoni, 3 Moja 3, Krakow  
 Komorowska Jadwiga, Polish Academy of Sciences, Warszawa  
 Koscianski Tadeusz  
 Kowalewska Salomea, Akacja 4, Lodz  
 Kowalewski Zdzislaw, Warszawa  
 Kowalski Stanislaw, Koscinaki 103 M 6, Poznan  
 Kozninski Andrzej, Warszawa  
 Krajewski Mieczyslaw, Marymoncka 34 Awf., Warszawa  
 Krawczyk Barbara, Marymoncka 34 M 26, Warszawa  
 Krawczyk Zbigniew, Marymoncka 34 M 26, Warszawa  
 Krys Alina, Wiosenna 6/19, Chorzow  
 Krys Roman, Wiosenna 6/19, Chorzow  
 Kubin Jerzy, Broniwoja 11 M 4, Warszawa  
 Kulpinska Jolanta, Kasprzaka 55 M 8, Lodz  
 Kurzynowski Adam, J. Bruna 6 M 30, Warszawa  
 Kwasnewicz Wladyslaw, Czarnowiejska 101 M 17, Krakow  
 Kwasniewski Krzysztof, Opole  
 Kwilecki Andrzej, Polish Academy of Sciences, Poznan  
 Lapinska Bozena, Swierczewskiego 68 M 46, Warszawa  
 Lewicka Maria, Swoboda 64 M 6, Poznan  
 Lobodzinska Barbara, Nowotni 23 M 34, Warszawa  
 Lopatka Adam, Czesnikowska 4 M 4, Poznan  
 Lutyk Aleksander, Paryska 37 M 7, Warszawa  
 Makarczyk Waclaw, Saska 44 M 46, Warszawa  
 Malanowski Jan, Opaczewska 21 M 4, Warszawa

Malewska Hanna, Londynska 12 M 16, Warszawa  
Malicka Wladyslawa, Sitkowskiego 6 M 2, Warszawa  
Malinowska Maria, Anielewicza 45 M 62, Warszawa  
Markiewicz Ludgarda, Utanska 18 M 8, Poznan  
Markiewicz Wladyslaw, Utanska 18 M 8, Poznan  
Marosek Boleslaw, Hibnera 9/6, Gdansk-Wrzeszcz  
Michalczyk Maria, Sosnowiec  
Mirowski Wlodzimierz, Warszawa  
Modzelewska Jadwiga, Bruna 28 M 31, Warszawa  
Morawski Witold, Ractawicka 142 M 81, Warszawa  
Mrozek Wanda, Drozdow 38, Katowice  
Narojek Winicjusz, Warszawa  
Nowak Stefan, Niemcewicz 7/9 M 99, Warszawa  
Nowakowska Elzbieta, Pl. Grunwaldzki 1 M 2, Szczecin  
Nowakowski Stefan, Sady Zoliborskie 5 M 4, Warszawa  
Nowicka Ewa, Koszykowa 3 M 41, Warszawa  
Olczyk Eugeniusz, K. Wojcika 2 M 46, Warszawa  
Ossowska Maria, Krasinskiego 16 M 32, Warszawa  
Ossowski Krzysztof, Nobla 23, Warszawa  
Owieczko Aleksander, Gorskiego 4 M 53, Warszawa  
Pacesna Halina, Pts. Krak. Przed M 3, Warszawa  
Paisek Ryszard, Judyma 56, Lublin  
Paszkiwicz Elzbieta, Krochmalna 2 M 502, Warszawa  
Paszko Helena, Ul. Lentza 2/119, Krakow  
Pawlowska Ija, Wierzbowa 38 M 48, Lods  
Piasek Roman, Judyma 91, Lublin  
Piekara Andrzej, Jasna I II P. P. 215 SIB, Warszawa  
Pieniazek Jolanta, Czerwonej Armii 38 M 7, Poznan  
Pilichowski Andrzej, 27 M 1, Lods  
Piotrowski Andrzej, Czerwonej Armii 4 M 14, Lods  
Piotrowski Jerzy, Filtrowa 62 M 75, Warszawa  
Piwowarski Wladyslaw, Szopena 27, Lublin  
Pohoski Michal, Felinskiego 27, Warszawa  
Podgorecki Adam, Krakowskie Przedmieście 3, Warszawa  
Przeclawski Krzysztof, Wilcza 63 M 37, Warszawa  
Pudelkiewicz Eugeniusz, Marymoncka 34, AWF, Warszawa  
Rajkiewicz Antoni, Warszawa  
Rebeta Jerzy, Lublin  
Rybincki Pawel, 18 Stycznia 61/7, Krakow  
Saar Elzbieta, I. N. K. F., Marymoncka 34, Warszawa  
Sarapata Adam, Osiedle przyjazn 172, Warszawa  
Sekulski Zbigniew, Sporna 76 M 20, Lods  
Sicinska Barbara, Potocka 37 M 1, Warszawa  
Sicinski Andrzej, Potocka 37 M 1, Warszawa  
Skeris Piotr, Lublin  
Słomczynski Kazimierz, Marchlewskiego 20 M 1312, Warszawa  
Skorzynski Zygmunt, Kasprowicza 54 M 40, Warszawa  
Sokolowska Magdalena, Kopernika 8/18 M 17, Warszawa



- Solecki Andrzej, Dzierzynskiego 19 M 13, Krakow  
Soterios Stawru, Okoze 30/36 M 35, Lods  
Staciwa Czeslaw, Kinowa 18 M 58, Warszawa  
Stanowski Adam, Al. Ractawickie 23 bl. 13 M 15, Lublin  
Stanowski Alina, Al. Ractawickie 23 bl. 13 M 15, Lublin  
Starega Joanna, Sady Zoliborskie 7 M 21, Warszawa  
Staszczan Zofia, Opole  
Stocki Orest, Polanki 64, DS 5, Gdansk — Oliwa  
Strzelecki Jan, Krasinskiego 18 M 94, Warszawa  
Strzeminska Helena, Buczka 8 M 23, Warszawa  
Sufin Zbigniew, Kobielska 62 M 15, Warszawa  
Swiecicki Andrzej, Narbutta 52 M 24, Warszawa  
Symonowicz Tomasz, Moja 3, Krakow  
Szacka Barbara, Lipowa 7 M 4, Warszawa  
Szacki Jerzy, Lipowa 7 M 4, Warszawa  
Szafnicki Krzysztof, Piotrkowska 24 M 13, Lods  
Szaniawski Klemens, Krasinskiego 42 M 41, Warszawa  
Szawiel Tadeusz, Anielewicz 30 M 21, Warszawa  
Szczepanski Jan, Hoza 40 M 65, Warszawa  
Szczepanska Eleonora, Hoza 40 M 65, Warszawa  
Szostak Krzysztof, Piotrkowska 24 M 134, Lods  
Sztompka Piotr, Jaracza 8/7, Krakow  
Sztomski Janusz, Jdrikowskiego 22 M 6, Torun  
Szymanska-Piotrowska Krystyna, Narotowicza 141 M 68, Lods  
Taras Piotr, Zeromskiego 6, Utwock  
Teodorczyk Hieronim, Mita 17 M 27, Warszawa  
Terech Janina, Niepodleglosci 130 M 17, Warszawa  
Trawinska Danuta, Warszawa  
Tulli Renata, Swietojanska 11 M 4, Warszawa  
Turowski Jan, Stawinskiego 13 M 14, Lublin  
Turski Ryszard, Kasprowicza 48 M 13, Warszawa  
Tyszka Andrzej, Kawowa 18, Inst. of Sociology, Warszawa  
Tyszka Krystyna, Kawowa 18, Inst. of Sociology, Warszawa  
Weber Barbara, Swierczewskiego 88/89 M 94, Warszawa  
Wejroch Michal, Warszawa  
Wesolowski Wlodzimierz, Juliana Bruna 10 M 32, Warszawa  
Wesolowska Maria, Juliana Bruna 10 M 32, Warszawa  
Wiatr Jerzy, Batorego 37 M 11, Warszawa  
Widerszpil Stanislaw, Hoza 29/31 M 4, Warszawa  
Wierzbicka Wanda, Niepodleglosci 130 M 17, Warszawa  
Wierzbicki Zbigniew, Niepodleglosci 130 M 17, Warszawa  
Wierzbicki Janusz, Niepodleglosci 130 M 17, Warszawa  
Wisniewski Wieslaw, Ghojecka 40 M 30, Warszawa  
Witkowski Kazimierz, Zbaraska 4 M 8, Warszawa  
Wohl Andrzej, Mickiewicza 23 M 39, Warszawa  
Woskowski Jan, Marynarska 18 M 9, Lods  
Wyrosiak Stanislaw, Mickiewicza 149 M 11, Szczecin  
Zagorski Krzysztof, Swierczewskiego 75 M 7, Warszawa

Zajczykowa Lidia, J. Dabrowskiego 84/90 M 108, Warszawa  
 Zechowski Zbigniew, Poznan  
 Zelazo Marek, Ogrodowiec 28 M 192, Lods  
 Ziolkowski Marek, Piotrkowska 24 M 13, Lods  
 Ziolkowski Janusz, Skarbka 23, Poznan  
 Zurn Marek, Batorego 29 M 161, Warszawa  
 Zygluski Kazimierz, M. Buczka 30 M 8, Lods

## PORTUGAL

Cruziero Maria Eduarda, R. Miguel Lupi 18-R. C., Lisboa 2  
 Marques Almeida Maria Alice, Junta Colonização Interna Rua do  
 Vale do Pereiro 2-3, Lisboa  
 Medeiros Soares Maria Candida, R. Ricardo Espírito Santo 8-4 E,  
 Lisboa  
 Miranda Jose David, R. Miguel Lupi 18-R. C., Lisboa 2  
 Negreiros Maria Augusta, R. Tenente Ferreira D. 33 3 G, Lisboa  
 Pacheco Pinheiro Maria Madalena, R. Cidade da Beira Lote 9-8  
 esq., Lisboa  
 Pereira de Moura João Maria, Rua do Sol ao Rato 102-2E, Lisboa  
 Seauera Maria Luisa, Direção G. Assistência Rato, Lisboa

## ROMANIA

Achim Mihiu, Cluj  
 Aluas Ion, Cluj  
 Anineanu Ioana, Str. Prof. I. Cantacuziano No 8, Bucarest  
 Apostol Adina, Str. Galati No 212 A, Bucarest  
 Apostol Pavel, Str. Galati No 212 A, Bucarest  
 Badina Ovidiu, Aleea Alexandru No 11, Bucarest  
 Bazac Dumitru, Str. M. Eminescu 47, Bucarest  
 Beraru Petru, Str. Ana Ipatescu No 44, Bucarest  
 Berlogea Octavian, Str. C. A. Rosetti No 25, Bucarest  
 Bogdan Ana, Str. Putul de Piatra No 31 A, Bucarest  
 Bogdan Tiberiu, Putul de Piatra No 31 A, Bucarest  
 Buruiana Gloria Doina, Str. M. Eminescu 47, Bucarest  
 Caramelea Vasile, Bd. Pacii No 94-100 Bl. 19 Et. I Ap. 86, Bucarest  
 Cazacu Agulin, Str. Bd. Garii de Nord No 6 Bloc A, Bucarest  
 Cernea Mihail, Str. Vulturilor No 25, Bucarest  
 Cîmpeanu Pavel, Str. Mihail Eminescu 47, Bucarest  
 Cîmpeanu Pavel, Str. Bd. Primaverii No 24, Bucarest  
 Ciocirlan Elena, Str. M. Eminescu 47, Bucarest  
 Clatici Olivia, Str. Bizet No 1, Bucarest  
 Cogan Ecaterina, M. Eminescu 47, Bucarest  
 Constantin Florea, Str. Aviator Protopopescu No 9, Bucarest  
 Constantinescu Miron, Calea Victoriei 125, Bucarest



Constantinescu Virgil, Bd. 1 Mai No 156, Bucarest  
Cosea Dumitru Mircea, Str. M. Eminescu 47, Bucarest  
Danian Natalia, Sociological Laboratory, Bucarest  
Datculescu Petre, Str. M. Eminescu 47, Bucarest  
Desmireanu Ion, Str. Corbeni No 30, Bucarest  
Dobrica Marian, M. Eminescu 47, Bucarest  
Dragan Ion, Bucarest  
Dumutrescu Lucia, Str. M. Eminescu 47, Bucarest  
Dumutru Nicolae, Str. Calea Grivitei No. 405 B, Bucarest  
Florea Elena, Bucarest  
Florea Georgeta, Str. Aviator Protopopescu Bl. C2, Bucarest  
Francisc Albert, Timisoara  
Gall Erno, Calea Victoriei 125 Casa Bellu, Bucarest  
Gerogescu Florian, Calea Victoriei 31, Bucarest  
Ghita Maria, Str. M. Eminescu 47, Bucarest  
Goldstein Emilian, Str. Dionisie Lupu No 40, Bucarest  
Goliat Ion, Str. Corbeni No 30, Bucarest  
Hoffman Oscar, Str. 13 Decembrie 25, Bucarest  
Ioanid Mircea, Bucarest  
Ion Petru, Str. M. Eminescu 47, Bucarest  
Ionescu Constantin, Bucarest  
Tordachel Ion, Str. 30 Decembrie No 9, Bucarest  
Karpinski Anton, Str. M. Eminescu 47, Bucarest  
Kepes Gheorghe, Str. Academiei No 35—37, Bucarest  
Lazar Maria, Str. M. Eminescu 47, Bucarest  
Lupu Justin, Str. Michail Eminescu 47, Bucarest  
Mahler Fred, Str. Kiselef No 24 A, Bucarest  
Mahler Rola, Str. Kiselef No 24 A, Bucarest  
Mamali Mihai Puiu Catalin, Str. Mihail Eminescu 47, Bucarest  
Marga Andrei, Str. M. Eminescu 47, Bucarest  
Marionescu Maria, Str. M. Eminescu 47, Bucarest  
Matei Ioan, Str. Izvor No 36, Bucarest  
Mazilu Dumitru, Calea Victoriei 125 Casa Bellu, Bucarest  
Mazilu Virgil, Splaiul Independentei 289, Bucarest  
Miscol Oltea, Str. M. Eminescu 47, Bucarest  
Moldovan Roman, Bd. Primavera No 37, Bucarest  
Necsulescu Lidia, Str. Schitu Magureanu No 25, Bucarest  
Negritoiu Valentina, Str. Giuseppe Garibaldi No 4, Bucarest  
Nicolescu Gheorghe, Str. M. Eminescu 47, Bucarest  
Nicuta Constantin, Str. Oslo No 4, Bucarest  
Nicuta Ileana, Str. Oslo No 4, Bucarest  
Nita Marin, Str. M. Eminescu 47, Bucarest  
Pantelimonescu Florin, Str. M. Eminescu 47, Bucarest  
Pinzaru Floarea, Str. Desrobirii No 16, Bucarest  
Pinzaru Petru, Str. Desrobirii No 16, Bucarest  
Roll-Metac Teofil, Str. M. Eminescu 47, Bucarest  
Rusu Stela, Str. N. Beloianis No 5, Bucarest  
Sandu Dumitru, Str. M. Eminescu 47, Bucarest

Schifirnet Constantin, Str. M. Eminescu 47, Bucarest  
 Secarus Maria, Str. M. Eminescu 47, Bucarest  
 Secarus Vasile, Str. M. Eminescu 47, Bucarest  
 Siletschi Mircea, Str. Elefterie 38 Secteur 6, Bucarest  
 Slama-Cazacu Tatiana, Rahovei 108, Bucarest  
 Springer Ecaterina, Str. M. Eminescu 47, Bucarest  
 Stahl Henri, Str. Haga No 9, Bucarest  
 Stahl Margareta, Str. Haga No 9, Bucarest  
 Stanoiu Andrei, Str. M. Eminescu 47, Bucarest  
 Steriade Stefania, Str. 13 Decembrie No 33, Bucarest  
 Strausser Raschela, Str. Bucsenesti No 22, Bucarest  
 Taigar Simion, Str. Pictor Iscovescu No 18, Bucarest  
 Toba Lucia, Str. M. Eminescu 47, Bucarest  
 Topa Leon, Str. Sold. Ambrozie 1 A Bl. DLB Sc. D., ap. 78, Bucarest  
 Trebici Chrisanta, Str. Pompiliu Eliade No 4, Bucarest  
 Trebici Vladimir, Str. Pompiliu Eliade No 4, Bucarest  
 Tulea Gitta, Str. Pictor Rosenthal No 30  
 Turcu Ion, Str. M. Eminescu 47, Bucarest  
 Varga Vidrica, Str. Judetului No 15, Bucarest  
 Varhegyi Stefan, Str. M. Eminescu 47, Bucarest  
 Velea Ioan, Aleea Bucseneni No 2, Bucarest  
 Vlad Constantin, Calea Victoriei 125 Casa Bellu, Bucarest  
 Vulcanescu Romulus, Str. Sighisoara No 18, Bucarest  
 Zara Mircea, Str. Dr. Atanase Demostene No 9, Bucarest  
 Zlate Camelia, Str. Aleea Rotunda No 4, Bl. H6 Sc. 8, ap. 37, Bucarest

## SPAIN

Alonso Isidoro, C/O Chat, Paseo de Gracia 11, Barcelona 7  
 Apacil Luis V., Pintor Lopez 1, Valencia 3  
 Beltran Miguel, C/O Chat, Paseo de Gracia 11, Barcelona 7  
 Cano Pedro, Arapiles 15, Madrid  
 Carrillo Montesinos Francisco J., Calle de Larios 1, Málaga  
 Cazorla Jose, C/O Chat, Paseo de Gracia 11, Barcelona 7  
 Costa de Carrillo Carmen, Calle de Lariosi, Málaga  
 De Miguel Armando, C/O Chat, Paseo de Gracia 11, Barcelona 7  
 Del Campo Salustiano, Juan Ramón Jiménez 9, Madrid 16  
 Duran Angles, C/O Chat, Paseo de Gracia 11, Barcelona  
 Gavia Mario, Escuela de Sociologie, Univ. de Madrid, Madrid  
 Gonzalez Seara Luis, Felix Boix 8, Madrid  
 Jimenez Jose, C/O Chat, Paseo de Gracia 11, Barcelona 7  
 Jover Guerra Carmen, Castillejos 21 4 Ext. A, Madrid 20  
 Lopez-Cepero Jose Mariano, Inst. de la Juventud, Marqués del Riscal  
 16, Madrid  
 Maestre Alfonso Juan, San Bernardo 109/8, Madrid 8  
 Marinez Maestro Victor, Castillejos 21 4 Ext. A, Madrid 20  
 Moya Valganon Carlos, Almirante 30, II D/Cha, Madrid 4



- Paramo J. M. Gonzalez, Confederación Española de Cajas de Ahorros, Alcalá 27, Madrid 14  
 Rodriguez Majon Luisa, San Bernardo 109/8, Madrid 8  
 Sanchez de la Torre Angel, Castello 118, Madrid 6  
 Torregrosa Jose Ramon, C/O Chat, Paseo de Gracia 11, Barcelona  
 Vidal-Beneyto Jose, Luis Muriel 8, Madrid 2

## SWEDEN

- Abrahamsson Bengt, Dept. of Sociology, Norrtullsg. 41, 11385 Stockholm  
 Altvall Lena, P. O. Box 3014, 13203 Saltsjö 80  
 Anderson Charles, Univ. of Umeå, Dept. of Sociology, Umeå  
 Andersson Bengt, Gylleholm 218, 223 59 Lund  
 Berglind Hans, Tyresövägen 317 122 36, Enskede, Stockholm  
 Berner Oste Mia, Västergat 7 A 411 23, Gothenburg  
 Bjömberg Ulla, Naktergalsg. 7, 42169 Gothenburg  
 Björkman Katarina, Fagelvägen 29, 19500 Marsta  
 Björkman Torsten, Fagelvägen 29, 19500 Marsta  
 Bohm Kerstin, Odenvägen 6 D, Upplands Vasby  
 Bondeson Ulla, Limhamnsväg 6 A, 21759 Malmö  
 Calais Sonja, Dept. of Sociology, Uppsala Univ., Drottninggatan I, Uppsala  
 Dahlgren Stefan, Stalbrogatan I, S-222 25 Lund  
 De Laval Gustaf, Kungsgatan 9B, S 4 II 19 Göteborg  
 Dencik Lars, Sofiaparken 3A, Lund  
 Enström Peter, Ulrikedal S 416, S 22358 Lund  
 Erikson Robert, Dept. of Sociology, Univ. of Stockholm, P. O. Box 6702,  
 113 85 Stockholm  
 Fallenius Ann Marie, Glasmästaregatan 22, Göteborg  
 Franden Olof, Bellmansgatan 42, Uppsala  
 Friberg Mats, Gibraltarg 82/115, 412 79 Göteborg  
 Fridsonsdottir Katrin, Ulrikedale 202, 223 58 Lund  
 Garmer Karin, Ulrikedal S 416, S 223 58 Lund  
 Gelin Gunnar, Studentstaden 14, Uppsala  
 Giliwik Linnea, Galonvägen 17, Bromma, Stockholm  
 Hedberg Magnus, Bodalsvägen 20 VII, 18136 Lidingö  
 Himmelstrand Ulf, Vaderkvarnsgatan 22B, Uppsala  
 Johansson Sten, Havrevägen 4, Uppsala  
 Karlsson Georg, Alidbacken 2 A, 902 Umeå  
 Karsten Eva, Svenska Vägen 10, Lund  
 Khalaf Alhadi, Sociology Inst. Getingevägen 8, Lund  
 Knocke Wuokko, 5 Ekvaegen, 13100 Nacka  
 Korpi Walter, Dept. of Sociology, Univ. of Stockholm, P. O. Box. 6702,  
 113 85 Stockholm  
 Kuhlhorn Eckart, Brunkebergsåsen 44, Sollentuna  
 Kuhlhorn Britt Marie, Brunkebergsåsen 44, Sollentuna  
 Lindberg Goran, Tinghogsvägen 50, 40 Lund  
 Lindgren Lena, Rattssociologiska Seminarier Fack., 22005 Lund 5

- Lundberg Dan, Valsgardev I, 16154 Stockholm  
 Lunden Sture, Svenska Sparbanksforeningen Fack., Stockholm 103 80  
 Magnusson Dan, Rattssociologiska Seminariet, Fack., 22005 Lund 5  
 Marklund Staffan, Axtorpsvagen 38 B, 902 34 Umea  
 Nasman Olle, Stipendiegrand 14 B, 902 40 Umea  
 Nelhans Bertil, Gotgatan 2, 411 05 Göteborg  
 Persson Rune, Dept. of Sociology, Univ. of Lund, Lund  
 Pfannenstill Bertil, Bredgatan 23, Lund  
 Rundblad Bengt, Von Dobelns Vag. 23, 44300 Lerum  
 Sellerberg Persson Ann Mari, Mollevangsvagen 7, Lund  
 Sigeman Ulla, Slojdgatan 8, Uppsala  
 Siksio Ola, Hospitalsgatan 9 A, 22353 Lund  
 Sjogren Olof, Ensittarvagen 15, 17500 Jakobsberg  
 Skogsberg Christina, Sandfjardsgatan 120 III, Johanneshov  
 Sotto Richard, Kamnarvag 7 G 113, 222 46 Lund  
 Styrborn Sven, Laduvagen 3, 75247 Uppsala  
 Swedner Harald, Mantalskroken 3, Lund  
 Tellenbach Sten Thomas Walter, Lilla Algatan 3A, 22350 Lund  
 Trost Jan, Dept. of Sociology, Uppsala Univ., Drottninggatan 1, Uppsala  
 Udovic Stjepan, Sturegatan 11 A, Uppsala  
 Wallden Marja, Skolov 7, Upplands Vasby  
 Warneryd Karl Erik, Karlavagen 64, Stockholm  
 Weibust Knut, Strakvagen 12, Solna  
 Werner Birgit, Drottning Kristinas Vag 63, 542 00 Mariestad  
 Westerlund Gunnar, Stockholm School of Economics, P. O. Box 6501,  
 113 83 Stockholm  
 Wiberg Hakan, Dag Hamm Vag 1 A, 22364 Lund  
 Yague Damaso, Sociologiske Inst., Jetingevagen 8, Lund

## SWITZERLAND

- Anmenn Ursula, Bellarivetrohe 6, 6000 Luzern  
 Atteslander P., Silbergasse 2, 2500 Biel  
 Bassand Michel, 41, Route de Loex, 1213-Onex  
 Beck Peter, Akad. Berufsberatung Hirschengraben, Zürich  
 Bridel Renee, 2, Chemin des Magnolias, Lausanne  
 Campiche Roland, Le Presbytère, 1249-Avully  
 Cassee Kitty, Grindelstr. 10, 8603 Hegnau  
 Chirot Daniel, C/O M. Albert Lamontagne, Macolin  
 Chirot Holley, C/O M. Albert Lamontagne, Macolin  
 Clematide Bruno, Sonnenstr. 12, 8580 Amriswil  
 Cockburn Christine, International Social Security Assoc., 24, Av. Ernest-  
 Pictet, Genève  
 Erard Maurice, 54, rue de Pierre-A. Mazel, Neuchâtel  
 Fricker Yves, Michel Serret 8, Genève  
 Girod Roger, Univ. de Genève, Genève  
 Gottraux Martial, Chemin Bois Murat 8, 1066 Epalinges



- Graggin Andreas, Bellerivetrohe 6, 6000 Lüzern  
 Günter Hans, International Inst. for Labour Studies, 154, Rue de Lausanne,  
 Genève  
 Gurny Ruth, Florastr. 14, 8006 Zürich  
 Held Thomas, Ekkehardstr. 17, 8006 Zürich  
 Henderson Maria, Str. Alban-Vorstadt 43, 4052 Basel  
 Hutmacher Walo, Service de la Recherche Sociologique, 63—65, Rue de  
 Lausanne, 1202 Genève  
 Inderbitzin Stephan, Weihemattstr. 49, 8902 Urdorf  
 Jaeger Carlo, Metzgergasse 57, Bern  
 Juchler Kobi, Schubertstr. 4, 6000 Lüzern  
 Luscher Kurt, Robinsonweg 10, CH 3006 Bern  
 Meylan Jean, Route du Signal 10, 1018-Lausanne  
 Miller Andreas, Zollikerstr. 27, 8008 Zürich  
 Morsink Hubert J. A., United Nations Office, Genève  
 Oertel Lutz, Haus zur Sage, 8555 Mullheim  
 Oetterli Jorg, Orl. Inst. Eth. Leonhardstr. 27, 8001 Zürich  
 Perrenoud Philippe, Boul. de la Forêt 45, 1012 Lausanne  
 Pina Carole, 9 Rue Cramer, 1702-Genève  
 Reich Richard, Falkenstr. 11, 8021 Zürich  
 Rodriguez Campoamor Hernan, 164 Intervil, 1261 Borex VD  
 Rotter Lucie, Bucheggstr. 35, 8037 Zürich  
 Rys Vladimir, Research and Document Service of the ISSA, 24 Av. Ernest  
 Pictet, 1203 Genève  
 Schindler Brigit, Wehrenbachhalde 4, 8053 Zürich  
 Siotis Jean, 58, Rue de Moillebeau, 1211-Genève  
 Stromberg Jérôme, World Health Organization Recs, 1211-Genève 27  
 Vuille Michel, Place Palud, 7, Lausanne  
 Walser Karin, C/O Herr Friedli, Scheuchzerstr. 36, 8006 Zürich  
 Walter Emil J., Rigrigrane 2, 8033 Zürich  
 Wegelin Jurg, Ahornweg 11, 3012 Bern  
 Windisch Uli, 52, Rue de Monthoux, Genève  
 Zacchia Carlo, Commission Economique pour l'Europe, Palais des Na-  
 tions, Genève  
 Ziegler Jean, 4, Route de Drize, Carouge, Genève

## USSR

- Abduslukurov Z., Novocheremushkinskaya 46, Moscow B-418  
 Abgarian Edward, Novo Ostankinskaya 46, Moscow  
 Abramova Larisa, 5 Krasnoarmeiski Z-7, Leningrad  
 Afanasiev Vladimir Grigorievich, Novocheremushkinskaya 46, Mo-  
 scow B-418  
 Afanasieva Iren, Bratska 23 D, Moscow  
 Aganbegyan Abel Gezevich, Prospekt Nauki 17, Novosibirsk 90  
 Aianitzki Oleg, Smolenski Bulvar 13 AN 8, Moscow  
 Aistova Liudmila, Nab. Makarova 4, Leningrad

- Alexandrov V. S., Novocheremushkinskaya 46, Moscow B-418  
 Alexeevskaya Ostolina, Tankovskoy 3/31, Kiev  
 Alperovich O. N., Novocheremushkinskaya 46, Moscow B-418  
 Aminova Galina Alexandrovna, Novocheremushkinskaya 46, Moscow  
 B-418  
 Amvrosov Anatoli, Novocheremushkinskaya 46, Moscow B-418  
 Andreev Igor Leonidovich, Prospekt Stroitelei 11, Vladimir  
 Andreeva G. Mikhailovna, Prospekt Marxa 18, Moscow  
 Antosenkov Evgeny, Prospekt Nauki 17, Novosibirsk 90  
 Apostol Alexandr, Dimitrov 8/2, Kishinev  
 Arab-Ogly Edward Arturovich, Kolpachny 9 A, Moscow K-9  
 Arlov Anatol Vadimovich, Stanislavsky Str. 3/34, Kiev  
 Arnoldov A. I., Volhonka Str. 14, Moscow G-19  
 Artemov Victor Andreevich, Prospekt Nauki 17, Novosibirsk 90  
 Arutyunian Yuri, Ul. Dm. Ulianova 19, Moscow  
 Atmane Maya, Novocheremushkinskaya 46, Moscow B-418  
 Avrorin V. A., Nab. Makarova 4, Leningrad  
 Bacheira Yuri, Jzin Pr. 123/1, Moscow  
 Babinsev V., Novocheremushkinskaya 46, Moscow B-418  
 Bagramov A. A., Novocheremushkinskaya 46, Moscow B-418  
 Bagramov Eduard, Leningradski Pr. 49, Moscow  
 Bagrinovsky Kirill, 44 Morskoi Av. ap. 21, Novosibirsk 90  
 Baimbetov Alexandr, R. Zorge 28/1 Ufa  
 Balkev German, 2 Komsomolska, 12—46 Leningrad  
 Baller A. B., Volhonka Str. 14, Moscow G-19  
 Barkovskaya Alexandra, Stoliarni Per. 1/11 ap. 26, Moscow  
 Baskakov Nikolai Alexandrovich, Marx-Engels Av. 1/14, Moscow  
 Baskina A. G., Novocheremushkinskaya 46, Moscow B-418  
 Belashenko Tom, Sadovaya Str. 18, Moscow  
 Belenki Vasil, Kulsheva 14, Krasnoyarsk  
 Beliaeva Galina, 3 Karachavskaya 16 ap. 22, Moscow  
 Bedkon Alla Tarasovna, Lipski Pereulok 3/8, Kiev  
 Bertagaev T., Research Institute of Linguistics, Marx- Engels Str. 1/14, Moscow  
 Bestuzhev-Lada Igor Vasilievich, Novocheremushkinskaya 46, Moscow  
 B-418  
 Bikova Sofia, Cheremushkinska 47, Moscow  
 Blinov Nikolai, Novocheremushkinskaya 46, Moscow B-418  
 Bogatyrev Ivan Demidovich, Novocheremushkinskaya 46, Moscow B-418  
 Borisova Ludmila, P. Nauki 17, Novosibirsk 90  
 Borodkin Friedrich M., Prospekt Nauki 17, Novosibirsk 90  
 Braguinski V., Marx Av. 18, Moscow  
 Brusskov Vladimir, Novocheremushkinskaya 46, Moscow B-418  
 Burlatski Feodor Mikhailovich, Novocheremushkinskaya 46, Moscow  
 B-418  
 Changli Irina, Novocheremushkinskaya 46, Moscow B-418  
 Cheboksarov N. W., Dm. Ulianov Str. 19, Moscow  
 Chenev Venedikt, Novocheremushkinskaya 46, Moscow B-418  
 Cherkasov Sergey, River Moyka 79/6, Leningrad



- Cherpinski N. V., Novocheremushkinskaya 46, Moscow B-418  
 Chestopal Atanasi, Gotvald 14, Moscow  
 Dashdamirov Afrand, Baku-10 Nezamy 137, 27, Baku  
 Davidov Georgi, Pr. Mira 110/2, ap. 253, Moscow  
 Davidovich Jan, Lomonosovski Pr. 16, ap. 253, Moscow  
 Davidovich Vsevolod, Novocheremushkinskaya 46, Moscow B-418  
 Desheriev Unus Desherievich, Marx-Engels Str. 1/14, Moscow G-19  
 Desherieva Tamara, Novocheremushkinskaya 46, Moscow B-418  
 Dezingin Yuri, Sadovaya Str. 18, Moscow  
 Diligenski G. G., Yaroslavskaya 13, Moscow  
 Dyachkova Nelly, N. Danchenko Str. 32/21, Lvov 11  
 Dmitriev Yuri, Chugunnaya 94, Leningrad  
 Dobrinina Valentina, Novocheremushkinskaya 46, Moscow B-418  
 Dobrovolskaya Natalia, Rue Machtakova 55, ap. 54, Moscow  
 Dolgova Asalia, Zvenigorodskaya, Moscow  
 Drobyzheva Lidia, Dm. Ulianov Str. 19, Moscow  
 Dzunusov M. S., Volhonka Str. 14, Moscow G-19  
 Eavaltseva Ialina, Novo Izmaylovski 16, Leningrad  
 Epstein Lev, Novocheremushkinskaya 46, Moscow B-418  
 Eremeev B. I., Novocheremushkinskaya 46, Moscow B-418  
 Ermolenko Dmitri Vladimirovich, Pr. Kalinina 40-32, Moscow  
 Erofeev Alexi, Maleregnar 31, Moscow  
 Erofeeva Natalia, Novopeschanaya 23, ap. 167  
 Fadeev Vladimir, Kolhoznaya Str. 25, fl. 43, Vladivostok  
 Fadeeva Larisa Alexeevna, Marlauka 4/1, Kharkov  
 Fedoseev Piotr Nikolaevich, Novocheremushkinskaya 46, Moscow B-418  
 Filin Ph., Dm. Ulianov Str. 19, Moscow  
 Filipov F. R., Novocheremushkinskaya 46, Moscow B-418  
 Filipov G. G., Novocheremushkinskaya 46, Moscow B-418  
 Firsov Boris Maximovich, Nab. Makarova 4, Leningrad  
 Fislenko Lidia, Vaviloka 44, Moscow  
 Freizer Fergis, Novocheremushkinskaya 46, Moscow B-418  
 Frolov Stanislav, Novocheremushkinskaya 46, Moscow B-418  
 Galkin Alexandr Abramovich, Novocheremushkinskaya 46, Moscow B-418  
 Gegeshidze Michail Kirilovich, Dzerzhinskogo Str. 8, Tbilisi  
 Gelyuta Alexandra Maximovna, Novocheremushkinskaya 46, Moscow  
 B-418  
 Geushev Z. B., Inst. of Philosophy and Law, Baku  
 Giltzova Tamara, Malaya Astronomovskaya 63, Moscow  
 Glagolev V. F., Novocheremushkinskaya 46, Moscow B-418  
 Glezerman Grigori Efimovich, Novocheremushkinskaya 46, Moscow  
 B-418  
 Gogoliuhin S. R., Lenin Str. 46, Sverdlovsk  
 Gomerov Igor, Krasny Pr. 2, Novosibirsk  
 Goncharenko Nikolai Vasilievich, ul. Kirova 4, Kiev  
 Gordienko Anatoli, Novocheremushkinskaya 46, Moscow B-418  
 Gorelov Vadim, Leningradskoe Shosse 104, ap. 263, Moscow  
 Goryachenko Elisaveta, P. Nauki 17, Novosibirsk 90

- Guseva Ludmila, Dovatora 6/6 ap. 11, Moscow  
Grachov Stanislav, Dm. Ulianov 3, ap. 106, Moscow  
Grazhdannikov Evgeny, Pr. Nauki 17, Novosibirsk 90  
Gretski Milya Nikolaevich, Marx Av. 18, Moscow  
Grigoriev Vasil, Gorki 9, Moscow  
Grishchenko Kiril, Limferpol Str. 9/23, Kiev  
Grushin Boris Andreevich, Novocheremushkinskaya 46, Moscow B-418  
Gubyani Aleksii, Rustaveli 25, Tbilisi  
Guboglo Mikhail Nikolaevich, Dm. Ulianov Str. 19, Moscow  
Gugushvili P. V., Novocheremushkinskaya 46, Moscow B-418  
Gusev Boris, Lenin Str. 45/24, Barnaul  
Harchev Anatoli Georgievich, Nab. Makarova 4, Leningrad  
Harulin Felix, K. Marx 5/A, Ufa  
Hasanov B., Kirov Str. 136, Alma-Ata  
Horbashova Yalina, Serbitenko Str. 50, Kharkov  
Horoshavna Svetlana, Geodezicheskaya 19, kv. 36, Novosibirsk  
Ikonitski Yuri, Novocheremushkinskaya 46, Moscow B-418  
Ikonnikova G. I., Novocheremushkinskaya 46, Moscow B-418  
Ilyashenko T. P., Pirogov Str. 25, Kishinev  
Isaev Alexandr, Vipolzov Per. 10, ap. 74, Moscow  
Iskenderov Akhmet Akhmetovich, Kolpachny 9A, Moscow K-9  
Istoshin Igor, 14 Solnechnogorskaya Str., ap. 20, Novosibirsk 55  
Ivanov Afanasi, Sato 2, Riga  
Jacura Vladimir, Krakovska Str. 30/9, Lvov 6  
Jancher Victor, Krasnoarmeyskaya 134, fl. 16, Kiev  
Jazykova Valentina, Novocheremushkinskaya 46, Moscow B-418  
Jegorichev Alexandr, Ordshenikidze 12/14, Kharkov  
Jegorova Tatiana, Lenin 44/35, Kharkov  
Judin Valeri, Novocheremushkinskaya 46, Moscow B-418  
Juristovski Alexey Ivanovich, Listopadnaya 2/11, Lvov  
Kadrina Ludmila, Pebenko 30, ap. 96, Moscow  
Kaltachan V. F., Novocheremushkinskaya 46, Moscow B-418  
Kaminskaya S. N., Zvenigorodskaya 22, Moscow  
Kanaeva Irina, Novocheremushkinskaya 46, Moscow B-418  
Karapetyan R., Novocheremushkinskaya 46, Moscow B-418  
Kardobovski Oleg, Novocheremushkinskaya 46, Moscow B-418  
Karlenko Valentina, Egorov Str. 8, fl. 12, Jirovograd  
Kasagachina Nina, Novocheremushkinskaya 46, Moscow B-418  
Katagoschina N. A., Marx-Engels Av. 1/14, Moscow  
Katkova Irina, Novocheremushkinskaya 46, Moscow B-418  
Katrish Irene, K-104 Malaya Bronnaya 18, 521, Moscow  
Kazimirchuk Vladimir Petrovich, Frunze Str. 11, Moscow  
Kelle Vladislav Zhanovich, Volhonka 14, Moscow G-19  
Kerimov Dzanfir Abasovich, Novocheremushkinskaya 46, Moscow B-418  
Kharchev Anatol, Novocheremushkinskaya 46, Moscow B-418  
Khmelko Valeri, Lomonosova 21/14, fl. 29, Kiev 127  
Kistanyan S. L., Novocheremushkinskaya 46, Moscow B-418  
Klemenchuk V. N., Kirova 5, Kiev



- Kochetov Georgi Mikhailovich, Pr. Nauki 21, Novosibirsk 90  
Kokorev Ivan, Gotvald 10, Moscow  
Kon Igor Semenovich, Nab. Makarova 4, Leningrad  
Kondratovich Nina, Kazanskaya 30, 8, Leningrad  
Kondzelka Vladimir, Elektricheskaya Str. 7A/4, Lvov  
Konikov I. A., Volhonka Str. 14, Moscow B-418  
Konoplev Victor Kirilovich, Novocheremushkinskaya 46, Moscow B-418  
Konstantinov Feodor Timofeevich, Volhonka Str. 14, Moscow  
Konstantinov Feodor Vasilievich, Frunze 11, Moscow  
Konstantinov Igor, Omskaya 12, Leningrad  
Konstantinovski David Lvovich, Pr. Nauki 17, Novosibirsk 90  
Korchanov Vladimir, Lepse 57, fl. 93, Kiev  
Koriaeva Valentina, Kremliovskaya 1, fl. 34, Moscow  
Korletyanu Nikolai, Pirogov Str. 65, Kishinev  
Koros tilov J. M., Novocheremushkinskaya 46, Moscow B-418  
Korostelyov G., Lenin Str. 64, Sverdlovsk  
Kosechev Anatoli, Marx Av. 18, Moscow G-19  
Kosolapov V. V., Kirov Str. 4, Kiev  
Kostakov Vladimir, Novocheremushkinskaya 46, Moscow B-418  
Kostanion Sergey, Novocheremushkinskaya 46, Moscow B-418  
Kovaliev Vladimir, Sadovaya Str. 18, Moscow  
Kovaliov A. G., Kuznetzovska Str. 44 C 83, Leningrad  
Kozlova Elena, Chelkovo 3, Moscow  
Kozlov B., Dm. Ulianov Str. 19, Moscow  
Kozlov Vasili Ivanovich, Novocheremushkinskaya 46, Moscow B-418  
Krasin Georgi, Novocheremushkinskaya 46, Moscow B-418  
Krivosheina Margarita, Pushkinska Str. 162-5, Igevs  
Kudinova Antonina, Novocheremushkinskaya 46, Moscow B-418  
Kudinova Antonina, Novocheremushkinskaya 46, Moscow B-418  
Kulakov Victor, Novocheremushkinskaya 46, Moscow B-418  
Kulichenko Mihail, Novocheremushkinskaya 46, Moscow B-418  
Kulinchenko Galina, Sibirski Pr. 16, fl. 24, Kazan  
Kulikova Irina, Volhonka Str. 14, Moscow G-19  
Kutarjevski Grigori, Junosti 56, fl. 38, Moscow  
Kutikev Boris, P. Nauki 17, Novosibirsk  
Kutyriov Boris, 30 Molodiozh boul., fl. 14, Novosibirsk 55  
Kvachahia Verona Mihailovich, Chavchavadze Av. 1, Tbilisi  
Kvasov Grigori Grigorievich, Novocheremushkinskaya 46, Moscow  
B-418  
Kvelte R. A., Rainisa boul. 19, Moscow  
Kuzirev Alexander, Birnzova 8, fl. 223, Moscow  
Lazetin Dimitri, Maltvin 51, Moscow  
Lapin N. I., Novocheremushkinskaya 46, Moscow B-418  
Laptenok Sergey, Lenin Str. 96, Minsk  
Larmin O. V., Marx Av. 18, Moscow  
Leonavichus Uri, Skodda 32/1, Kaunas  
Lesohina Luisia, Nab. Makarova 4, Leningrad  
Lesovski Vladimir, Leningrad  
Levin Boris, Novocheremushkinskaya 46, Moscow B-418

- Levkovich Valentina, Fisi Kutuzovski Pr. 24/24, Moscow  
Lisichkin Genadi, Novocheremushkinskaya 46, Moscow B-418  
Litvyakov P. P., I Horoshevskaya 3, Moscow  
Lopatkin R. A., Novocheremushkinskaya 46, Moscow B-418  
Lubashevski Yuri, Usievish 11, Moscow  
Lyascheno Liudmila, Prospekt Nauki 17, Novosibirsk 90  
Machalov Victor, Novocheremushkinskaya 46, Moscow B-418  
Maximenko A. M., Kazakova Str. 18, Moscow  
Malinin Evgeni, P. Nauki 17, Novosibirsk 90  
Malshev Vasil, K 37 Somolshi, fl. 100, Derm  
Mamaeva K. N., Rainisa Str. 19, Riga  
Mankovski B. S. Novocheremushkinskaya 46, Moscow B-418  
Mansurov Nikolai, Novocheremushkinskaya 46, Moscow B-418  
Mansurov Vavi, Derendaeva 52, Kirov  
Marahov V. G., Nab. Makarova 4, Leningrad  
Marshak Arkadi, Neopolinovski 14, ap. 9, Moscow  
Markarjan M., Novocheremushkinskaya 46, Moscow B-418  
Maslov Paul, 15 Cshtajnovski, Moscow  
Matzkovski Mihail, Parkova 42, ap. 74, Moscow  
Matveev Benedikt, Gorki 11, Moscow  
Mazur V. N., Kirov Str. 4, Kiev  
Mazurov V. F., Novocheremushkinskaya 46, Moscow B-418  
Melnikova N. I., Novocheremushkinskaya 46, Moscow B-418  
Menshikova M. N., Novocheremushkinskaya 46, Moscow B-418  
Mihailovskaya I. B., Novocheremushkinskaya 46, Moscow B-418  
Mileykovski V., Novocheremushkinskaya 46, Moscow B-418  
Mitin Mark B., Novocheremushkinskaya 46, Moscow B-418  
Mitrofanov Valeri, Akorna 8, Moscow  
Mochulskaja Tamara, Tolyatti 15, A/11, Sverdlovsk  
Modrzhinskaya Elena D., Volhonka Str. 14, Moscow G-19  
Moiseev Afanasi, 10/1 Prospekt 4/10, Moscow  
Mokronosov N., Novocheremushkinskaya 46, Moscow B-418  
Mokronosov G. V., Pervomaiskaya 91, Sverdlovsk  
Momdzhan H. N., Novocheremushkinskaya 46, Moscow B-418  
Morozov Victor, Central 15/32, Leningrad  
Moskvichev Svyatoslav, Kirov Str. 4, Kiev  
Moskvichov Lev N., Novocheremushkinskaya 46, Moscow B-418  
Motroshilova Nelly, Volhonka 14, Moscow G-19  
Mozhin Yuri, Sadovaya Str. 18, Moscow  
Muhachev Vladimir, Lenin 81/15, Sverdlovsk  
Myaya V. I., Novocheremushkinskaya 46, Moscow B-418  
Nakarchuk Stepan, Franco Str. 157A/43, Lvov  
Naumova Nina, Novocheremushkinskaya 46, Moscow B-418  
Navasardov S., Novocheremushkinskaya 46, Moscow B-418  
Nazimov I. N., Kirov Str. 4, Kiev  
Neigoldberg V. Y., Novocheremushkinskaya 46, Moscow B-418  
Neresova Elena, Novocheremushkinskaya 46, Moscow B-418  
Nikitinski V. I., Kutuzovski Pr. 23, Moscow  
Nikolski L. B., Novocheremushkinskaya 46, Moscow B-418



- Nitoburg N. L., Dm. Ulianov Str. 19, Moscow  
Nordshev Andrey, Novocheremushkinskaya 46, Moscow B-418  
Nosik Elena, Demiana Bednitcho 20, Moscow  
Novikov A. D., Kasakov Str. 18, Moscow  
Novikov Nikolai, Novatora 40, Moscow  
Ochrimenko Veniamin, Moscow  
Oinus Edward, Unosti 6, Moscow  
Okulov A. S., Novocheremushkinskaya 46, Moscow B-418  
Okulov Sergey, St. Stakanovcev 10 3 100, Leningrad  
Olesnevitsch Ljubomir, Lvov  
Olshanski Vadim, Novocheremushkinskaya 46, Moscow B-418  
Osipov Genadi, Novocheremushkinskaya 46, Moscow B-418  
Osipova Elena, Novocheremushkinskaya 46, Moscow B-418  
Ostroverkh V. N., Franko Str. 22/24, 20, Kiev 30  
OvjKarenko Vasil, Chapaev 76, Minsk  
Pankratova M., Dm. Ulianov Str. 19, Moscow  
Parigin Boris, Pragskaj 37 K 3 K 221, Leningrad F 236  
Pasko Nina, Sodchich Str. 34 335, Kiev  
Patrushev Vasili, 38, Tereshkova Str., fl. 12, Novosibirsk 72  
Pavlova U. M., Novocheremushkinskaya 46, Moscow B-418  
Perederj V. F., Novocheremushkinskaya 46, Moscow B-418  
Perehvatova Elena, Onscalova 21, ap. 34, Moscow  
Petrov Igor, Novocheremushkinskaya 46, Moscow B-418  
Petrov N., Novocheremushkinskaya 46, Moscow B-418  
Petrova-Averieva Yulia, Dm. Ulianov Str. 19, Moscow  
Pilipenko N. V., Novocheremushkinskaya 46, Moscow B-418  
Platonov K. K., Volhonka Str. 14, Moscow G-19  
Platonova E., Olga Shilina 88, 79, Novosibirsk 5  
Plotinski I. V., Novocheremushkinskaya 46, Moscow B-148  
Plotnikov S. N., Novocheremushkinskaya 46, Moscow B-418  
Pogostin Victor, B-313 Kravchenko 4-3-47, Moscow  
Poliakov Iliia, Malaya Ekaterinovskaya 12, ap. 11, Moscow  
Poltoranova Galina, Tavricheskaya 2-265, Leningrad C-15  
Popov Mark, Novocheremushkinskaya 46, Moscow B-418  
Popov S. I., Novocheremushkinskaya 46, Moscow B-418  
Popova Irina, Kirov Str. 4, Kiev  
Prechin Mihail, Bolshaya Filebskaya, Moscow  
Predvechniy G., Novocheremushkinskaya 46, Moscow B-418  
Prianishnikov Nikolai, Tchanaevski Per. 16, ap. 6, Moscow  
Prigozhin Arkadi, Neopolinovski 14, ap. 9, Moscow  
Provolotskaja N. F., Pr. Nauki 17, Novosibirsk 90  
Puzik Vasiliy Maksimovich, Novocheremushkinskaya 46, Moscow B-418  
Rabbot Boris Semenovich, Novocheremushkinskaya 46, Moscow B-418  
Raikova Dina, Novocheremushkinskaya 46, Moscow B-418  
Ratinov Alexandr, Zvenigorodskaya 22, Moscow  
Retirov Anatoili, Novorezanskaya 16, ap. 76, Moscow  
Rgoshev Konstantin, Papanina Str. 5, Flat 84, Sverdlovsk  
Rodzinskaya Irina, Novocheremushkinskaya 46, Moscow B-418  
Roustein Hairov, Beliaeva Bogordok, ap. 134, Moscow

- Rumyantsev Aleksei Matveevich, Novocheremushkinskaya 46, Moscow B-418
- Rutberg N., Novocheremushkinskaya 46, Moscow B-418
- Rutkevich Michail Nikolaevich, Ul. Lenina 51, Sverdlovsk
- Rutkovskiy G. A., Novocheremushkinskaya 46, Moscow B-418
- Ryabinova Irene, Babushkina Str. 20, Fl. 70, Leningrad
- Ryazanzeva Marge, Novocheremushkinskaya 46, Moscow B-418
- Ryvkina Rozalina, B. Zhemchuzhnaia Str., ap. 8, Novosibirsk 90
- Sakada Nikolay Anisimovitski, Yanvarskoye Vosstanie 27/B/10, Kiev
- Saronov Vadim, Voevodina 9, ap. 9, Moscow
- Sbitova L. S., Volhonka Str. 14, Moscow G-19
- Serbakov Alexandr Ivanovich, Krasny Prospect 54, Novosibirsk
- Sheremet Irina Ivanova, Derevyanko 64/65, 52, Kharkov
- Shevejakov Vladimir, Novocheremushkinskaya 46, Moscow B-418
- Shernisch Leonard, Novocheremushkinskaya 46, Moscow B-418
- Seitov Alexandr, Bolshaja Cherkizovskaya 8, Ap. 42, Moscow
- Semashko Alexandr, Novocheremushkinskaya 46, Moscow B-418
- Semenov Vadim Sergeevich, Novocheremushkinskaya 46, Moscow B-418
- Sennikova Lilie, 8-Marta 142-32, Sverdlovsk
- Serebryannaya Elena, Frunze Str. 11, Moscow
- Sergeiev A. V., Novocheremushkinskaya 46, Moscow B-418
- Sergienko Elena, Engelsa 17/7, Kiev
- Sevastianov Ivan, Frunzenska 76, Monsh
- Sevastianov Leonid Ivanovich, Pr. Nauki 17, Novosibirsk 90
- Shereshenko L. A., Volhonka Str. 14, Moscow B-418
- Shilikide Ansor, Novocheremushkinskaya 46, Moscow
- Shtirmer Dvoira, 8 Solnechnogorskaia Str., ap. 20, Novosibirsk 55
- Shubkin Vladimir Nikolaevich, Novocheremushkinskaya 46, Moscow B-418
- Shyparov Arsen, Novocheremushkinskaya 46, Moscow B-418
- Sidorov Nikolai Andreevich, Novocheremushkinskaya 46, Moscow B-418
- Sikov Pavel, Novocheremushkinskaya 46, Moscow B-418
- Silschenko Tamara, P. Nauki 17, Novosibirsk 90
- Sharatan O. I., Novocheremushkinskaya 46, Moscow B-418
- Smirnov A., Novocheremushkinskaya 46, Moscow B-418
- Smirnov Vasil, Novocheremushkinskaya 46, Moscow B-418
- Sohan Lidia Vasilevna, Ul. Kirova 4, Kiev
- Sokolovski Leonid, 2 Karetnikovski 7, ap. 5, Moscow
- Solovev Nikola, Garialo 3, Vilnus
- Solovjov N., Soviet Sociological Association, Moscow
- Souvorov Lev Nikolaevich, Novocheremushkinskaya 46, Moscow B-418
- Starushenko Gleb Borisovich, Novocheremushkinskaya 46, Moscow B-418
- Stepanian Katar, Novocheremushkinskaya 46, Moscow B-418
- Steshenko V. S., 5 Rov Str. 4, Kiev
- Stupnitski Sergei, Chereshnevaya Str. 1, Lvov
- Suhanov Lev, Novocheremushkinskaya 46, Moscow B-418
- Suharev A. J., Novocheremushkinskaya 46, Moscow B-418



- Suimenko Evgeni, Gagarin Str. 28, ap. 95, Dnepropetrovsk  
 Tadener Juri, Kievskaya Str. 16, ap. 1, Harkov  
 Talalay Victor, Leningrad  
 Teliatnikova Emilia, Novocheremushkinskaya 46, Moscow B-418  
 Ter-Grigorian Eliko, Pervosnaska 6, Moscow  
 Terenteva Ludmila, Dm. Ulianov 19, Moscow  
 Tihonovich Alexander, Vasilevskaya Str. 15/76, Kiev  
 Timorin Arkadi, Tuhachevski Str. 161, Moscow  
 Tyushkevich S. A., Novocheremushkinskaya 46, Moscow B-418  
 Tokarovski Georg, Fakoultetski Pek. 3, ap. 177, Moscow  
 Tolshv Vladimir, Sportivman 5, Moscow  
 Toshenko Georg, Uritzki 24, Krasnodarsk  
 Trapeznikov G., Dm. Ulianov Str. 19, Moscow  
 Treskova S. I., Marx-Engels 1/14, Moscow  
 Troitski Stanislav, Lenina 32, Sverdlovsk  
 Tyushkevich S. A., Novocheremushkinskaya 46, Moscow B-418  
 Ugrinovich D. M., Marx Av. 18, Moscow  
 Urlanis Boris, Volhonka Str. 14, Moscow G-19  
 Ustinov V. A., Novocheremushkinskaya 46, Moscow B-418  
 Valentinova Natalia, Novocheremushkinskaya 46, Moscow B-418  
 Vasilenko V. A., Novocheremushkinskaya 46, Moscow B-418  
 Vasileva Irina, Novocheremushkinskaya 47, Moscow  
 Vasilev V. G., Novocheremushkinskaya 46, Moscow B-418  
 Vaskin Vasil, Mayakovski Str. 15A/8A, Lvov 5  
 Vellamma Aida, Fratuse 18/15, Tallin  
 Vernikov Marat, Engels Str. 27, fl. 2, Lvov  
 Vischnevski Yuri, Parkovaya 3 30, N. Tagl  
 Vodolatchina Alla, Vorobiovske Chosse 5, ap. 287  
 Voinova Vera, Serafimovitcha 2, ap. 399, Moscow  
 Volkov Genrih, Novocheremushkinskaya 46, Moscow B-418  
 Volkov Yuri, Novocheremushkinskaya 46, Moscow B-418  
 Voronkov Yuri, Ul. Mira 120, ap. 323, Moscow  
 Voronov Yuri, 21 Morskoi Av., fl. 9, Novosibirsk 72  
 Vygorova Aida, Novocheremushkinskaya 46, Moscow B-418  
 Vasirikov Oleg, Lisienko 3/5A, Lvov  
 Yadov V. A., Novocheremushkinskaya 46, Moscow B-418  
 Yakovlev A. M., Kutuzovski 23, Moscow  
 Yankova Zoya, Novocheremushkinskaya 46, Moscow B-418  
 Yurkevich N., Novocheremushkinskaya 46, Moscow B-418  
 Zaitzeva Maria, Novocheremushkinskaya 46, Moscow B-418  
 Zamoshkin Yuri, Novocheremushkinskaya 46, Moscow B-418  
 Zaslavskaya Tatiana, 32 Morskoi Av., fl. 4, Novosibirsk  
 Zborovskii Harold, Posadskaya 47/59, Sverdlovsk  
 Zdravomislov A. G., Nab. Makarova 4, Leningrad  
 Zelenkov Boris, Gorkogo 65/A, Moscow  
 Zentchov Iliia, Novocheremushkinskaya 46, Moscow B-418  
 Zenkovski Eugeni, Bernadskogo 99, Moscow  
 Zhemanov Oleg, Novocheremushkinskaya 46, Moscow B-418

Zhilin P. A., Novocheremushkinskaya 46, Moscow B-418  
 Zhuravlev Vitalii, Moscow  
 Zlobin Nal, Novocheremushkinskaya 46, Moscow B-418  
 Zvorikin Anatolii, Novocheremushkinskaya 46, Moscow B-418  
 Zykov P., Novocheremushkinskaya 46, Moscow B-418

## YUGOSLAVIA

Athic Miroslav, Studentski Prg 19, Beograd  
 Buric Olivera, Narodnog Fronta 45 Idn., Beograd X  
 Dzinic Firdus, Inst. of Social Sciences Univ., Narodnog Fronta 45, Idn.,  
 Beograd  
 Franjo Kozul, Dure Salaja 11, Sarajevo  
 Gaber Stevan, Faculté de Droit, Skopie  
 Ibrahimasic Mensur, Bulevar Lenina 55, Beograd  
 Janicijevic Miloslav, Neznanog Junaka 21 B, Beograd  
 Jasna Klara, Juricic, Kralja Jomislava 36 III, Sarajevo  
 Jerovsek Janez, Stara Cesta 16, Kranj  
 Jovan Ristovic, Vukova 10, Zemun  
 Jusic Bozo, Gunduliceva 49, Zagreb  
 Kirn Andrey, Ul. Stare Pravde 7, Ljubljana  
 Klinar Peter, Ilirska 4, Ljubljana  
 Kostic Cvetko, Trebinjska 24, Beograd  
 Kozic Petar, Marka Oreskovicica 4, Nis  
 Lukic Radomir, Fac. of Law, Univ. of Beograd, Suroborska 17, Beograd  
 Markovic Danilo, Ekonomski Fakultet, Nis  
 Maystorovic Stevan, Nebojina, Beograd  
 Mectedovic Sefko, Palmira Tojatija 25, I, Sarajevo  
 Mihovilovic Miro, Jezuitski Trg 4, Zagreb  
 Milic Vojin, Centinjiska 8/4, Beograd  
 Mlinar Zdravko, Tugomerieva 4, Ljubljana  
 Omer Ibrahimagic, Bratstva Jedinstva 14 II, Sarajevo  
 Pecar Janez, Rozmanove 2, Ljubljana  
 Peter Jambrek, Urtaja 2, Ljubljana  
 Popovic Mihailo, Fac. of Philosophy Univ., Dusanova 25, Beograd  
 Popovic Savo, Svetozora Moskovica 17, Beograd  
 Safeta Kovo, Hasana Parvica 50 IV, Sarajevo  
 Sinadinorski Fakim, Faculté de Sciences Naturelles, Skopie  
 Rus Veljko, Linhartown 11, Ljubljana  
 Vrbanc Dusan, Fen Kennedy Ev. Trg. 7, Zagreb  
 Woodward Susan L., Brace Kavarica 4/1 Zagreb  
 Vidanovic Zoran, Sutjeska 26, Sarajevo  
 Zvonarevic Mladen, Filozofski Fakultet, Diuro Salaja 3, Zagreb



REPRESENTATIVES OF INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS  
 REPRESENTANTS D'ORGANISATIONS INTERNATIONALES

Glinkine Anatoli, UNESCO, Paris, France  
 Ornauer Helmut, Conseil International des sciences sociales, Centre Euro-  
 péen de coordination, de Recherches et de documentation en Sciences sociales,  
 Grünangengasse 2, Vienne 1, Autriche