

## New Tsars and New Aristocrats

MARXISM holds that the separation of physical labour from mental labour emerged, lasts and will end together with class society. With the elimination of classes, class differentiations including that between physical labour and mental labour will inevitably disappear. However, in Soviet society today in which allegedly class "conflict" and class "antagonism" no longer exist, an opposite phenomenon can be seen: not only is the gap between physical labour and mental labour growing but the antagonism between them is sharpening with each passing day. There, intellectual aristocrats and their like naturally consider themselves superior to others and look down on those who do manual labour. Investigations at a number of schools in the Soviet Union show that students all go after titles and positions such as experts and doctorates, and that in the order of preference for jobs, that of a steel-worker rates the 28th, lathe turner the 35th, tractor driver the 51st, with farm labourer and livestock breeder forming "the lowest of professions."

Obviously the steady widening of the difference between physical and mental labour and the emergence of group after group of new intellectual aristocrats are a concrete expression of the all-round capitalist restoration in the Soviet Union. The arch-criminals who have brought about this situation are none other than the new tsars. The schools and especially the institutions of higher learning in the country today are the breeding ground of bourgeois intellectual aristocrats. The Soviet revisionists ruthlessly poison the minds of youth in these institutions with decadent ideas such as using knowledge as capital, studying "for the sake of getting official appointments, looking down upon the working people, etc. In these institutions "special education for young talent is enforced." According to what the Soviet revisionists call "principles of educational legislation," those who enrol in vocational schools will be trained as the "reserve force of the working class," "young skilled workers"; whereas those admitted to institutions of higher learning can expect to fill positions of "high-level experts." In addition, the Soviet revisionists have established special schools to teach politics, mathematics, fine art and music to so-called "talented students." These special students who consider themselves far superior to the masses will be given upon graduation positions at all levels of the power structure to serve the bureaucrat-monopoly capitalist class in the Soviet Union, dominated by the revisionists.

Those who have the opportunity to enter institutions of higher learning and special schools are first of

all sons and daughters of the bourgeoisie. Higher education for sons and daughters of the working people is vilified by the Soviet revisionists as "futile labour-like sowing seed on stones." Offsprings of some working people who are admitted into professional and technical schools are only trained to be skilled wage-workers to create surplus value for the bureaucrat-monopoly bourgeoisie. New bourgeois intellectual aristocrats have mushroomed in the Soviet Union for a long time as a result of the wide spreading of revisionist rubbish by Brezhnev and company through various channels and the adoption of all kinds of measures to intensify bourgeois right.

The antithesis between physical and mental labour is always a reflection of class antagonism. The gap between a handful of bourgeois intellectual aristocrats on the one hand and workers and peasants engaged in physical labour on the other has become wider and wider in the Soviet Union today. Workers and peasants who toil all the year round get small wages, while the unearned income of intellectual aristocrats, the favourites of the Soviet revisionist renegade clique, is several dozen times, even hundred times, higher than wages of the ordinary workers and peasants. In addition, the intellectual aristocrats enjoy every kind of privileges and live in luxury. This grave situation cannot but aggravate class antagonism and arouse ever stronger discontent and resistance among the broad masses of the Soviet working people.

*(by Tai Shan-hung, member of a unit of the Chinese People's Liberation Army)*

## What Makes for Production Efficiency?

AT the 25th congress of the Soviet revisionist party, Brezhnev urged "promoting the rapid growth of labour productivity and achieving a steep rise of efficiency in all social production." Soviet propaganda took up the theme in no time, calling for tighter labour discipline, higher production efficiency and fulfilment of fixed quotas.

There is a reason for the fact that the Soviet revisionist authorities are worried about production efficiency.

As its all-round restoration of capitalism seriously damaged the social productive forces and impeded the fulfilment of plans, the Soviet revisionist renegade clique has been beset with difficulties and mired in a protracted and insuperable crisis. According to Soviet press reports, in the Kirghiz Union Republic, "every year, one-fifth of the (industrial) enterprises, on the average failed to attain their targets for a rise of labour productivity." Production efficiency was low in in-

dustries of such union republics as Georgia and Armenia. *Pravda* openly blamed many enterprises for low labour productivity, saying that "almost one half of the plants, workshops and production units built in the past few years failed to reach the designed levels in a number of important indices within the deadline." Naturally the Brezhnev clique wanted to "put things in good order."

What is the Soviet panacea for raising labour productivity? According to Brezhnev, it is to combine "material incentives" with "strict and mandatory sanctions," in other words, to use money as bait and threaten with a big stick at the same time. Those who are willing to sweat blood will be paid a few more rubles and those who do not work to the satisfaction of the bosses will be severely punished. This is the way by which all exploiting classes increase labour intensity. Now the Soviet revisionist renegade clique has taken it over for intensified oppression and exploitation of the Soviet working class. This fully reveals the vicious features of the bureaucrat-monopoly bourgeoisie in the Soviet Union which stops at nothing to fleece the working people.

The low production efficiency in the Soviet Union today is an outcome of its social system. It can never be changed by Brezhnev and company's ruble-and-stick policy.

What makes for production efficiency? Man's labour has always proceeded in certain social relations. Where social production relations are different, the social character of labour is different too. Under the system of exploitation, labour is compulsory and the working people's initiative is limited and impaired. It is only under the socialist system of public ownership that the working people, now the masters of the means of production, change from working under compulsion to working for themselves and bring their production initiative into full play.

The Soviet working class overthrew the reactionary rule of the tsars in the October Revolution and established a socialist system. They worked conscientiously as masters of their own country and developed production rapidly. But in the Soviet Union today with capitalism restored in all fields, socialist public ownership has changed into bureaucrat-monopoly capitalist ownership. The relationship between the ruling class and the working class is one between oppressors and the oppressed and between employers and the employees, and the workers have once again become wage-labourers. Therefore, Soviet workers are not enthusiastic about their work, often staying away from work or using go-slows to show their protest against the Soviet revisionists' reactionary rule and merciless exploitation.

Here are a couple of examples disclosed in the Soviet press: In Georgia, "owing to the loss of work-days and the suspension of work during the period of the 9th five-year plan," "the republic sustained a decrease in industrial production of 570 million rubles' worth of products, which amounted to 10 per cent of the annual total output value." In Lithuania, "the total number of days workers stayed away from work in 1975 in the enterprises under the Ministry of Building Material Industry nearly doubled and in those under the Ministry of Light Industry rose 28 per cent."

All this furnishes conclusive proof that where there is oppression, there is resistance and that the heavier the oppression, the stronger the resistance. The struggle of the Soviet workers will surely advance until they break the shackles imposed by the Soviet revisionist ruling clique and stand up once again as masters of their own country.

*(by a workers' theoretical study group of  
the Kweilin Steel Plant in the Kwangsi  
Chuang Autonomous Region)*