

**WHAT  
IS**

**COMMUNISM?**

**questions and answers**



# WHAT IS COMMUNISM?

---

Questions  
and Answers

# CONTENTS

To the Reader

Briefly About the Ideological Basis of Communism

What Is the Difference Between Socialism and Communism?

Will There Be Private Property Under Communism? What Is Personal Property?

Is There a "New Class" in the Soviet Union?

Is Communism a Totalitarian Regime?

What Functions Will the State Discharge Under Communism?

How Is the National Question Tackled Under Communism?

What Does Communism Do to Emancipate Women?

Will Society Command People's Free Time?

Does Communism Need an "Iron Curtain?"

Will Political Jokes Be Allowed?

How Will the National Economy Be Planned?

How Will Science Manifest Itself as a Direct Productive Force?

What Is the Meaning of the Principle "From Each According to His Ability?" Who Can Determine the Abilities of a Person and How?

What Is the Meaning of the Principle "To Each According to His Needs?" Is It Possible to Satisfy All the Requirements, Individual Needs and Tastes?

How Will the Good Things of Life Be Distributed? Will Not the Gratuitous Distribution of Goods Lead to the Enslavement of the Human Being, to the Standardization of Tastes, and Elimination of Free Consumer's Choice?

When Shall We Arrive at the Communist Principle of Distribution?

Does a Person Need to Have Several Occupations or Professions?

Does Communism Prefer Material Values to Spiritual Ones?

Will There Be Morality Under Communism? If So, How Will It Differ from Generally Accepted Morality?

Will People Have Human Weaknesses?

Will the Family Remain?

What Is the Communist Attitude to Free Love?

Will There Be Crime?

Will Freedom of Conscience Be Allowed?

Are Poverty and Privations the Best Breeding Ground for Communist Ideas?

What Contributes Most to the Current and Ultimate Success of Communism: International Tension, Local Wars, a World War, or Relaxation of International Tension and Peace?

Does the Building of Communism in the USSR Signify an Attempt to "Bury the West"?

Is Transition to a New Society Necessarily Linked with Violence?

Can There Be a National Form of Communism?

Will the Communist Party Remain?

What Will Happen after the New Social System Is Built? Does the Achievement of the Present-Day Ideals Mean that Everything Is Attained Especially in Social Development, in the Development of Democracy and of the Individual?

Is the Teaching of Communism Immutable? Has It Been Supplemented or Amended after Marx, after Lenin, or as a Result of the Experience Accumulated in the Building of a New Society in the USSR?

## To the Reader

*This book is not an exhaustive account of communist ideas. Neither is it designed to give a comprehensive description of the socialist way of life. It is merely an explanation of a few points of interest to Americans who desire first-hand information on the theory and practice of communism.*

*Do not dismiss this in haste as propagan-da. We have no intention of influencing your political convictions. Communists never make a secret of their views, but neither do they deem it possible to foist them on those who do not share their ideas. The purpose of the book is to give an objective explanation of several pivotal questions of communism.*

## **Briefly About the Ideological Basis of Communism**

“Philosophers merely **explained** the world in different ways; the point is, however, to **change** it.” This idea of the young Karl Marx, expressed 120 years ago, may serve as the key to communist ideology. It gives rise to a string of questions without answering which one has no right to undertake such an extremely difficult task as the deliberate reshaping of the world.

Is it within human power to transform the surrounding world purposefully? In what direction must men exert their efforts, what should they strive to secure, and to what purpose?

Nature lives according to its own laws, irrespective of the will of human beings. The human being harnesses the forces of nature by apprehending its laws and using them to his own ends. Man has unravelled the secrets of the atom and is putting its tremendous energy to his use. He has boldly stepped into

outer space. We do not feel awed today when we follow yet another American or Soviet space flight. We only ask ourselves: "Is everything in order? The spacemen will land safely if all calculations are correct, if a reliable ship has been built."

Indeed, by observing the laws of mathematics, physics, chemistry, or biology man can do amazing things. Humans not only explain the surrounding material world, but they can change it purposefully, too. This is a self-evident truth nowadays. And if we recall it here, it is only because we wish to accentuate how wrong are those who still claim that it is beyond human power to transform social life.

It is difficult for those who abide by this point of view to understand the meaning of the tremendous social changes occurring in the modern epoch. Sceptics also know, of course, that a revolution took place in Russia in 1917 and that, guided by the Bolsheviki, the people built up a new society which is called socialist. They also know that today socialism is being built in thirteen other countries, not counting the young states of Asia and Africa, which have embarked upon the non-capitalist road of development. They also know about the successful national-liberation revolutions of the colonial peoples.

Nonetheless, they regard these and other historical events as haphazard social experiments. In order to grasp their meaning it is

necessary to know one truth, which is an axiom for Communists, namely: human society, just as nature, lives and develops according to its own laws. Nobody can go against or abolish these laws. That is why we say: "It is impossible to reverse the course of history." Only by abiding by this view can one see the historical perspective and grasp all the complexities of social life.

But how is this? Is not history made by people? Isn't this a contradiction of what was said above? No, not at all. The **materialistic understanding of history**, discovered by Karl Marx and Friedrich Engels (i. e. recognition of historical development as an objectively indispensable process) in no way denies the role of people and individuals in the transformation of social life. On the contrary, Marxism holds it in very high esteem. At the same time, it believes that "the final causes of all social changes and political revolutions are to be sought not in men's brains, not in men's better insight into eternal truth and justice, but in changes in the modes of production and exchange. They are to be sought not in the **philosophy** but in the **economics** of each particular epoch." In other words, the course of history is determined by the development of the production of material values.

Why did the slave-owning society replace the primitive-communal system, which in turn had to give way to feudalism? Because they were based respectively on more advanced



ed means of production than the preceding societies. Why did capitalism replace feudalism? Because the feudal economy was primitive, while the capitalist economy was able to provide for people's requirements better. Developing machine production demanded much raw materials and manpower. In the meantime, the land with all its wealth and the people living on it belonged to the feudal lords. Society made economic progress due to the new, resourceful class—the bourgeoisie—but it was governed by the big landowners, the feudal lords. So the bourgeoisie eventually deprived them of power and reshaped social life to their liking.

Serfdom was replaced by free enterprise and hired labor. Absolute monarchies were replaced in a revolutionary way by various bourgeois-democratic states. Capitalism triumphed because it was a progressive system in those days. The bourgeoisie became the dominating class in society, because its subjective aspirations, wishes and will were an expression of the **objective necessity for replacing one socio-economic formation by another.** The feudal lords as a class were defeated because they went against this tendency of historical development.

Those who earnestly wish today to understand where human civilization is heading, to see the historical perspective, must analyze impartially what modern production demands of men in the way of social organization. Then

they will see clearly the goal Communists set themselves.

Every member of an industrial nation knows what tremendous scope the development of production has achieved today. Mighty productive forces have grown (although to different degrees in different countries, but equally inevitably) precisely because the means of production, used by each individual, have become **social** means of production, employed **jointly by a multitude of people**. Huge factories and mines require the joint labor of thousands upon thousands of workers (this fact cannot be changed by automation, because automatic machines are also produced by the work of thousands of people). Division of labor has gone so far that every working man and woman, every enterprise is linked with others by numerous invisible but strong ties and they all interdepend.

The main conclusion arising from all this is that social production is unable to function and develop normally and in full measure (without recessions, slumps and stagnation), if it is not socially-owned. This tendency toward the socialization of production is growing parallel with the development of capitalism. It is brought about, as a matter of fact, by one of the mainstays of capitalist society—free competition. The natural (and therefore inexorable) process of concentration and centralization of capital (and of production) is under way constantly. This process will inevitably and logically culminate in the

socialist nationalization of all the basic wealth of the country with all the attendant consequences.

Expressing this historical tendency of modern development, Communists have a clear goal before them. We are convinced that all peoples will finally arrive at the communist organization of social life. This is a historical necessity.

## **What Is the Difference Between Socialism and Communism?**

There are still people who believe that socialism and communism are two absolutely different social systems. This is not so. In brief, socialism and communism may be compared to the human organism at different stages of development and maturity. Socialism and communism are one socio-economic system. The founders of communist ideas, Karl Marx and Friedrich Engels, called the initial phase of communism—socialism. The concept of communism is usually used to denote the highest stage of this system. Communism grows out of socialism. The two have much in common basically. Socialism and communism have the same economic foundation—public ownership of the means of production. That is why there are no exploiting classes under socialism and society consists of working people only. Socialism and communism have the same concern: not pro-

fit-making or production for the sake of production, but care of man with all his manifold requirements. This goal is formulated in the following way in the Soviet Communist Program: ever fuller satisfaction of the growing material and cultural requirements of every member of society.

But there is a substantial difference between socialism and communism. It lies, primarily, in the **level of the development of productive forces.**

The scope and technical level of production are still insufficient under socialism to ensure the full satisfaction of the requirements of members of society. That is why distribution of most of the good things of life is effected under socialism in proportion to the work done by each member, depending on its quantity and quality. We observe the principle: **equal pay for equal work** irrespective of sex, nationality or race. Higher pay, naturally enough, is received for more skilled, more difficult, more intensive, and more productive labor.

At the same time up to one quarter of all the requirements (in terms of expenditure) are being satisfied in the USSR now on an equal footing for all from public sources: free medical care and education, free or cheap cultural services, construction of housing, pensions, stipends, family allowances, social insurance, etc.

Living standards are growing as production expands in the Soviet Union. When com-

munism is fully achieved, all the material and cultural values will be distributed according to the principle: **to each according to his needs, individual requirements and tastes.** This principle of distribution is not possible in every well-advanced society. Highly productive automatic machines are obviously not enough to make it materialize. Another requisite is social ownership of the means of production. Trade, money and credits will die off when people's needs are fully satisfied. All accounting—economic estimates, planning, statistics, determination of economic efficiency—will be done in kind and in measure of expended labor, i. e. working time. It goes without saying that all this will be made easy by the broad use of the most up-to-date computers.

Certain socio-economic and cultural inequality still persists under socialism. There are classes under socialism—the working class and the peasantry, as well as a special social group of intellectuals. There is no hostility or antagonistic contradictions among them, however. Most members of society are united by the common goal of building a new society.

There are also substantial distinctions under socialism between the living conditions of the urban and rural population, between manual and mental workers. There is also a certain inequality between men and women, especially because the latter are burdened by household chores.

Communism presupposes complete socio-economic and cultural equality of all members of society, i. e. absence of all classes and social groups in general. Substantial differences between town and countryside, physical and mental labor, will be eliminated. Communist society is a community of socially conscious and equal citizens, a society based on common labor and free self-government.

In socialist society, on the other hand, state power still plays a very important role. It not only protects the socialist system and the people's peaceful work from external (and under certain circumstances internal) enemies. It directs the economy on behalf of the people and in their interests, organizes the building of a new society, and together with the Communist Party, the trade unions and other public organizations exerts efforts to educate the people. The state will wither away under communism.

Vestiges of the past persist in the minds of many people under socialism—egoism, greed, self-interest, disregard for the interests of others, desire to live at their expense, etc. They are often aggravated by low earnings (primarily of unskilled workers), poor living conditions (especially in remote areas). That is why, along with the steady boosting of the people's living standards, extensive educational work is being carried on in the Soviet Union day in day out to raise the political awareness of the people, overcome various

prejudices and survivals of the past in the human conscience.

By ridding its members of worries about their livelihood, communist society creates hitherto unprecedented opportunities for the free and harmonious development of the individual. Reduction of working hours to the minimum will leave much free time, which everybody will be able to spend on favorite hobbies and pastimes, on expanding knowledge, extending cultural horizons, or learning new professions.

These, in very general terms, are the differences between socialism and communism.

## **Will There Be Private Property Under Communism? What Is Personal Property?**

If this means private ownership of land, natural wealth, factories, transport and communication facilities, or of any means of production, then there is only one answer: no such ownership exists even under socialism, which is the first stage of communism. It is non-existent, because private ownership of the means of production inevitably gives rise to the distribution of produced values proportionally to one's property, i. e. creates the basis for social inequality.

Socialist society is based on the principle

"from each according to his ability, to each according to his work." This principle, to our mind, is much fairer than the principle of private property "to each according to his property." Even in the wealthiest countries of the West millions of people, i. e. the bulk of the population, do not have profit-yielding property. They are compelled to seek employment from owners of enterprises and land. Under socialism every person's labor contribution to the common cause becomes the criterion of his social status and determines the remuneration he gets from society. This is a tremendously important fact. All the values produced in a socialist society become thereby the property of the working people. In a society based on private ownership of the means of production, on the other hand, the bulk of these values remains in the hands of the owners of enterprises. That is why Communists are for social ownership of the means of production. It enables any matter to be settled in the interests of all.

Here is a simple example. As many as 108 million people, almost half of the country's population, have moved into new modern flats in the Soviet Union during the past ten years. A considerable amount of land was needed, of course, to build such a huge number of dwellings. New buildings in Moscow, Leningrad, Kiev and hundreds of other cities were put up not only on new sites, but also on the site of old buildings, which had to be pulled down.



Let us try, at least approximately, to estimate what extra spending would be required for this construction, and for the pulling down of old buildings, if the land and buildings were private property. Just imagine what a frenzied speculation in land would begin. Prices on it would leap skyhigh. Thousands of families would be ruined, thrown into the streets, while a handful of "lucky men" would pocket new millions. . .

There can be nothing of the sort under socialism, because the land and the buildings on it (except for small family homes or cooperative houses) are **the property of all the people**. Hence, all these millions of people, who have moved from old, overpopulated houses into more spacious, well-appointed flats, built by the state, did not have to pay a penny for them. And another important point—this housing was given to them for all time. The monthly rent, paid to the local Soviet, amounts to only 4-6 per cent of the family budget.

Does this mean that Communists want to transfer everything to collective ownership, including the things necessary to satisfy one's personal requirements? We still hear such contentions. But let us turn to the facts.

In socialist society every person has the right to own or dispose of his personal belongings: clothing, various objects of everyday use, a car, a house for himself and his

family, i. e. to own what we call **personal property**. As a matter of fact, the collective farmers and rural intellectuals built 3,075,000 new personal dwellings in the period from 1959 to 1964. Furthermore, Communists are exerting efforts to provide Soviet working people with all useful and attractive things, needed by the man of our epoch.

Communists have different approaches to private and personal properties. Is there any inconsistency in this? Not at all. The point is that there is a difference of principle between private and personal property. Private property provides its owner with a material basis for unearned income, constitutes the material foundation for social injustice. Personal property, on the other hand, serves to satisfy the material and cultural needs of the working people and their families. This is the crux of the matter.

Personal property, naturally enough, will remain under communism, too. The range of goods and objects included in it will be determined by members of communist society themselves, proceeding from considerations of pure expediency.

Marxists are absolutely sure that further social progress is impossible without social ownership of land and the wealth in it, of the means of production. Only social property and nothing else does away with the economic foundations of social inequality and offers a real opportunity to create the fairest system in mankind's history - a communist society.

**Social ownership facilitates management of the whole economy** as a single entity, according to a scientific plan, with the sole purpose of most fully satisfying the material and spiritual requirements of all members of society.

**It facilitates concentration of resources and efforts rationally** on things most needed by society. This is exactly why the Soviet Union and the other socialist countries are able to invest unprecedented amounts of capital in the decisive sectors of economy, science and technology. At the same time they can afford to spend equally big sums on the rapid development of culture, extensive social insurance system, on housing construction, on free medical service to the whole population, on education and other benefits from social funds, i. e. from the national budget.

Social ownership of the means of production creates the basis for the unhampered **development of the best human features in every man.** After all, social ownership rallies together all the social groups, engenders relationships of friendship and comradeship. Thereby a human being breaks out of the narrow world of egoistic proprietary interests, which makes him hostile to the surrounding world.

In socialist society every person feels he is a co-owner of all the country, all the economy, and he develops a sense of responsibility not only for his own work and the welfare of his family, but for everything that happens

around him, for the welfare of others, of the whole of society. The life of such a person is infinitely more interesting and exciting than that of the one who thinks only of himself and his own good. He really becomes an equal, conscientious member of society. This is why we have such things as socialist emulation, broad movement of innovators in production, heroism of hundreds of thousands of young people who volunteered to develop virgin lands, to tap the wealth of Siberia, the Arctic, and the Soviet Far East.

At the same time, it is social ownership and planned management of the economy, based on it, that rid social life once and for all of such things as exploitation of man by man, unemployment, crises and recessions in production. This does not mean, of course, that the process of building a socialist society does not involve serious difficulties and shortages, that there are no mistakes or distortions, which are very gross at times. Nothing new is done without mistakes and hardships especially when it comes to building a new society in extremely difficult historical conditions.

No mistakes or temporary difficulties, however, can rule out the main fact: the experience of the Soviet Union and of the other socialist states fully confirms the fairness and viability of the new system, based as it is on social ownership. Some more time is needed, and not much more, before these advantages become clear to all unbiased people.

## Is There a "New Class" in the Soviet Union?

When the father of cybernetics Norbert Winer was asked: "Can a machine think?" he replied: "Everything depends on the definition."

There are many score definitions of the concept of class in sociology. Marxism puts it succinctly. The correctness of its definition is proved by the fact that it justifies itself in the most diverse spheres of sociology and practical policy.

It is clear that a class is a large group of people ranked together as possessing some common characteristics and interests. Both Marxists and their opponents are in accord on this point. Disagreements begin when it comes to characteristics. From the Marxist point of view the main characteristic that determines a person's affiliation to this or that class is his relationship to the means of production. The question of ownership is the pivotal point of the class problem.

The class of capitalists, for example, is made up of people possessing means of production (land, factories, mines, transport, etc.), and employing hired labor in order to extract profit.

The working class comprises people who do not own means of production and make their living by selling their labor. Thus the workers are called proletarians, or have-nots.

The peasantry consists of people who own land (or rent it) and cultivate this land mostly themselves and with the help of members of their families, employing farm machines or implements which also belong to them or are hired.

These, in the Marxist opinion, are the classes of modern capitalist society. Of course, there are also various intermediate transitional groups, the so-called middle sections.

It is relationship to means of production that determines the social status of members of each class or social group, the size of their incomes and the means by which they are made. But we are interested in quite another question here: are there such classes in the Soviet Union?

There are certainly no capitalists in the USSR since all the means of production belong to the people and nobody can wax rich by exploiting the labor of others. Since there are no capitalists, there are no proletarians, either. The working class of the USSR is a "new class", because under socialism the workers do not sell their labor to private employers, but work at enterprises which are their own property. The collective farmers, working in agricultural cooperatives, are also a "new class." The intelligentsia, too, is of a new sort, because it is not opposed to the people as a caste monopolizing the achievements of culture and serving the powers that be.

So we see that the Soviet Union has "new

classes," which capitalism has never known. These new class formations are typical in the period of transition from a society of antagonistic classes, such as capitalism, to a society which has no class distinctions, such as communism.

People mean something quite different, however, when they speculate on the "new class" in socialist society. They mean the emergence of some kind of a ruling élite, consisting of leading party, government, engineering and technical personnel. Is there really such an élite, making up a new ruling class? Those who are familiar with life in Soviet society know that there is nothing of the kind.

Indeed, when we speak of a ruling élite, we mean a definite, more or less stable group of people, holding key posts in society and pursuing their own interests, which clash with those of the people and society as a whole. The élite is a select group of people living by the exploitation of other sections of society. But exploitation of man by man is impossible in the Soviet Union either economically or legally.

The leading personnel of our society are selected democratically from all sections of the population. For instance, the Supreme Soviets of the constituent republics include 1,368 workers, 1,461 collective farmers, 328 engineers, heads of enterprises and other economic specialists, 437 scientists, artists, and teachers. The social composition of party

committees of all categories is identical. The election and obligatory replacement of a big part of elected local government and party personnel ensures the constant influx of fresh forces, enlistment of the working people in the administration of society. This is an example and the guarantee of genuine democracy.

There is, of course, a group of people under socialism, too, who are professionally engaged in managerial functions as officials of state, party and economic bodies. But this group has nothing in common with a ruling élite as regards working conditions, size of wages, social composition or outlook. It will gradually dissolve in organs of public self-administration as we advance toward communism.

It is pertinent to recall in this connection the statement by Hewlett Johnson, the Dean of Canterbury, who once said that the only "privileged class" in the USSR are the children.

## **Is Communism a Totalitarian Regime?**

If we try to sum up everything written on this score in the West, we shall get approximately the following formula: "Totalitarianism is a system of rule where the power of the state or of a dictator extends to all spheres of the society's or individual's life." Furthermore, the readers and listeners are intimidated all the time by the "dictatorship concept," by



the state's interference in "personal and family" life, by the omnipotent "political police," disregard of the individual "as a human being," and by many other minor and major vices of a totalitarian regime, which is identified with communist society.

An awful picture, indeed. But those who accept it as the true image of communism are making a grave mistake. Realistic paintings, as a rule, are not in high demand in the West these days. One may regret this, but it is, in the final analysis, a matter of taste, or influence of vogue. Things are much more complicated when sociological and political literature is produced in a sort of abstract manner, when numerous writings are based not on facts, but on imagination. This is exactly the point in case when attempts are made to equate two mutually eliminating concepts: communist society and totalitarianism.

There is one piece of truth in assertions about the totalitarian nature of communism, however, but it is distorted beyond recognition. It is that the state plays the leading role in the development of social organization at the initial stage of the construction of a communist society, i. e. under socialism.

As distinct from all preceding societies, which developed spontaneously, socialist society advances through the state's deliberate and planned guidance of the social and economic life of the country. But this in no way means that the state dictates its will to everybody, irrespective of popular opinion,

and reckons with it only when this suits it. A totalitarian regime presupposes the existence of a ruling clique in the country, a kind of caste, whose interests contradict those of the people. But in a socialist state the people themselves wield power, governing the country in the interests of the whole nation through their direct representatives. You will not find a single deputy in the plenipotentiary organs of state power, the Soviets, from the local bodies up to the Supreme Soviet, advocating the interests of a specific group of population. You will not find such a deputy, because there are no social groups in the Soviet Union whose vital interests are opposed or hostile to each other. Socialist society consists only of working people and they, due to their social character, have no interest in oppressing each other.

Under socialism the state discharges the will of the people. It directs the economy on a nation-wide scale, i. e. develops it in the interests of all the people, according to scientifically grounded annual and long-term plans. The socialist state organizes and finances the education and upbringing of its citizens, the medical services and social insurance. The state is the lever by means of which the Soviet people are remoulding relations on the principles of social equality and collectivism.

Is this good or bad? The answer to this question may be found by turning to socialist economic and cultural achievements.

The volume of industrial production has grown 52 times during the years of Soviet power, while that of agriculture has increased 2.3 times over. The incomes of workers have risen 6-fold, and of farmers —7-fold. Before the Revolution 80 per cent of Russia's population was illiterate, while now the USSR is about to introduce universal compulsory ten-year education. During the past 48 years, almost a half of which were spent on defending the country from enemy invasions and on rehabilitation, Soviet society, directed by the state, has achieved living standards which ensure for every citizen all the blessings of modern civilization.

There has been no unemployment in the Soviet Union for 36 years now and it can never recur because economic development for the purpose of constantly raising the welfare of the working people and satisfying more and more fully their requirements ensures a steady growth in the number of jobs, and, consequently, stable and full employment. This holds true despite population growth and the accelerated rates of mechanization and automation of industrial and agricultural production. Development of natural wealth in formerly desolate areas of the country, which is now proceeding full blast, gives every person a chance to choose the domicile he likes best. He will find proper application of his labor or knowledge in any part of the country.

Here is a concrete example. In 1964, the

population of the Soviet Union increased by three million people. A new generation had matured: 1,400,000 young men and women finished secondary school alone. The number of leavers from compulsory eight-year schools was even bigger. Of course, not all these young people needed immediate employment. Many of them decided to continue their education and enrolled at higher or specialized secondary educational establishments, or various trades schools. But it must also be borne in mind that these institutions of learning turned out more than 900,000 specialists in 1964. The same number of young workers was trained at various vocational schools. All these young citizens were given a worthy place in the huge economy. Some role was played in this, of course, by the natural replacement of generations. Elderly people retired on state pension and the vacancies were filled by the young. But the main thing is that 2,700,000 new jobs appeared in the Soviet Union in 1964. This is exactly half a million more than during the previous year. Where did these jobs come from? Six hundred new large-scale industrial enterprises were commissioned. A large number of new shops and production premises were put into operation at the old factories. The total length of new railways amounted to 600 kilometres. Personnel were also required by thousands of new schools, hospitals, pre-school children's institutions, and other cultural and catering establishments.

Do you think there is a nation who would protest against such manifestations of totalitarianism?

Now a few words about other problems. Let us start with the Party, because one of the main arguments backing the assertions of totalitarianism is that the CPSU is the nation's only party. Must there be only one party under socialism? By no means. A one-party system is not a principle, but a reflection of historical peculiarities in the building of socialism in the given country. For instance, there are two successfully cooperating parties in Bulgaria; three in Poland; and five in the German Democratic Republic. And these are all socialist states!

A one-party system does not mean that a country is totalitarian, if the party is the people's political vanguard, if it expresses their true interests, and is dedicated to the creation of a society where the interests of every individual will be priced above all. This is exactly the sort of party the CPSU is. It has a membership of about 12.5 million. More than a half are workers and farmers employed directly in production. The rest are scientists, teachers, doctors, artists and employees of state institutions.

Inner-party democracy and socialist democracy in general; the all-round development of the individual are the best guarantees against the dictatorship concept or, as we are used to saying, against the "personality cult." It is pertinent to recall again that the Communist

Party of the Soviet Union itself exposed the personality cult and the negative aspects of social life accompanying it. To say that the period of the Stalin personality cult proves the "totalitarian regime" thesis is tantamount to saying that Kennedy's murder spells the same end for all the US presidents.

As to state interference in people's personal affairs we shall only refer our readers here to answers to such questions as morality under communism, problems of the family and love, etc.

## **What Functions Will the State Discharge Under Communism?**

The state is not an eternal form of organization of human society. It has not always existed and will not continue forever. The state appeared when society split into antagonistic classes, and it will die with the building of a classless society—communism. This is the conclusion at which Marxist theoreticians have arrived after studying the political history of human society, the origin and essence of the state. This conclusion is being confirmed more and more by the practical changes the state is already being subjected to under socialism. We know that discussion of abstract sociological subjects can be uninteresting. But those who wish to learn the truth will have to climb all the

rungs leading to it. This begins with the question: what is a state?

Every person, to be sure, has his own associations with this question. For one man the state is mainly a tax collector, who has the bad habit of appearing when he is least of all wanted; for another it is a policeman, who is not always as polite and kind as shown in children's books; for another it is a group of gentlemen meeting in parliament, who always seem to be busy, judging by parliamentary reports, debating cardinal national and international problems. In short, the state and its machinery, no matter from what point you look at it, is a special group (or special groups) of people - and nobody seems to complain today that their number is too small—and of corresponding agencies: the parliament, army, police, court and jails.

Who needs this huge and expensive machinery, consisting of people, who, by virtue of their occupation, do not produce any material or spiritual values? Whom does this machinery serve?

Some naive people believe that the state is always and everywhere an unbiased arbiter, standing above society and maintaining law and order fairly, even though strictly. It expresses the interests of the nation, takes care of the welfare of all its subjects. This is true to some extent, but only if the state is able to remain an unbiased arbiter. This, however, is usually very difficult for it to do.

There has always been class struggle in a society rent by contradictions and antagonisms among its social groups. Its existence can be denied, of course. But there is no escaping the fact, for instance, that scores of thousands of strikes, involving millions of workers, have occurred in the industrial countries of the West during the past ten years. Let us consider the question: why do the workers and not the businessmen strike? Why do those who get work and not those who give it go on strike? This happens, obviously, because the former are dissatisfied with the existing system of distribution of the values they create, while the latter, i. e. the owners of the means of production, regard it as perfectly natural and lawful. After all, the factory and office workers would not fight for their rights if there were no infringement upon their interests.

The state, Marxists reply, arose when it became necessary to settle the conflicts that constantly broke out among the classes. But since the state is not an immaterial organism, since its machinery consists of living beings, it protects, quite naturally, the interests of the class which controls it. As a rule, however, official policy is shaped by people belonging to the most powerful class which dominates the economy. They use state power to further their selfish interests. They need the state machinery to bolster up and strengthen the existing system, to protect the interests and privileges of the ruling class from social forces



that want a fairer organization. It is easy to see how this is done in practice.

All the above-said should not be understood too primitively. The bourgeois state, for instance, is often compelled to go against certain private interests of this or that group of capitalists. It may carry out various measures, from time to time, to improve the people's living conditions. But all this is due to the long-standing struggle of the working people and is nothing but minor concessions by the ruling class to protect their principal interests. Neither universal suffrage nor anything else can alter the fact that in a society divided into antagonistic classes the state is apparatus designed to safeguard the privileges and ensure the domination of definite social groups at the expense of others.

Hence the conclusion: as long as a society has stable groups of people with opposing economic and social interests, the state's existence is just as natural and inevitable as sea tides.

And one more conclusion: if it is possible to build a society without antagonistic classes, a society where the contradiction between the social and the private does not come to a head, the state becomes unnecessary and withers away, to use the Marxist term. It will be gradually replaced by public self-government. This will be a communist society.

The state, however, is still necessary at the

first stage of communism, i. e. under socialism. Not only because the new system has to be defended from outside enemies (the 14-nation intervention against the young Soviet Russia, or the attack of nazi Germany on the USSR). Equally important are the internal factors. As pointed out by Lenin, "...we must not think that having overthrown capitalism people will at once learn to work for society **without any standard of right**. Besides, the abolition of capitalism **does not immediately create** the economic prerequisites for **such** a change." This means that material inequality is not done away with yet. There are still enough thieves, hooligans, and lovers of an easy life at the expense of others.

But the socialist state radically differs from its historical predecessors. This is explained, first of all, by the fact that the laboring classes take over all the political power when carrying out a socialist revolution. As a result of the establishment of public ownership of the means of production, all citizens become equal economically, that is, they turn into co-owners of the means and instruments of production. This, naturally, creates the basis for genuine political equality. The abolition of private property does away with class antagonism, because nobody is then able to exploit others. The former exploiters, just as all the rest, have to work for a living. Friendly relations are established gradually among workers, peasants and intellectuals, i. e. all

the three social strata making up socialist society. They administer the state jointly in their common interests.

Development of economy, science and culture becomes the main function of the socialist state, inasmuch as it is the master of all social wealth. This is why the sphere of purely state functions in their traditional forms steadily narrows down in the public life of the Soviet Union.

What does this mean in practice? First of all that the **special group** of people, professionally occupied in managing public affairs, disappears altogether. Every person begins to devote some of his time to this business. In other words, the state will become absolutely unnecessary when everybody grows to be a "statesman."

The very nature of the work which is now called statesmanship will lose its political character. There will, of course, be organs responsible for the economy or the planning of scientific research. But these will not be state organs, because their functions will not be determined by political, but only by specific considerations. Such "classical" state institutions as the court, police, security organs and army will disappear forever, and will become a part of history.

A communist society is an intricate and fine mechanism based on the high public awareness of all its members, and the ever-developing public control and regulation. This

control, however, will not be that of one social group or special agencies over the behavior of others. This will be purely self-control. This is the underlying principle of self-government.

People who say that communist society cannot be stateless usually refer to "human nature." They claim that people's "nature" is such that they are forever doomed to be slaves of their base passions, that people are essentially sly and aggressive, and that only political and state restraints can keep society from universal chaos and breakdown.

Communists are of a different opinion about "human nature." They believe that this "nature" is flexible and pliable, that most often a person is bad when his life is miserable. To change people it is necessary to alter their living conditions, to make them human in the full sense of the word.

What must be done? We know this now. It is necessary to make the economy serve social and not private interests, and to secure a situation where one's daily bread will not be the mass stimulus of human activity. It is necessary to raise the cultural standards of all the people and not of a handful of privileged citizens. It is necessary to ensure living conditions where every person can become a fully developed individual, harmoniously combining intellectual, moral and physical perfection.

This is what Marxists mean when they speak of building a communist society. A tre-

**mendous task. But nobody has ever succeeded in halting the march of history. Marx was right when he wrote:**

**“...Mankind always sets itself the task it can resolve, because at closer scrutiny it is seen that a problem arises only when there are the material requisites for its solution, or they are, at least, in the making.”**

## **How Is the National Question Tackled Under Communism?**

This can be illustrated by Soviet experience in tackling the national question. What is the national policy of our socialist state whose huge territory is inhabited by more than one hundred nations, peoples and ethnic groups?

Before the 1917 Revolution most of them were rightless, oppressed, economically and culturally backward. All the non-Russian population was contemptuously called “natives” by tsarist officials. Many peoples of Siberia, the Far East and the North were doomed to extinction, due to ruthless exploitation, hunger and numerous diseases.

Soviet power based its national policy on the principle that was briefly formulated by Lenin in the following way: not a single privilege to any nation. They must all enjoy the full right to self-determination. Relations among the Soviet peoples must be absolutely

equal, based on mutual respect, mutual confidence, mutual assistance and unselfish friendship. On the eighth day of its existence, i. e. November 15, 1917, the Soviet Government issued the "Declaration of Rights of the Peoples of Russia." It was the first document legalizing the equality of all citizens regardless of color of skin, race or nationality. This is also recorded in the current Constitution of the USSR.

The principle of equality of nations and races stems both from the very essence of communist ideas and the nature of the social system and political power in a socialist state. It is governed by the working people themselves, and, naturally, there is no place for economic, social or national oppression of man by man. Socialist society (the more so communist society) cannot have any groups of people interested in the enslavement, robbery or exploitation of one nation by another.

How is the equality of peoples, both big and small, ensured in the Soviet Union? The rights to work, leisure, education and social insurance, are guaranteed to all Soviet citizens without exception. People of various nationalities, both men and women, get equal pay for equal work all over the country. The same holds true of politics. It is not infrequent when a city with a predominantly Russian population elects a Georgian or an Uzbek as its representative in the Supreme Soviet, while the Uzbeks cast their ballots for a Ukrainian.

The Soviet state is based on the national

principle. The peoples inhabiting some definite territory have set up different political-administrative bodies, depending on their numbers. These include the constituent Soviet Socialist Republics, which, in turn, include Autonomous Soviet Socialist Republics, Autonomous Regions and National Districts.

There are fifteen constituent Republics: the Russian, Ukrainian, Byelorussian, Latvian, Lithuanian, Estonian, Moldavian, Georgian, Armenian, Azerbaijanian, Uzbek, Kirghiz, Tajik, Kazakh and Turkmen.

Every constituent Republic is a sovereign state. It has its own supreme organ of power—the Supreme Soviet—which appoints the Republic's government—the Council of Ministers, and elects the Supreme Court. The Supreme Soviet also confirms the Constitution, coat-of-arms, flag, anthem and capital of the Republic. It has the exclusive right of settling territorial questions. It is within the Supreme Soviet's competence to endorse annual and long-term economic development plans, and the Republic's budget. The national life of a constituent Republic is directed by national government bodies. All official correspondence and tuition within the Republic's confines is done in the local language.

All the constituent Republics enjoy freedom of self-determination. To develop more successfully, they have voluntarily united in a single state—the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics. Despite big differences in the size of their populations, the Republics are all

equally represented in the central organs of power.

The President of the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet of a Republic is simultaneously one of the fifteen Vice-Presidents of the Presidium of the USSR Supreme Soviet. Both the biggest Republic of the Union, the Russian Federation, which has a population of 125.7 million, and Estonia, with a 100 times smaller population, send 32 deputies each to one of the two equal Houses of the Soviet Parliament—the Soviet of Nationalities.

Another form of national state unit is the Autonomous Soviet Socialist Republic. It also has its own territory, Constitution, Supreme Soviet, government, budget, Supreme Court and capital. Each of the Autonomous Republics is represented in the Soviet of Nationalities by 11 deputies. An example of this form of national state is the Yakut Autonomous Republic with a population of 600,000. It is located in the northern part of Central Siberia.

The Autonomous Regions and National Districts are self-governing administrative units, established by minor nationalities, but they are not states. However they discharge many state functions. Every Autonomous Region elects five deputies to the Soviet of Nationalities, and every National District—one deputy. Their local organs of power—the regional or district Soviets of Working People's Deputies—are full-fledged masters of their own territory. They are formed with



due regard for the local conditions and conduct all the affairs in the language of the local population. They have their own budgets, which they execute at their own discretion. As an example we may take the Gorno-Altai Autonomous Region with a population of about 170,000 and the Evenki National District with a population of only 11,000, which is located in the Soviet Arctic region.

The equality of the Soviet peoples is also manifested by their economic and cultural development. Before the 1917 Revolution large-scale industry was chiefly concentrated in Central Russia, in the Urals and the Ukraine. Today, all the Republics have advanced modern economies. The Central Asian Soviet Republics—Uzbekistan, Kirghizia, Tajikistan and Turkmenia, which formerly had only a few semi-handicraft workshops, now have heavy, precision engineering, chemical and other industries. Tajikistan alone has more than 300 large-scale plants representing approximately thirty industries. They not only produce goods for the country, but export them to all parts of the world. Highly qualified national engineering and technical personnel, workers, managers of plants and farms, and executives have been trained there during the years of Soviet power.

The cultural standards have also grown strikingly. Many Soviet peoples did not have their own written language forty years ago. These included the Kirghiz, Kazakh, and most of the minor nationalities of the North and

the Far East. Today, every Republic has its own national Academy of Sciences and scores of research institutes, which are staffed by national scientific personnel. Big headway has been made by the young national literatures and arts of the minor nationalities.

Moreover 100 per cent literacy has been achieved through free education at all levels. The efficient system of free medical care, steady growth of the number of doctors and nurses from among the local population, have contributed to the wiping out of many diseases which plagued these peoples in the past.

The Leninist policy of international friendship, based on self-determination, complete equality and mutual respect, is pursued not only within the country by the CPSU and the Soviet Government, but in relations with all states and peoples. It cannot be otherwise. People say, and not without reason, that the foreign policy of a state is the direct extension of its domestic policy.

## **What Does Communism Do to Emancipate Women?**

This question concerns a good half of the human race. In answering it, we should like to say right away that Communists highly prize and respect the role of women in family life. They regard them as equals and worthy of enjoying the same social status as men.

Refusal to recognize this would deny the very idea of equality of human beings.

In spite of numerous zigzags, human society has made steady progress in its development, and this has been accompanied by the increasing recognition that mothers, wives and sisters are also human beings. The decisive part in the emancipation of women has been played by socialism. It did not stop at half measures. From its very first days, socialism granted women equal rights with men in all spheres of life. But the main thing is that it did not merely proclaim formal rights, but took the necessary steps to guarantee them.

Equality in employment is guaranteed by the right and real possibility to receive an education according to one's ability and inclinations. It is worth mentioning that, after the Revolution, institutes for women exclusively were set up in several Soviet Republics where women were in an especially unequal state prior to the Revolution. This had the purpose of eliminating their illiteracy as quickly as possible. Absence of unemployment in the Soviet Union and steady growth of the number of people working is a most important guarantee of a sure step from the desk to the plant, scientific institution or ministry. The work of every citizen is remunerated in line with its quantity and quality. Women thereby receive equal pay for equal work.

Thus, all roads are open to Soviet women. Women are employed in all branches of the national economy. They do the work of

turners and poultry breeders, teachers and actresses, book-keepers and scientists, managers and public leaders, doctors and even cosmonauts. Our economy employs over six million women with higher or specialized secondary education. This figure is even more impressive if we say that 6 million is more than 50 per cent of all Soviet specialists. It is nothing unusual to see women at the head of big factories, scientific and educational institutions. In the Turkmen Soviet Socialist Republic alone, where women were rightless even in family life only forty years ago, 134 of them are now managers and chief engineers of enterprises. Scores of Turkmenian women have been elected chairmen of collective farms and are managing them efficiently.

In such spheres as health and education, women are predominant. They account for 75 per cent of all Soviet doctors. Women are more than likely to be heads of rural or district health or education departments.

Soviet women have the same opportunities with men in science, a sphere which has been more monopolized by men than any other one since ancient times. Today, women account for 36 per cent of the total number of scientific workers in the USSR. As many as 971 of them are Academicians, Corresponding Members of Academies and Professors. Many of them have made a substantial contribution to the advancement of Soviet science. World

science is familiar with the names of Academician Militsa Nechkina (History), and Alla Masevich, Doctor of Sciences (Physics and Mathematics) and Vice-Chairman of the Astronomical Council of the USSR Academy of Sciences. The role of women in Soviet science is great, indeed. Much depends on them in the implementation of various scientific programs, including space research.

Women have made a good showing as state leaders. There is practically no Soviet state institution without women. To start with, there are 390 women in the highest legislative organ of the country—the Supreme Soviet. This means that they hold 27 per cent of the parliamentary seats. This is more than the total number of women in the parliaments of all the capitalist countries combined.

What is more, women very often head various standing committees and not infrequently Presidiums of the Supreme Soviets of different Republics. Yadgar Nasriddinova, for instance, was elected President of the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet of Uzbekistan, which is among the biggest Republics of the USSR. Currently, women hold posts of Presidents of the Supreme Soviets of Mordovia, Daghestan, Northern Ossetia and Yakutia. It is difficult to list the women who head local Soviets, because their name is legion.

We can name many Soviet women who hold ministerial posts: Yekaterina Furtseva is the USSR Minister of Culture, Hally Nazarova of Turkmenia, and Sakin Begmetova of

Kirghizia are Vice-Chairmen of the Council of Ministers of their respective Republics. The Ministers of Social Insurance of Kirghizia, the Russian Federation and Uzbekistan are also women. There is nothing unusual about women discharging official functions in the Soviet Union. It should be stressed particularly, that a woman's social status is determined only by her personal talent and business qualities.

**The New York Herald Tribune** wrote in connection with the space flight of Valentina Tereshkova, that the Russians had shown again that they knew the way to outstrip the Americans by letting women play an equal role with men in society. There is tremendous meaning in these words. The participation of women in socially useful labor has created the necessary conditions for the free development and full life of half of the nation.

## **Will Society Command People's Free Time?**

Most certainly not! There is nothing of the sort now, under socialism, and there will be nothing of the kind in the future, when we have communism.

The newspaper **Izvestia** once published the results of a poll on the pastime of its readers. What do they do after work? According to the poll, for instance, the chief techno-

logist of an automobile plant has been an amateur actor for many years now, a fitter at the same plant breeds aquarium fish at home, a foreign language instructor teaches German to neighborhood kids, a journalist is fond of angling, a mechanic enjoys photography, a nurse goes in for sports, a collective farm tractor-driver is keen on music and chess, etc.

Thousands of people volunteer to do social work in their spare time without compensation. They assist in the work of various committees of local Soviets, help trade union and Komsomol organizations, work at clubs, libraries, kindergartens and nurseries, study in scientific and art circles, read, draw and sculpture, go in for hiking, design their own TV sets and collect stamps. This is far from all, of course. Everybody has his own fancies, favorite pastime or hobby. **There is no need for a socialist or communist society to control this diversity of interests and attractions, and there is no reason to.** Everybody decides how he wants to spend his leisure time, thereby assuring genuine rest, and contributing to the comprehensive development of the people. This is important for every individual and for society as a whole. That is why the Soviet state seeks to provide every opportunity for all working people to spend their leisure time to advantage. Huge funds are being spent every year from the State Budget and the budgets of enterprises and public organizations on libraries, club-houses,

palaces of culture, stadiums, sports grounds, various museums, exhibitions, etc. All this is available to the people either free or for a nominal fee.

**Socialist society only takes care that a person's fancies do not run counter to accepted morality and do not harm others. But this is, quite naturally, in the interests of all.**

There will be no objections, of course, if somebody plays cards with his pals in his free time, or enjoys a game of dominoes, or, let us say, goes to the races and tries his luck at the totalizator. Nobody will censure a person for wasting his free time or, as we say, killing it. But he risks losing the respect of his comrades.

In socialist society the development of productive forces is accompanied by the rising living and cultural standards of the working people. Consequently the problem of free time is being solved on an increasingly favorable basis. There will be even more free time under communism, of course.

Here it is worthwhile recalling Karl Marx's remarkable statement, that while before communism social wealth is determined by the amount of time spent on work, the wealth of a communist society will be measured in terms of free time.

·On the other hand, however, we approach the problem of working and free time with the present-day yardstick, and draw a line between them. But under communism people will approach their work in quite another



way, and will, consequently, look upon their free time differently. Indeed, a person does not watch the clock, but spends his time as he sees fit when he is doing something he is fond of—inventing, creating. In this case it is often difficult to say where “obligatory” work ends and “pure” leisure begins. It is definite, however, that people will not sit idle. The well developed members of a future society, people with immense intellectual requirements, will surely know how to fill their free time. how to make use of this “space for mental development,” as it was called by Marx. The urge to acquire new knowledge, to master new professions will become just as natural in human beings as the need to work, rest, and sleep. Every person will have really unlimited opportunities to develop his endowments and put them to proper use. Communism will be the heyday of human individuality with its inexhaustible genius, talent and cultural wealth.

## **Does Communism Need an “Iron Curtain?”**

Many of those who now use the term “iron curtain” don’t know that it was first coined by the Goebbels propaganda machine. Political propriety alone, it seems, should have prevented them from repeating this anti-Soviet fascist invention.

The Soviet socialist state never wished to shut itself off from the rest of the world by an iron or any other curtain. Right after the establishment of the Soviet Republic Lenin came out for the development of economic and other relations with foreign countries.

The point is, unfortunately, that long before the "iron curtain" lie was put into circulation, the ruling quarters of the West did their best to shut the young Soviet Republic off from the outside world by the so-called sanitary cordon. People of the older generation remember well how a string of states and governments, hostile to the Soviet Union, were set up along the western frontiers of the USSR. Their purpose was to blockade the Russian Revolution, to cut Soviet Russia off from other countries, to prevent the spreading of communist ideas. And now, many years since, the very same quarters that endeavored to "quarantine" Soviet Russia, have the boldness to accuse her of shutting herself off from the rest of the world.

Of course, being surrounded for many years by frankly hostile countries, **the Soviet state was compelled to take definite measures for self-defense.** But these were forced, retaliatory steps, and the engineers of the sanitary cordon were to blame. The "iron curtain" myth is completely threadbare now. And how can a self-respecting person mention this "curtain" when there is a lively exchange of people and ideas going on between our coun-

try and the other states? Suffice it to say that more than one million foreign tourists come to the Soviet Union every year, let alone other visitors from abroad. There is a broad cultural exchange between the West and East. Trade and cooperation in different spheres have also grown.

The experience of past years has clearly shown that the scope of relations and contacts among states, belonging to different socio-political systems, is in direct proportion to the relaxation of international tension.

Many obstacles collapse when tension subsides, obstacles that still interfere with the rapprochement of countries and peoples. And vice versa, the worsening of international climate invariably has a reverse effect. This, as a matter of fact, is one of the reasons why the Soviet Government strives so hard to relax tension, to do away with the sources and reasons for tension.

**An "iron curtain" is not needed by a country and people who are successfully building up communism. On the contrary, it is in their interest for ever more people to learn of their experiences in building a new life, and at the same time for themselves to benefit from everything valuable and new abroad.** This is true even now. It goes without saying that a communist society, when it is built in our country, will open its doors even wider for the rest of humanity in order to show its accomplishments and advantages.

## Will Political Jokes Be Allowed?

Any member of a communist society would no doubt find such a question funny. He would most probably feel it was asked as a joke.

But since we are, apparently, asked this question in earnest, it is necessary to answer it in all seriousness, too. The fact is that this query in itself shows how gravely communism is misinterpreted by some people.

But let's get down to the point. Will political jokes be allowed under communism? Let us begin with a joke themselves: There will always be jokes as long as there are human beings. There is no joking on the moon, perhaps, but that will all change when Soviet and American cosmonauts get there!

Laughter is killing, but it cannot be killed! People were tried as counter-revolutionaries for jokes during the Stalin personality cult period. But the Soviet people's sense of humor could not be subdued. The people have always laughed and continue laughing at everything that is funny or absurd.

It would take too long to list all the books by Soviet humorists and satirists, in such great demand in our country. It would be hard to live without a good joke, to say nothing about building a new society. Humor and satire, as a matter of fact, are the most popular forms of criticism and self-criticism, which constitute one of the foundations of Soviet democracy.

Are there people in our country who are against satire and humor? Yes, there are. These are the men we laugh at—bureaucrats, office-seekers, grabbers, ignoramuses, and drunkards. But these objects of satire will become fewer and fewer with our approach to communism. And then, what will the satirists and writers of funny stories do?

It is difficult to believe, however, that having finally built a society where people will enjoy all human liberties, the men and women of communism will doom themselves to a dull life without jokes or laughter. After all, a sense of humor is just as immortal as the human race itself.

## **How Will the National Economy Be Planned?**

The presently accepted principles of socialist economy, to our mind, will be further developed and improved. The reader is, probably, familiar with such terms as the "five-year" and "seven-year" plans. These are programs for the development of the Soviet national economy over corresponding periods of time. Planning in the USSR is of a perfectly realistic character. All Soviet enterprises belong to one owner, the people, and when there is one owner, to be sure, he is in a position to know best about the output capacities of his enterprises and their potentialities. He also controls the funds of all the plants

and factories. This is exactly why the Soviet people can have a planned economy, which takes into consideration both the requirements of the people, and the available output potentialities. If it is necessary to step up the development of some sector of the national economy, this can be easily done in a planned society. All the funds are centralized, and they are channelled out to various branches of the national economy according to an all-over plan of development.

It goes without saying that this process cannot wholly be pictured in rosy colors. There occur setbacks and failures, unjustified losses, unrevealed resources, etc. Yet historic experience vividly proves that planned economic development on a nation-wide scale provides tremendous advantages.

Economic planning begins at the enterprises - plants, factories, mines, collective and state farms, transport, building, trading and other organizations. The factory and office workers and farmers contribute directly or through their public organizations to the planning of production by submitting estimates and proposals for the development and improvement of the operation of enterprises. These proposals are usually intended to expand production, improve quality, mechanize and automate labor processes, improve working conditions, make more rational use of raw materials, fuel, electric power and supplies, promote better utilization of equipment, more

efficient and profitable organization of production, etc.

After due consultation with the personnel of the enterprise and proper verification, the management draws up a draft plan for the required period (the accepted practice in the USSR is to work out current plans for a 1-2 year period, long-range plans—for 5-7 years, and perspective plans—for 15-20 years).

The plans of individual enterprises and organizations are checked, coordinated, corrected and incorporated by planning committees in a draft plan for territorial-production units (firms, production boards, ministries, etc.). Public health, educational, scientific and cultural bodies, trade unions and different public organizations draw up programs for the unproductive sphere of life, proceeding from the growing requirements of the people. All these data are included in a single plan for the development of the economy of a region, republic or country.

The estimates grow bigger at every higher level of planning and their range narrows down gradually.

After the plan is finally coordinated on a nation-wide scale, it is considered by the USSR Council of Ministers and the All-Union Central Council of Trade Unions (AUCCTU), and then endorsed by the Supreme Soviet of the USSR. It then becomes law, and must be carried out in the name of the common good.

Yet, the ratification of the plan does not

mean it cannot be changed. It is amended as soon as new resources or new, hitherto unknown circumstances come to light (reserves are set aside to provide for this).

### **What may change in planning under communism?**

Three important points are apparent even now. At present the requirements and needs of the people must be calculated within the limits of their purchasing capacity, i. e. depending on the level of their incomes. **In a communist society, where money will be dispensed with, this evaluation of requirements will be replaced by consumption statistics and registration of the sum total of individual orders.**

Today, all plans are calculated in kind and cash. The former method will be further developed and cash calculations will be replaced under communism by calculating units of expended labor.

In drawing up plans, Soviet economists rely on **relative indices**, the principal ones being indices of growth and comparison with other advanced nations.

Planning grows more and more difficult as the national economy expands. By now our planning bodies have to process tremendous amounts of data, connected with the calculation of consumers' demand, and also with different figures related to the operation of thousands of plants and factories. The purposes and process of planning will become



even more complicated under communism, when the needs of different groups of the population and even of individuals will be considered much more differentially. Inasmuch as requirements change all the time, it is necessary to correct the plans accordingly. A way out of this labyrinth of difficulties lies in the broad use of mathematical methods and cybernetic devices in the national economy, in accounting and planning. The country will be covered with a network of information storing and computing centers, interconnected with one another and the National Computing Center by special communication lines. In addition to collecting data, this will make it possible to plan and produce the optimal quantity of goods.

One more kind of index will, apparently, be introduced. It might well be called an "index of mutual economic relationship." The use of such would permit enterprises and districts to select the most optimal decisions for their plans, with due regard for the economy of the entire society. Planning will be made easier with the creation of such a system, because it will be possible to coordinate the plans with fewer indices.

It goes without saying that cybernetic information and computing machines will be used to group together and sum up the millions of orders coming from the consumers, to select the optimal processes of production, ways for the best utilization of resources, the rational distribution of production, the ba-

lanced coordination of economic proportions, and for the elaboration of the entire system of indices; machines will effect current and statistical accounting and control, etc.

And one more point. Economic planning in the USSR envisages, even today, the creation of definite reserves for uninterrupted economic development. In the future, sufficient reserves will allow the planned economy to run smoothly and will guarantee against all chance miscalculations in planning or natural calamities.

## **How Will Science Manifest Itself as a Direct Productive Force?**

Novelists of past centuries have devised an ivory tower and its inhabitant, the scientist, who resents the slightest attempt to make practical use of his discoveries. Even the high priest of ancient Egypt, whose head was a jumble of hopeless mysticism and rudiments of real knowledge, took care to make these grains of science benefit his tribesmen.

We are living in the age of an unprecedented scientific and technical revolution. Staggering scientific discoveries of the last half century have not only enabled us to advance industry and agriculture at a fast pace, but have given rise to new branches of production—chemical industry (especially the manufacture of a wide range of plastics), electronics, and atomic energy. But even the contemporary level of science and the rates at

which its achievements are being utilized in production, consequently, becoming available in everyday life, are not the limit. After all, the extent to which all the potentialities of science are used depends on the social organization of society.

This is borne out by the experience gained in the construction of a socialist economy in the USSR and the other countries of socialism. It becomes possible to carry out many projects needed by society, quickly and smoothly. **Rational concentration of capital, its investment in the most important, decisive sectors of the national economy and scientific research, are also governed by considerations of social expediency, and not by the desire to extract profit in private interests.** Such things as competing firms buying up or concealing patents are unthinkable under socialism.

It becomes possible to plan scientific research and concentrate it on the solution of the most urgent tasks, for the benefit of society. Efforts of thousands of scientists are concentrated on key problems, and the extent of this concentration is incomparable even with such a concerted effort as the Manhattan A-bomb Project or the effort to make a hydrogen bomb. As a matter of fact, under communism science will no longer be subjected to military goals, which often distorts its progress and diverts huge funds and forces from vital peaceful problems to developing ominous weapons for mutual extermination.

Both the Soviet Union and the other socialist countries train scientific and technical personnel according to plan in unprecedented numbers (280 engineers per one million of the population a year; the total number of scientific workers amounted to more than 600,000 at the end of 1964). Combined with a planned economy, all this makes possible the increasingly fast introduction of scientific achievements in production, the expansion of experimental research at plants and farms, the exemplary organization of scientific and technical information in all the country, and the ever fuller use of world experience. Herein, we imagine, lies the growing role of science as a direct productive force. Typical for modern science is the emergence of new branches, which usually originate "at the junction" of two or more spheres of research which formerly seemed to be quite foreign to each other, such as, for instance, bionics, a crossbreed of biology, physiology and electronics. The latest research shows that it is precisely in these "border spheres of science" that the most amazing discoveries are being made and the most overwhelming prospects for progress are found. Needless to say, tremendous opportunities will be opened up by the expansion of cooperation between scientists of different countries, when all political barriers are fully eliminated.

Science and production will pool their efforts under communism to achieve the common goal of satisfying the constantly growing

requirements of the people. This is why the speedy use of inventions in production will become a matter of routine, and an honorable duty of people taking part in this process.

The question may arise: Will not this rapid introduction of ever new scientific achievements result in the continuous regearing of production lines, shops and plants? Will this not produce a big gap between scientific progress and considerations of economic expediency and definite production stability? After all, the inventions applied in production to-day may become obsolete a few months later (something like this is now happening in military technology).

Yes, there is such a danger if we approach the question with the present-day yardstick. But under communism with its tremendously developed and planned economy the temporary stopping of plants or even whole branches of production will be easily made up for by bigger production in other industries. This will give the scientists of the future a chance to carry out huge experiments on a continental or even global scale.

## **What Is the Meaning of the Principle "From Each According to His Ability?" Who Can Determine the Abilities of a Person and How?**

Some people doubt whether anybody will want to work, the more so to full ability, af-

ter they get everything according to their requirements.

Others ask: How can it be determined whether a person is working to his full ability or not? His ability is often a riddle not only to the surrounding community, but to himself, too.

And still others say: Is the principle "according to one's ability" fair with regard to strong and gifted men? A mediocrity, even if he works 12 hours a day, will never be able to produce as much as a more gifted person.

These doubts arise only because the inquirers proceed from the habitual present-day conditions and standards. The first thing they must do is to imagine the conditions of a communist society, where labor will no longer be merely a source of earnings, but a natural necessity of man.

Is this not too categoric? No, not at all! The entire history of the human race is, primarily, a history of the production of material values and perfection of implements of labor. This means that labor is the main sphere of human activity. It is an inherent necessity of human beings, and they will simply be unable to live without it, just as without water or food.

It is easy to grasp the difference between the labor of a farm-hand, for instance, and the work of a composer. What makes the former sell his labor? Unwillingness to die of hunger and desire to earn a living for himself and his family. What makes a composer write

music? His inherent urge and sense of satisfaction from having produced something, that, in his opinion, is new and valuable, something that may be needed by others.

This, of course, is rather a primitive comparison, but it shows the difference between hired, forced labor, done for the sake of an earning, and creative endeavor, which brings joy and makes a person feel socially useful. It may be said that there are quite a number of composers who write music for the sake of money, and not a few workmen, who enjoy their work. Quite true! The most diverse attitudes to labor may be observed even in a society where everything is assessed in terms of money. Very often people do not realize themselves why they work: if it is merely for money or due to other motives? The important point is to see which of these two tendencies prevail.

**Under communism, work will be rid of elements of profit-making and other ulterior motives. This will not mean that everybody will become altruistic (though a highly moral image will be of great significance). The main point is that the level of economic development and the new economic conditions will destroy the very soil on which such things as profit-making and money-loving mature. The natural necessity of a human being to work will not be restricted either socially or economically.**

Even at the first stage of communism, i. e. under socialism, we know no forced labor,

and since there is no unemployment, people do not have to accept any available job. Furthermore, the interests of society and the individual coincide under socialism. All this engenders a new attitude to labor in the socialist countries. Sharing his impressions of the Soviet Union in the book **Peace with Russia**, Averell Harriman wrote that he was amazed to discover that Soviet workers take an interest and pride in their own contribution to the common national task. This does credit to Mr. Harriman, because he has detected correctly a very significant feature of socialist society. In our country, though it has just begun the construction of a communist society, everyday work is a vital necessity for millions of people; a source of inspiration and a means of self-assertion.

We could list here millions of workers and collective farmers—innovators in production and rationalizers, hundreds of thousands of members of different public designing offices, economic and planning bureaus, who voluntarily solve many problems in their free time without being paid for it; professors and instructors, who deliver lectures free of charge at people's universities all over the country. There are very many such examples, indeed.

It is by no means easy, of course, to make every job creative or to secure conditions when every working man will feel a full-fledged master of the country. But the Soviet people are sure that this task will finally be solved, too. Much attention is being paid in



the USSR to the automation and mechanization of all branches of production, and not only because this raises labor productivity. We hold equally important the task of **easing labor conditions** in every possible way, of employing automation and electronics to bring physical labor closer to intellectual work. One may see improvements at Soviet plants, which do not yield a direct economic effect, but facilitate and better working conditions.

A communist society, in the final count, will merge physical labor organically with intellectual work. This work will bring joy, apart from satisfying man's natural necessity. It is inherent in people to set themselves ever new tasks, to strive for new accomplishments. A worker or engineer feels great satisfaction when he produces something that is better than its predecessor. And communist labor creates the best of conditions for the blossoming of human gifts and endowments.

Another point of no lesser importance: one of the principal freedoms, guaranteed to a human being by communist society alone, is to change his profession at will, to work according to his calling and ability. Millions of people will no longer be condemned by the prevailing division of labor to a chance or disliked profession.

Even under socialism every man enjoys guaranteed employment, the right to a free education and vocational training (including education without quitting work). In 1964

alone as many as 900,000 young workers were trained in technical trades schools at the expense of society. What is more, many workers have learned a trade or upped their skills right at work. Open contest exams at higher educational establishments and research institutions, additional paid leaves and other privileges to students, give everybody a chance to choose a profession freely, and to change it when necessary.

And last but not least: the enhanced social awareness of people, their growing moral standards. Of course, there are still grabbers among us, there are people who don't work well, but are eager to make money. It is much easier, you see, to build up a thousand of the most up-to-date enterprises than to remould human nature, burdened by age-old habits of a society based on profit-making and exploitation. But collective work, collective efforts in building up a new society, are the best media for fostering lofty moral qualities in millions of people.

All that has been achieved in this respect in the USSR and in the other socialist countries makes us confident that everybody will work "according to his ability" under communism. Nobody will have to be **forced** to work either administratively or by means of various incentives. People engrossed in creative labor, people who get pleasure from it, cannot work otherwise. And no special gauges will be needed to determine whether a member of a communist society works to

full ability or not. He simply won't be able to work any other way.

## **What Is the Meaning of the Principle "To Each According to His Needs?" Is It Possible to Satisfy All the Requirements, Individual Needs and Tastes?**

There is a view that production, no matter how fast it develops, has its limits, while individual human requirements are boundless. Consequently, no matter how many good things of life are produced, they will not suffice to satisfy all the needs fully. Is this correct?

Having set the goal of creating a society of full abundance, scientific communism, as distinct from utopian teachings of the past, rules out asceticism, i. e. restriction of human consumption to prime necessities. Stereotypeness of personal consumption is unthinkable under communism. The critics of communism often point to the numerous difficulties and privations which the population of the young Soviet Republic, for instance, had to endure during the first twenty or so years of its existence. But, first of all, these shortages did not occur in a communist society, but in the very initial (and most difficult) period of breaking the ground for such a society, in conditions when the economy lay ravaged by the civil war and foreign intervention.

We must not overlook also such a factor as the economic blockade by hostile capitalist powers and sabotage of the exploiting classes, which still survived in those days inside the country. And, secondly, having started building up in these extremely difficult conditions the first stage of communism—a socialist society—the Soviet people **deliberately imposed** temporary, though rather serious restrictions on the consumer in order to increase capital investment in the national economy, science and culture (there are some restrictions of this kind even now, for instance, on motor cars). But we repeat that these are temporary measures, taken deliberately to accelerate the achievement of the set goal—the building up of a communist society.

Incidentally, it is worth noting, that the difficulties and privations endured by the Soviet people are by no means unavoidable for other countries embarking upon the road of communism. Why? Because many of them are starting to build up a new society with a much more advanced economy. Application of a fair principle in the distribution of material and spiritual values allows to raise the people's living standards right away. It goes without saying that the higher the economic level of a country, the more good things of life its people will be able to get. Economically advanced countries will, of course, be able to develop all sectors of the national economy without hurting the population.

The contemporary international situation,

characterized as it is by the growth of peace forces, makes possible the prevention of armed intervention by reactionary forces in the affairs of socialist states. This means that their peoples are now able to avoid war sacrifices and devastation.

In dealing with the problem of demand in conditions of complete communism, Marxism-Leninism proceeds from the assumption that human requirements tend to grow boundlessly, that there is a wide variety of tastes, and that human individuality is bound to blossom. The sole aim of a communist economy, therefore, will be to satisfy ever more fully the material and spiritual requirements of every member of society. Otherwise the struggle of Marxists for the revolutionary transformation of society, for universal progress, would lose all sense.

At the same time, in determining the requirements of human society Marxists proceed from the scientifically proved formula that natural human requirements are by no means boundless at every given stretch of history, that they may be estimated (excluding extravagances, of course, greediness, groundless whims or claims of individuals or social groups). Can such a pastime, for instance, as piano-smashing contests which have become popular in some countries of late be regarded as a natural necessity?

It is scientifically proved that the consumption of food, clothing, footwear, housing, numerous household necessities, various ameni-

ties and cultural services has its intelligent and rational limits. Beyond them we have wastefulness and groundless whims. An intelligent person realizes, of course, that every product must be consumed in reasonable quantities. Overeating, for instance, lowers the vitality of one's organism, harms one's health, and shortens one's life; too much furniture creates inconveniences; an overstocked wardrobe is practically useless and troublesome; abuse of the cinema, theatre or TV can be exhausting and irritating instead of affording aesthetic satisfaction and pleasure.

Careful scientific research in the USSR and other countries has determined the best diet for every set of living conditions (climate, consumption of physical and mental energy, etc.). It is not very difficult to determine also the housing conditions necessary for maximum comfort, the total quantity of material and cultural values needed for a well-to-do life according to modern scientific standards. For the population of the Soviet Union this is approximately 1.5-2 times that of the current average living standards in the United States (in terms of value). According to one Soviet sociologist, who just recently visited the United States, a rank-and-file American would be twice as well off at the present level of production, if the principle of distribution in the country were socialist and not private ownership.

There can be no doubt that the productive forces of modern society are able to achieve a

level which will ensure the necessary abundance of material and cultural values for all people. This task can be ultimately solved in a comparatively short space of history, and with a sufficient margin to make up for the future growth of consumption to meet individual digressions from the scientifically warranted average requirements. These are the very principles which underlie the long-range economic plans of the Soviet Union, designed to create the material and technical foundation of a communist society.

We can well imagine, of course, that there may be some unique things, which would be outside the reach of all at one time. The paintings of great artists, for instance, and outstanding performances (this problem will be solved at least partially by global color TV). But evidently a communist society will find means of establishing fair priority in the enjoyment of such unique pleasures.

The implementation of the principle "to each according to his requirements" envisages, apart from an abundance of consumer goods, the formation of several other requisites, which will take some time. They include, above all, an efficient and smoothly functioning planning machinery, which will respond promptly to the growth of demand, individual needs and tastes, and a most up-to-date system of public services, which will supply the consumers with everything they need.

But it is most important and most difficult to foster high social consciousness in the

people, to make them despise wastefulness, to value public wealth created by common labor. This means the bringing up of people devoid of egoism, greediness or avidity, who would not have parasitic designs on others.

The full and unhampered implementation of the principle "to each according to his requirements" will be possible under communism precisely because the needs of every consumer will only be restricted by his own intelligence and morality, his sense of self-respect and respect for the interests and requirements of other members of society.

## **How Will the Good Things of Life Be Distributed? Will Not the Gratuitous Distribution of Goods Lead to the Enslavement of the Human Being, to the Standardization of Tastes and Elimination of Free Consumer's Choice?**

It is difficult to foresee now the concrete forms and ways by which the members of a communist society will find it most convenient to distribute the good things of life. It may be that this system will be based on the present method of selling from stock and taking individual orders, with the only difference that everything will be provided free of charge and in any quantity. There is nothing impossible or dangerous in this, considering the well advanced communist economy and high social consciousness of all its members.



**The only brake will be the reason and taste of the consumer.**

The belief persists for many centuries now that "one should not look a gift horse in the mouth." Some people now figure it this way: what kind of choice can there be if everything we receive is a gift? You must be pleased with what you get if it is free of charge! And how can the giver take into account all tastes? He will inevitably foist his own tastes on many. The taker, therefore, will be the slave of his benefactor! And if all the good things of life are distributed free of charge, will they not be in the nature of a gift? Will this not lead to a situation when you will have to take what is given you?

Such views on gratuity and its consequences under communism still persist among people, who know little about scientific communism. First of all there will be no beneficiaries under communism. All able-bodied people will work in this highly developed society to the best of their abilities. Each one of them will make his contribution to a life of plenty. Every member of a communist society will be a producer and consumer at the same time (except children, the retired and disabled). This is why the produced goods cannot be regarded as gifts. This will alter human psychology toward things that are distributed free of charge. One should not look a gift horse in the mouth, indeed. A beneficiary, true enough, has no freedom of choice. But a man who draws on common

stores, which he has contributed to with his labor, is rather the master and not a beneficiary. Quite some difference, is it not? Being the master, he will produce the things that are needed by the people of his time, and in good variety, too. Quantitative restrictions in distribution (within reasonable amounts, of course) will disappear then, and the best of conditions will exist for the development of diverse tastes. Despite their wide range, they will, naturally, fall into certain groupings, because people have so much in common after all, and the super-developed productive forces will be fully able to satisfy consumer demand both quantitatively and qualitatively.

Further. These conjectures stem from the contemporary experience of the human race, which shows that as long as there is no abundance of consumer goods, gratuity is always linked with some degree of restriction, rationing, and standardization. But the point is that this entire experience is inseparable from the condition "as long as there is no abundance of consumer goods."

But just imagine another standard of economic development, when consumer commodities will be turned out in an incomparably richer assortment, of better quality, and in average quantities twice or thrice that, let us say, available today to the population of the most developed Western states. Nobody will then dream of regimenting tastes, reducing or eliminating the freedom of consumer choice. The choice will be made even greater

by the free distribution of the good things of life. After all, everybody has to reckon with his budget today. There is a certain degree of freedom of choice, of course, but for most of the people it boils down to a certain sum of money. And the budgets of the owner of a steel company, let us say, or a farm-hand are by far not the same. On the other hand, every member of a future society will be like a man with an unlimited bank account and a cheque book to draw on it.

Incredible, you may say. Society cannot allow everybody to help himself to as much as he wants, irrespective of value. People have such appetites they will never be satisfied. And what will happen if unlimited freedom of choice is guaranteed? People are sure to take only the best, and what will you do with inferior and cheaper products?

Such arguments again betray the present-day dependence of consumer choice on the family budget. True enough, many goods are now made of inferior quality and sold at a cheaper price to meet the purchasing capacity of the population. This is a sort of regulator. And what if we get rid of it? Will there be any need of production goods of inferior quality? No, of course not.

The desire to stockpile as much goods as possible will also disappear. We must bear in mind that under communism people will have an entirely different psychology. The population of the Western states is quite used now to the fact that a man's public standing

and welfare depend on the amount of wealth he has. Under these circumstances property begins to prevail over human beings, and to turn them into its slaves. On the other hand, when an abundance of goods is achieved and they are available free of charge, there will be no need of hoarding. It will be unnecessary to leave an inheritance to one's children, because they will receive all they need free, too. The property cult, which fetters the human being, will disappear. There will be no economic necessity to have what a man does not need. This new psychology is one of the most important factors which guarantee the possibility of satisfying fully the requirements of all members of a communist society.

If you can imagine all this, you will realize that any distribution for money will impede and control consumer choice much more than free of charge supply. It is the latter that does away with the last economic fetters, the last economic regulations. And only then, for the first time in history, the human being, sensible and morally sound as a member of a communist society is bound to be, will become really free in his consumer choice, in the satisfaction of his individual tastes.

## **When Shall We Arrive at the Communist Principle of Distribution?**

It is incorrect to think that a communist society will transfer to free distribution all

at once, at one go. This would be tantamount to saying that there is a blank wall between socialism and communism. We should like to remind our readers once again that there is no such wall, that socialism is actually incomplete, immature communism. This is manifested in every sphere of life, including the distribution of many values.

Even at the first stage of communism, i. e. under socialism, many material and cultural requirements of the Soviet people are satisfied free of charge or at minimum cost. Money for this comes from collective sources. This is why they are called social funds, i. e. funds that are to be used in the interests of all, irrespective of earnings, social status, or nationality. The social funds are made up of deductions from the revenues of socialist enterprises. The USSR Supreme Soviet annually provides for such collective funds in the state plan. In 1964 they amounted to approximately 40 per cent of all budget spendings. These are the funds which provide additional benefits for the Soviet people over and above their wages.

What are these benefits? Medical care, for instance. It is available free of charge in the Soviet Union. Every Soviet citizen is entitled to free medical care, ranging from a check-up to delicate operations. All expenses are borne by the state. Here is a chance to appeal once again to the common sense of those who doubt the possibility of preventing the abuse of gratuitous benefits. To follow

their logic, the Soviet people should have spent all their free time in hospitals and polyclinics. Why not see the doctor and get treatment if it is all free of charge? But nobody goes to the doctor without need and nobody wants to get medical treatment in advance. What for? It will be the same with other benefits, too.

All education, from primary to higher, is also absolutely free of charge in the USSR. In addition, most of the students get government scholarships (stipends).

If a Soviet citizen falls ill, he receives an allowance, which is usually only slightly below his average earnings. The factory and office workers get paid leaves every year. But this Soviet society's concern for the recreation of the working people and their families does not end there. As many as twelve million people annually spend their leaves and holidays at rest homes, sanatoria and Young Pioneer camps. Most of them get accommodation free of charge or at no more than 30 per cent of its cost.

The number of pensioners reached 32.5 million in the USSR by January 1st, 1965. The size of pensions for most retired workers ranges from 50 to 100 per cent of their former earnings. More than 10 million children are looked after at kindergartens and nurseries while their parents work. What has this to do with social funds? A lot! Judge for yourself. A child's nursery accommodation costs the state 300-350 rubles a year, while the

parents pay on the average only 45-55 rubles, and many don't pay anything at all. The state assumes all the expenses connected with the upkeep of the children.

From this you can see that social funds play a significant role in raising the living standards of Soviet people.

Assessing the importance of social funds, the noted American scientist William Dubois, said: "The population of the Soviet Union are not haunted by such thoughts as: how will they live in old age? Where will they get treatment in case of illness? How to provide their children with an education? How to go on leave when every penny is needed at home? The Soviet citizen knows," the scientist stressed, "that the state takes care of all that."

In 1963 each Soviet citizen received, on an average, 130 rubles in the way of various benefits and grants from society. In 1964 this figure grew to 160 rubles. The size and role of social funds grow and will keep on growing as the years go by. Approximately one half of all the requirements of Soviet citizens will be satisfied at the expense of society by 1980.

The communist method of satisfying the people's needs operates under socialism, too, but only to a certain extent. The Soviet people still have to buy most of the things they need for the money they earn. But the important point here is the general tendency of social development. And this tendency leads directly

to the free distribution of all commodities as the socialist society grows richer. So we see that the question—when will all values be distributed in the communist way?—actually boils down to: when will the last thing that has to be bought become available free of charge? This is how matters stand. After all, we see that the range of freely distributed goods and benefits is gradually expanding. This is why the question should be answered in the following way: under complete communism, when there will be an abundance of all the good things of life.

The reader may pose a legitimate question: is it not better to use the money that makes up the social funds to increase the wages of the working people? In this case medical care, education, and the best housing would be accessible in different measure to different people, depending on their earnings. This is alien to the very nature of socialist society. It is unfair. The only correct way is for the state to see to the satisfaction of the people's needs, to relieve the population of payment.

## **Does a Person Need to Have Several Occupations or Professions?**

Can an astrophysicist, tired of his scientific research, switch over for a while to the job of a mine mechanic, then start composing symphony music, and finally return, comple-



tely refreshed, to his favorite stellar worlds? Only in fiction, you may say.

But if you look around attentively, you will see the makings of the most diverse professions, the most varied, seemingly incompatible inclinations in many people. The history of human culture knows of many cases when people had really encyclopaedic knowledge. The noted 19th-century Russian composer, Borodin, for example, was a chemistry professor, while the great musician, Rimsky-Korsakov, was a naval officer. Yes, but these were all outstanding personalities, you will say. And what about the ordinary man?

Everything depends on the conditions in which he works and lives. The division of labor, which has developed over centuries, is a scourge for creative human nature. It bridles, impoverishes and cripples it, brings moral suffering, and often leads to material hardships and dramas.

Requisites for the solution of this age-old problem are being formed for the first time in the socialist society. The system of free day-time and evening education and guaranteed employment facilitate the choice of a profession. Mechanization and automation make the job of a worker akin to that of an engineer. The thirst for knowledge and science is growing steadily among the working people of town and countryside. Society ensures ever more favorable conditions for the satisfaction of this important requirement. Whereas the number of people with a higher and secon-

dary education amounted to 43 per cent of the Soviet Union's population in 1959, it grew to 50 per cent by the beginning of 1964.

Emancipation of the people from the old division of labor, which straitjackets them, begins, therefore, with socialism, and communism will continue and complete this great cause. Social inequality will disappear, distinctions between town and countryside will be eliminated, and there will be no antithesis between mental and physical labor. The people of the future will not have to worry about a livelihood, and will be able to develop their talents and endowments to the utmost. Having much free time and the necessary conditions, they will be able to master the most diverse knowledge, skills, and professions.

This does not mean, of course, that there will be no experts and authorities in different spheres of knowledge under communism, and that they will not be needed. Not at all! People highly versed in definite branches of production, science and culture will be needed everywhere. But despite this, no member of society will be bound forever to one profession, or doomed to a boring occupation. The scientific and technical revolution, which is now under way, leads to the disappearance of narrow professionalism. Automation of production tends to combine professions and leads to the simultaneous operation of several machines. In these conditions a workman has to have several professions and not one, has

to perform a whole complex of operations and not some particular one. The scope of a worker's activity broadens out, and the share of mental labor in the working process increases. The new professions are characterized by deep and thorough knowledge. The job of a worker is increasingly becoming a kind of engineering work. A member of a communist society will not be bound for life to one narrow speciality. Having received comprehensive and thorough training, and possessing several specialities to his liking, he will be able to change his job or occupation repeatedly, finding new pleasure in it every time, and getting an opportunity to put his abilities and knowledge to proper use.

## **Does Communism Make Spiritual Values Subordinate to the Materialistic Approach to Nature and Society?**

Material production and the economic relations determining it engender all the rest—morality, law, science, and art, everything that is called by Marxists the “ideological superstructure” on the economic foundation of society. Material production may be compared to roots, feeding a gorgeous tree, with its maze of branches, leaves and flowers.

The Marxists are least of all to blame for the fact that most people usually see only the flowers and fruits, and forget about the roots that nourish them. This rough com-

parison should not be understood literally, of course. Everything is much more complicated in actual life. In a developed society, for instance, the ideological superstructure can exert a great influence on the economic aspects of life. But the principle remains unchanged—material production, the level of productive forces underlie the entire development of society. This is the main conception which explains the Marxists' seeming preference for the material rather than the spiritual factor.

Try to trace all the stages of the development of human society, from tribal communism to capitalism and socialism which is replacing it. You will see that each of these social structures had not only a definite level of the development of productive forces and its own form of ownership of means of production, corresponding to it, but its own law, morality, and art. This does not rule out, of course, the existence in all epochs of common human traits, for instance, in morality or art, which live on for centuries and will remain, as a matter of fact, under communism, too.

Tackling today the problems of building up a socialist and then communist society, the Marxists have arrived at the conclusion that their task No. 1 is to create a powerful material and technical foundation. But this is by no means the goal of the Communists and an end in itself. This is merely a **means** to ensure a real abundance of material (and consequently cultural) values for all members

of the new society. Indeed, what spiritual freedom can there be, what harmonious development of the individual can be expected, if men devote all their efforts and thoughts to the task of earning money, of winning bread for their family?

The view that moral values and questions of spiritual life are relegated to the background under socialism, and the more so communism, can be explained by ignorance or disinformation. Universal free education, general thirst for knowledge, record editions of books, broad development of art and its accessibility to everybody, the flourishing of amateur art—all this is characteristic of the Soviet Union and the other socialist countries. Those of our readers who have seen performances of the Bolshoi Ballet, the Moiseyev Dance Company, the Moscow Art Theatre, who have enjoyed the concerts of Svyatoslav Richter, David Oistrakh, Mstislav Rostropovich, Zara Dolukhanova, will realize that the consummate skill of these “stars” did not grow from nothing.

Karl Marx called material production “the realm of necessity.” Outlining the contours of a future communist society in his famous **Capital**, he wrote: “The realm of freedom really begins where labor, dictated by need and formal expediency, ends, and, consequently, it essentially lies on the other side of material production.” Characterizing the goal of communism, Marx stressed that it is not material production in itself. Only “on the

other side of it," he wrote, "begins the development of human force, which is an end in itself, the true realm of freedom, which, however, can blossom out only on this realm of necessity, as on its basis."

The new society must definitely be a "realm of freedom," where the creative life of people, knowing no material worries, will develop unhampered. The endowments and talents of each, their finest moral qualities will blossom forth. The norms of morality will become the sole regulator of relationships among the people.

Can one imagine better conditions for the proper role of moral values in society, for the genuinely free development of an individual's spiritual life?

## **Will There Be Morality Under Communism? If So, How Will It Differ from Generally Accepted Morality?**

We shall start off with a counter question: can there be human society without morality? We are convinced there cannot be. Why should communism be an exception then? Furthermore, every condition will be created in the communist society for the blossoming of human morality to an extent when moral codes will replace legal standards and administrative coercion in human relations.

And now let's go over to the second part

of the question. What is communist morality?

First of all, it must be stressed that Communists have not invented any special morality of their own. They never tried to. Communists did not discard the lofty morals, developed by the human race in the course of its history. Let us begin with the crux of the matter in order to understand the moral principles that communist ideology advocates.

Communists have set themselves the task of rebuilding social life on principles of full social justice. This means that every person will be guaranteed really equal opportunities for the all-round development of his individual gifts and abilities. Only then will he be able to become (as befits his lofty calling!) a harmoniously integrated creative personality; to feel himself the real master not only of his own destiny, but of social life, too, and, thereby, enjoy supreme moral satisfaction. In order to achieve this, all citizens must be well provided for materially, must be genuinely (not formally) equal and free, and must partake freely of all the boons of human culture. These conditions are being increasingly created under socialism, i. e. in the process of the construction of a communist society, in which they will fully materialize.

In building communism deliberately and consciously, the Soviet people devote all their physical and intellectual energy, all their ardor to this noble cause. After all, the main thing is to create conditions for the completely fair treatment of **every** person, which is the

only possible basis for the establishment of really human, fraternal relations **among all** the people. Hardly anyone will argue that these are exactly the relations that express the innermost essence of morality, that they are ideal from the moral point of view. This is why communism for us is not only a humane earthly goal, but a lofty moral ideal. The grandeur of this social system consists in that it combines for the first time in history a moral ideal with material and spiritual requisites for its attainment.

It goes without saying, therefore, that the Soviet people gauge the moral value of their deeds, their behavior by the degree to which they meet our concept of communism, the tasks of building it.

What are the concrete demands made of people by communist morality? What actions are considered morally decent?

One of the main principles of communist morality is the conscientious attitude of every person toward his work for the good of the socialist (consequently, communist) society. This, in our opinion, is the principal criterion of a citizen's conscientious attitude to his public duty. The finest moral qualities of a member of a communist society are also intolerance of injustice, unqualified respect for human dignity, honesty, truthfulness, sincerity, modesty, mutual respect in family life, concern for the upbringing of children, attention to the aged and the sick.

The relationships of people, according to



the moral code of Communists, are based on the immutable rule: man is to man a friend, comrade and brother. This means that we consider it absolutely necessary to foster a sense of collectivism and comradely mutual assistance in every person. Tact, kindness, compassion, readiness to help even a stranger at any time - this is what we prize most in the behavior of Soviet people.

We wish to assert in life all the finest moral principles, developed in the course of the age-old history of civilization. Herein lies the general human character of communist morality. At the same time, though professing lofty moral principles, the Communists do not shut their eyes to the social reasons, interfering with the implementation of these principles. Communist morality does not say in general: people, be fair to one another! It says concretely: destroy the very source of injustice and build up a fair society!

This is why, apart from the historically developed principles, which are common to all humanity, the moral code of Communists includes also formerly unknown principles and rules, elaborated in the course of the creation and development of a new society. These are, primarily, loyalty to the cause of communism, which is simultaneously an expression of love of the socialist homeland, and service to one's people. The new moral principles include, moreover, a respectful attitude to socially useful labor, concern for the preservation and growth of public wealth, col-

lectivism and fraternal solidarity with the working people of all countries, and with all peoples. We regard as disgraceful and unworthy of man any manifestation of national enmity or racial intolerance.

Human beings are socially-minded creatures. They cannot live in solitude. Each one of us experiences the need to communicate with other people. "Company in distress makes trouble less," says the wise old folk saying. Friendly compassion alleviates any grief. Joy brings pleasure only when it is shared with others. We need one another. This is a rudimentary truth. But don't forget to draw the conclusion suggested by it: people must live in friendship, they must promote solidarity. Those who speak of humanism, must always bear this in mind, because solidarity is humanism.

The Communists have drawn this conclusion. This is why they have set themselves the task of creating a society, the living conditions of which would unite and not alienate people. And this is the main thing that makes communist morality really effective and essentially humane.

Only relations among people who are absolutely equal, who have the same property relationships and enjoy equal opportunities to satisfy all their reasonable requirements, can be genuinely humane. This is why communist morality is for collective, public property, for collective labor for the benefit of all the society, and not only in one's selfish

interests. This is why it is against money-grabbing, self-interest and parasitism. Private property, which gives an individual or a group of people an opportunity to exploit others, disunites the people, engenders egoism, individualism, self-opposition to others. This is why communist morality is against private ownership of means of production—land, plants, factories, banks, etc.

This is the difference between communist morality and the bourgeois morals now prevailing in the West (and not "the generally accepted morality" as it is put in the question, because there is no single morality in a society divided into antagonistic classes). It is worth mentioning that communist morality itself was born within the bourgeois society. It is an offspring of the working class, whose moral views are expressed by Marxist ethics.

It is generally known that the Great October Socialist Revolution marked the beginning of the implementation of communist ideals (including moral ideals). It placed the workers at the helm and did away with private ownership of the means of production. The exploiting classes were abolished in the country in the course of socialist construction, which spelled an end to exploitation, social inequality, racial and national oppression. A solid foundation was created in the USSR to rear all the members of society in the spirit of communist morality.

Aare Noionen, a correspondent of the Finnish press and radio, had lived in our country for four years. Upon his return home, he was asked what impressed him most in the USSR. Here is what he replied: "This is not so easy to answer, but I would say it is the nation-wide concern for each other. Nobody can be a lone soul in the Soviet Union, no matter where he may be at the time."

By saying this, Aare Noionen has actually accentuated the main thing—the humanism of communist morality.

Needless to say, moral standards and rules of decency will continue developing and improving even when a communist society has been built. Prohibitive rules, which exist in our days due to vestiges of the past in human behavior, will disappear gradually. Positive norms of morality, according with the finest ideals of humanism, will be further developed. This will signify the genuine blossoming of moral freedom, which does not mean denial of moral responsibility to society and oneself, but voluntary observance due to deep personal conviction.

## **Will People Have Human Weaknesses?**

Let's put it another way: will the people of a communist society be completely perfect? It would be naive to think so. Life under com-

munism, naturally enough, will not be care-free and cloudless, will not be a sort of Eden the world over, will not be a rosy abode of peace and tranquility. The people of communist society will also have to exert their energy to the utmost sometimes, will know the thrill of labor accomplishments, the excitement of scientific quest, and the bitterness of mistakes. The people of the communist morrow will transform nature, grapple with its powerful forces, unravel the greatest secrets of our planet and the vastnesses of outer space, solve the most complicated scientific and technical problems, streamline public administration institutions, and tackle many routine problems that come up. And this life, vital and throbbing with activity, will have its own difficulties and worries, losses and sacrifices, doubts and disappointments. There will be risk, danger, feats of valor, creative inspiration, and the joy of victory.

Communism will do away with class, national, religious, and racial antagonisms, there will be no breeding ground for social and economic conflicts, which alienate people. Such vices as greediness, conceit, hypocrisy, egoism, rudeness, and dissoluteness will disappear forever. This does not mean, however, that there won't be contradictions, that people will never disagree on tastes and views. No progress is possible without contending views, without debates and arguments. And a communist society will hardly agree to mark time. Even then, it may be presumed,

not everyone will have the same level of conscientiousness, there will be people making mistakes and blunders.

Neither will the contradictions of a spiritual-psychological nature disappear. Even in the atmosphere of general trust, frankness and goodwill, typifying communism, there may be misunderstandings between separate individuals, different likes and dislikes, clashes of characters—rational and emotional, of feeling and duty, differences between parents and children, and family troubles. It may be presumed that rivalry and jealousy will remain in love. There will be the sufferings of an abandoned lover and the torments of unrequited love. But humanism will prevail in these situations, and people will settle their personal conflicts in a dignified, humane way.

The role of friends and society as an “educational” medium, as the “deliverer” of people from their personal shortcomings will grow tremendously. Friends will see to it that unhealthy inclinations do not lead to deeds liable to harm the individual or others, that it does not develop into something that contradicts the rules and ethical concepts of society. And it is perfectly clear that such present-day “weaknesses” of ours as heavy drinking and gambling will be censured. The life of the people will be incomparably sounder, more sensible than today, and many harmful habits will disappear with time.

## Will the Family Remain?

There were people in the past, who believed the Communists wanted to abolish matrimony and destroy the family. Probably there aren't many who believe that now. Life has shown that far from introducing the notorious "community of wives," the Communists are concerned with strengthening the family.

Needless to say, the family will not escape some changes in the process of future social and psychological upheavals which will take place in all spheres of social life, in the customs and views of the people.

What will these changes be like?

Some people believe that the family may gradually die off under communism, when it reaches its prime. They proceed mainly from two assumptions. Firstly, that under communism people will no longer have to worry about their subsistence, and the family will cease to be an economic unit of society. Secondly, that society will be able to assume fully the task of bringing up the children.

But the supporters of this theory are wrong. There are valid points in their arguments, of course, but we cannot agree with their conclusions.

It is true that the family will gradually lose its economic importance. Well developed social production will create a life of plenty, and everybody will enjoy the benefits. The material dependence of some members of a fa-

mily on others, on the bread-winner, will disappear. Women will be freed of household chores. They will become independent in the full sense of the word, independent of men and free to engage in creative labor on an equal footing with them.

But are economic bonds the sole and principal foundation of the family? Even now, in a socialist society, love, mutual respect, and spiritual community are decisive in the alliance of two persons. We believe that this will be the only foundation of the family in a society of the future. Feelings will not be marred and suppressed by material hardships, difficulties and shortcomings. Many causes of quarrels, disagreements, and irritation will disappear. Love will become even more beautiful, deeper. Feelings will be stronger, supplemented and enriched by parental joys, concern for the children.

Under communism, society will, of course, play a much bigger part than today in the upkeep and rearing of the young generation. The system of child welfare institutions will be much more developed than today. But will the parents renounce the joy of living together with their own children, of being their first tutors? We think not!

But does not the complete freedom of divorce, which will doubtlessly exist under communism, contradict this conviction of ours? Will not the people abuse this freedom?

We don't think so.

Yes, relationships between men and women



will become a purely private affair and society will have no cause to meddle. People will marry only if they love each other, prompted by no other reasons or motives. For this reason their marriage will be a healthy, happy one. Will it be everlasting? We cannot guarantee this. As in everything, exceptions prove the rule. Divorce, when the husband and wife no longer see sense in their alliance, will become a blessing, and not only for the two of them, but for society, too, which is interested in the personal happiness of all its citizens.

Very interesting are the results of a poll of 500 newlywed couples, carried out by staff members of the Philosophy Institute of the USSR Academy of Sciences at the Leningrad Palace of Weddings. The question was: "What, in your opinion, is the main requisite for a lasting and happy wedlock?" As many as 89.4 per cent of the newlyweds said that it was love, or love plus community of views, trust, sincerity, friendship, equality, and mutual respect. So we see that by now it is the moral and not the ulterior economic approach to marriage that prevails in the Soviet Union.

The following figures show how much sounder and stronger matrimonial and family relations have become in the USSR.

Today, there are 12.1 marriages in the USSR per 1,000 of the population. This is much more than in the United States (8.5 marriages), Britain (7.5 marriages), and France (7.0 marriages). Figures also testify to the

growing moral weight of the very act of marriage registration in the USSR, the establishment of a "legitimate" family. At the same time the number of divorces is declining and amounts (1960 data) to approximately 1.3 per thousand of the population, or one divorce for every nine marriages. This is much less than in many Western countries.

This means that the socialist system in itself is conducive to the triumph of new principles in matrimonial relations - freedom and voluntariness of marriage, equality and mutual respect of husband and wife, prevalence of feeling over all other considerations. This is the earnest of the further consolidation of the family in a new society.

## **What Is the Communist Attitude to Free Love?**

First of all, we must decide what we mean by free love.

In 1915, before the October Revolution, a prominent figure in the international women's movement, Inesse Armand, decided to write a popular pamphlet on social problems for the working women. Wishing to consult Lenin on this question, she sent him the plan of the pamphlet. It included, among other matters, the question of freedom of love.

"What do you mean by that?" Lenin asked her in his reply.

"Do you mean:

"Freedom from material considerations in love?

"From religious prejudices?

"From parental interdiction?

"From the prejudices of 'society'?"

"From the stifling (peasant, petty-bourgeois, or bourgeois intellectual) atmosphere of social environment?"

"From the fetters of law, the court and the police?"

"From the serious aspects of love?"

"From childbirth?"

"Freedom of adultery?"

Since the question is not sufficiently clear, Lenin wrote, the readers of the pamphlet may easily mistake the last three points for "freedom of love." But this approach has nothing in common with communist views.

Communists believe that true love means relations between a man and a woman, free of everything that has no direct bearing on the feeling of pure love. Communists are convinced that freedom of love means freedom from material considerations, ulterior motives, various prejudices, hypocrisy, parental arbitrariness, and unfair laws. In other words: real freedom of love is when you are free to choose your own mate and marry only for love.

Arguing with Lenin, Inesse Armand claimed that even a fleeting passion is more romantic and chaste, than matrimonial kisses without love. An illogical comparison, Lenin retorted. The loveless kisses of a hypocritical

couple are disgusting, indeed. But why must they be compared with chance intercourse instead of the kisses of truly loving hearts? After all, when you get down to it, that which is "fleeting" is not love either!

Lenin's remark throws light on the views of Communists on problems of love and family relations.

The old Russia had laws and customs which often prevented the union of young people really in love. Marriages were prevented, for instance, if she was rich and he was poor, if he was a noble and she a peasant, if he was a Moslem and she a Christian, etc. Parents often forced their daughters to marry wealthy men they did not love because the alliance was "profitable." Divorce was made very difficult. There was much hypocrisy, despotism, and injustice in family relations.

New human relations began to develop in the country under socialism. This was bound to affect the relations between men and women, who had become equals, and to have a bearing on family life.

In the first years after the Revolution, in the difficult period of reconstruction, there were people who went to extremes and made blunders in rejecting the old, hypocritical morality. They included, for instance, advocates of the anarchistic "glass of water" theory. They were of the opinion that in a communist society love would be satisfied as easily and matter-of-factly as quenching one's thirst with a glass of water.

Communists bluntly rejected this view. Drinking water is easy, it is true, provided it is clean. Real love requires special chastity and mutual attention. After all, love which involves two persons, may produce a third one, a new life. Herein lies its great responsibility. This is why it engenders a sense of duty to the person you love, to posterity, and, consequently, to society.

The pseudo-revolutionary declarations of the advocates of the "glass of water" theory found no support in our society. But this certainly does not mean there are no longer fleeting love affairs or short-lived marriages.

Communists do not profess to be ascetics, and do not oversimplify the problem of sex. The people of a new society will not shun worldly pleasures and the joys of life. But they, as a rule, are against extravagances, perversions, a light-hearted approach to love and marriage.

Communists want love to be free, but not from human principles. It must only be free of that which may distort and hamper its full expression. This is real freedom of love in our opinion.

## **Will There Be Crime?**

No, crime will become a thing of the past. A communist society will be the first to be able to eradicate crime. And this is not an idle wish, a hopeless dream, it is an absolutely realistic task, feasible under communism.

What do we proceed from? Primarily from the conviction that crime is not inevitable. Man is not born a violator of law and order, a swindler, a gangster or killer. It is the influence of his environment and living conditions that is to blame. Avidity, selfishness, and the desire to encroach upon the property and life of others are engendered in people only by definite social conditions, where life is full of injustice and vices, arising from exploitation, oppression, unfair distribution of material values.

One may say: Very well, supposing all this is true, why is there crime under socialism, in the social system which Marxists uphold?

Yes, it still exists. The replacement of one social system by another does not eliminate this age-old social evil right away, automatically, so to say. In general, it is characteristic for psychology to lag behind the changing socio-economic conditions, behind the changes that occur in life. Furthermore, these changes, although they are tremendous in the socialist countries, are not sufficient to ensure the necessary economic and social conditions for the complete disappearance of crime. Such conditions will be created in the advanced, communist society. We must not disregard also the force of traditions, habits, and concepts inherited from the past. Therefore, it is not enough to combat crime. It is necessary to solve many complicated economic and educational problems before crime will be fully wiped out

Socialism creates conditions which nurture lofty moral qualities, a sense of social duty, and humanism. But not everybody is able to profit by these favorable conditions, either due to domestic problems, unfavorable local environment, or a sort of psychological inertia. We must not overlook also the difficult aftermath of war and fascist occupation, the millions of orphans and broken lives. There is practically no family in the USSR which did not lose somebody during the war. And if we still have crime in our country, if we still encounter infringements of law and order, we are confident that in time this will become a thing of the past.

Crime is steadily decreasing in the Soviet Union. In 1963 the number of convictions in the country was 16.4 per cent less than the previous year and the lowest in the past thirty years. It is characteristic that the biggest decrease was observed in the gravest offences, which are becoming increasingly rare.

Apart from administrative bodies, the public at large is making an ever greater contribution to the struggle against crime in the USSR, to overcoming the reasons and factors that lead to crime. Volunteer public order squads have become very popular in our country of late. They are active in all rural and urban areas.

They not only keep up law and order in public places and streets, detain rowdies and drunks, but also directly assist the militia in its struggle against crime.

There are comradely courts at many plants and factories, on collective and state farms. The members are elected from among the most respected workers, who are held in great esteem by their fellow workers. This is a very effective form of public influence on those who violate law and order. This court cannot sentence a man to jail, the most it can do is to condemn him morally or reprimand him. A person brought before a court of fellow workers or neighbors, feels as though he is being tried by public conscience itself. There were cases when people preferred to answer for their misdemeanors before a regular court rather than face a meeting of their fellow workers, so great is the force of public condemnation.

Such means of public influence, combined with daily explanatory and educational work carried out by the courts, prosecuting bodies, public law and order bodies, and public organizations, help to prevent many offences.

There will be no need for criminal or civil law when communism is fully established. This does not mean there will be no violations of law and order, but they will be considered only from the viewpoint of morality and ethics. Many of the crimes known to us today will be completely forgotten. Others will become impossible due to their senselessness or utter incompatibility with the ethical concepts of the man of the future. Who will benefit, for instance, from robbery or bribery in a so-

ciety of plenty? Under communism, when everything will be done voluntarily, conscientiously, without coercion, the new morality, which will have become the accepted regulator of social relations, will take the place of present-day law and administrative coercion.

## **Will Freedom of Conscience Be Allowed?**

You are, probably, aware of the attitude of Soviet Communists to religion. As proponents of a materialistic philosophy, we accept only a scientific and not a religious explanation of all the things and phenomena we encounter in nature and in society. We reject religion for the simple reason that we have faith in the omnipotence of the human intellect and believe in the natural origin of everything on the earth.

But it does not follow from this that the Communists must strive to prohibit religion. First of all, to be frank, this would not be feasible. And, secondly, we don't want to be inconsistent.

Religion consists of religious concepts, religious feelings, and religious worship. The authorities can prohibit the open performance of religious rites. But who would want to try to forbid others to think and feel as they pleased? Communists would hardly be astute, if they did not realize that to believe in God



is a private affair, the business of every person's conscience. It is impossible to ban religious convictions and feelings, just as it is impossible to prohibit any other convictions and feelings.

Furthermore, to prohibit a believer from performing religious rites freely, to persecute him for his religious views, would be an offence against his conscience. For this reason it is contrary to communist convictions to ban freedom of conscience, and we shall never resort to it. How can we build communism, a society where every person will be really free, and suppress at the same time one of the basic freedoms? Communists recognize only ideological struggle against religion. We hold that believers can only be dissuaded and not coerced. And this must be done tactfully and patiently.

There is full freedom of religion in the USSR. Here is the actual state of affairs:

Every citizen of the Soviet Union is free to profess any religion or none at all. This is the inalienable right of every Soviet man and woman. It is laid down in Article 124 of the Soviet Constitution, which says in part: "Freedom of religious worship and freedom of anti-religious propaganda is recognized for all citizens."

As you see, the Soviet Constitution does not allow any offence against human convictions. You are free to be an atheist or a believer. It is the only fair approach to the question of freedom of conscience. After all, it is gene-

rally known that most Soviet people do not believe in God. Despite this, the religious convictions and feelings of believers are respected in our country. This is exactly why the Soviet state has proclaimed and guaranteed freedom of worship. Any infringement of this freedom is punishable by law. Thus, Article 143 of the Criminal Code of the Russian Federation stipulates a sentence of up to 6 months hard labor for attempts to "prevent the performance of religious rites." It is regarded as immoral in our society to offend the religious feelings of believers.

Nobody in the Soviet Union is obliged to disclose his religious beliefs. People are not registered according to religion. You will not find any indication of religion in the papers of Soviet citizens. Religion does not affect one's voting rights, employment, enrolment in educational establishments, or privileges available under the social insurance system. This means that atheists, rank-and-file believers, and churchmen enjoy the same civil rights in the USSR, and the state protects their interests equally.

The Soviet state does not meddle with the internal affairs of churches and other religious societies. They all exist freely as voluntary associations on the voluntary contributions of the believers. They are all administered freely on the basis of their church regulations. The only exception are cases when the performance of religious rites involves cruelties, inflicting physical or psychological in-

juries upon people, or infringes upon their civil rights. For instance, some sects believe in keeping children in cellars and caves for many years to "save" their souls from the "sinful influences of the surrounding world." They would cripple their health and lives, keep them from going to school, and prevent them from mixing with children from atheist families. Cases were investigated a few years ago when sectarian fanatics killed children during prayer as sacrificial offerings. It goes without saying that the killers were tried and duly punished.

And on the other hand, religious organizations cannot influence the work of Soviet organs. This means that the church in the USSR is separated from the state, and the school is separated from the church. The children get a secular education.

Every church trains its clergy in its own ecclesiastical schools. For instance, the Russian Orthodox Church has five seminaries and two ecclesiastical academies. The Moslems have their own madrasas, the Buddhists have their religious schools, and the same is true of the Jews, Catholics, and Lutherans. Furthermore, some Moslems from the USSR receive education at Islamic faculties of Damascus and Cairo, while Baptists study at the ecclesiastical departments of British, Swedish and Canadian universities.

Church incomes are not taxed in the USSR. Clergymen, however, pay income tax the same as other citizens.

All the necessary religious literature: Holy Scriptures, prayer-books, church calendars, and also text-books for the religious schools are published, when needed, by the ecclesiastical centers in state printing shops at the usual rates. In recent years, for instance, Orthodox and Baptist versions of the Bible, the Koran and other religious books have been published. The believers have their own periodicals, such as the "Journal of the Moscow Patriarchy," and the "Herald of Brethren" put out by the Evangelic Christian Baptists.

Religious leaders in the USSR maintain extensive contacts with fellow believers abroad, including the United States. Every year Soviet Moslems go on pilgrimages to Mecca and Medina. Representatives of all faiths take part, at their own discretion, in the work of sessions, conferences, and congresses of various international religious associations. Delegations of believers from different countries often visit the Soviet Union.

All this shows that there is real freedom of religion in the USSR. But it must be stressed at the same time that the Soviet state and the Communist Party are instilling in people the belief in scientific, atheistic ideology. This is why believers in the USSR are mostly people of the older generation, and, we think, there are comparatively few of them.

This is the socialist view on freedom of conscience. We presume it will be the same under communism. But we are sure that the

religious conceptions of life, nature, man, and his place, role and destination, just as all other superstitions and prejudices, will gradually disappear altogether in the process of building a new society, making way for the new, materialistic view on life. Even now people believe that universal welfare and happiness can be achieved here, on the earth, today and not after death, in another world. Every member of a communist society will have faith only in his own energy, his work, in the unlimited creative potentialities of his free spirit, in his bright mind, equipped with the all-conquering force of knowledge.

## **Are Poverty and Privations the Best Breeding Ground for Communist Ideas?**

When a man is hungry, he cares little for ideas, but only craves a bit of bread. This is unquestionable. But it is not by bread alone that the people live. The dream of a better world may thrive in a poor man's hut as well as in a royal palace. Marx was the son of an artisan, his wife was a countess by birth. But it is not individuals who count, of course. To answer this question correctly, we must make clear what social forces in a given country, at a given moment, are capable of implementing the ideas of social progress.

These are, of course, the working people, all those who suffer the consequences of social injustice.

Nobody will argue that sufferings and dissatisfaction of the people have always been a breeding ground for revolutionary unrest. People in need always seek change and fight vigorously for justice. The idea of communism originated in the ancient days amidst the humiliated and unfortunate. The vital needs of the oppressed first produced the dream for a "Promised Land," and then the "City of Sun," Utopia. But one more point should not be overlooked. Poverty existed both under slave-owning and feudal systems. But the scientific concept of communism could not have originated in those days. The utopian theories of communism remained unfeasible. The working class, interested in the transformation of society, and, what is most important, capable of transforming it in the interests of the majority of the people, emerged in the social arena only in the epoch of capitalism. This is precisely when the communist outlook originated as a science, which combined the achievements of philosophical and economic thought with the experience of the liberation struggle of the exploited classes. The emergence of scientific communism is an objective process, prepared by the entire course of history. The workers themselves were unable, of course, to elaborate the scientific communist ideology due to inadequate educational standards. It was worked out and formulated by representatives of the progressive intelligentsia and then introduced in the labor movement.

But it would only be a half-truth if we were to stop at this. Poverty, backwardness and misery are by no means **indispensable requisites** for spreading communist ideas. These ideas are also appealing to those who do not eke out a miserable existence.

For every sober-minded individual the attractive force of these ideas lies in the fact that a communist society brings salvation not only from poverty, but from the other social vices of the old society, too. It eliminates the division of people into classes, the exploitation of man by man, national and racial oppression, social inequality in all its manifestations. It opens up vistas for unlimited social progress.

Suppose you were to give an unbiased account of the principles of a communist society (not saying that they are communist, of course!) to people of different walks of life—a worker, a farmer, an intellectual, and a small businessman? They would most certainly be approved by the overwhelming majority. But if you were to tell them afterward that they approved of the principles of communism, they would be shocked by such a “charge.” Such is the force of prejudice, of misinformation.

Nonetheless, there is no reason for doubting that common sense and the urge for justice are just as fertile ground for communist ideas as poverty and backwardness. It is not accidental, after all, that so many great minds of our epoch, so many humanists and

truth-seekers have sided with communism. We can name such people as Bernard Shaw, Theodore Dreiser, Frederick Joliot-Curie, Paul Dangevin, Thomas Mann, Louis Aragon, Pablo Picasso, and many others.

And no matter how strong the inertia of prejudice may be, no matter how extensive anti-communist propaganda is, an ever growing number of people all over the world are beginning to realize that communism cannot be rejected merely because the road to communism was not strewn with roses for those who first set foot on it . . . The example of the Soviet Union and other socialist nations, their successes in the development of their economy, science and culture, in the practical implementation of the principles and ideals of communism, this is what will open the eyes of those who shun communist ideas today. No man does not live by bread alone, and his yearning for justice is indomitable. It will finally show the correct road to all.

## **What Contributes Most to the Current and Ultimate Success of Communism: International Tension, Local Wars, a World War, or Relaxation of International Tension and Peace?**

It is worth noting that this question contains a partial reply in itself. After all the reader has by now learnt about communism,



its goals and principles, it will not be difficult for him to see the correct answer.

It is for good reason that the question mentions the current and final goals of communism. True, the nature of the goals always determines the means of attaining them. We have already seen that the goal of communism is the triumph of social justice, welfare and happiness of the people, emancipation and flourishing of human individuality, creation of powerful, most up-to-date production forces, capable of ensuring full satisfaction of all the human requirements. If so, the Communists are bound to avoid everything that may divert them from their struggle for the achievement of the proclaimed goal, that may entail an unnecessary waste of material means and resources at their disposal.

We are asked: Do Soviet Communists regard international tension as a suitable climate for the successful building of a new society? Of course not! International tension is always linked with the arms race, with inflated military budgets. Marx wrote in his time that war "in the economic sense is the same as a nation throwing overboard part of its capital." But in the days when Marx wrote this, even shooting wars did not consume such tremendous material resources as are now cast by all countries into the fathomless pit of military expenditures. It goes without saying that countries engrossed in socialist and communist construction, countries which have set before themselves lofty goals, are by their

very nature bound to strive for a lasting détente. for the ending of the cold war. for the normalization of international relations.

This is even more true of local or world wars. War is always linked with human losses, it always devours tremendous resources, leads to vast devastation and worsened living conditions. involving colossal unproductive expenditures of social wealth. Modern war. employing the latest means of annihilation and destruction. threatens to surpass everything yet known to mankind in suffering. death toll and destruction.

But it is not only the material side of the matter that counts. Socialism and aggression are incompatible in general. Communists are striving for fraternity and friendship among peoples, for a lasting peace on earth. The Soviet Union is ruled by representatives of the working classes, which bear the brunt in all wars. How can they want a new war? Communism is an extremely humane teaching, which stemmed from compassion for the lot of the working people, from a profound understanding of the conditions of life, from the desire to provide a decent life for every man and woman. This is why genuine Marxist-Leninists are doing all they can to avoid war. They do not tire of repeating that wars between states are not needed for the victory of communism. Inasmuch as a communist civilization must serve the good of the people, must be the summit of progress, it cannot be

built up on the ashes of battlefields, on the ruins of civilization.

This is not pacifism or fear of war. The Communists have shown more than once their intrepidity in the struggle for their ideas. But the very character of the goals they have set before themselves makes true Communists dedicated champions of normalizing international relations, liquidating tension, ending the cold war, makes them advocates of general and complete disarmament.

So we see that peace and peaceful coexistence are the most desirable international conditions from the viewpoint of the current and long-range goals of communism. It can be said that a lasting peace is the main condition for building communism. This is why the Soviet Communist Party stated in its Program that peaceful coexistence is the general line of Soviet foreign policy. Life shows that these are not empty words!

## **Does the Building of Communism in the USSR Signify an Attempt to "Bury the West?"**

First of all it should be stressed that the building of communism in the USSR is the internal affair of the Soviet people.

In building communism the Soviet people are not trying to spite somebody abroad or to "irritate" the West or the East. We want

a communist society, because, in our opinion, it embodies the loftiest human ideals. Linked with it is our conception of justice, reason, and expediency.

Needless to say that in building communism, in creating its powerful and up-to-date material and technical foundation, the Soviet people are displaying concern for themselves, for their children and grandchildren. They care least of all to "bury" anybody in other parts of the world.

What is then the reason for the stubborn talks about the attempts of the Soviet Union to "bury the West?" They are due, primarily, to old, long since refuted delusions about the "aggressiveness" of communism. The Soviet Union, the first socialist state in the world, was born in the crucible of the greatest of revolutions which caused the propertied classes in all countries to tremble in fear. But what revolution, worthy of the name, did not scare the supporters of the old system? Didn't the American bourgeois revolution of the 18th century, for instance, seem to be a diabolic obsession to representatives of the aristocratic classes of Europe, especially Britain?

Later on, as the Soviet state grew stronger, the accusations of Soviet aggressiveness, the communist desire to dominate the world, became part and parcel of all anti-Soviet propaganda.

In the meantime, it remains a historical fact that the Soviet Union has never tried to "bury the West," though the latter, as is ge-

nerally known, has endeavored to bury the USSR more than once. It began with the "fourteen powers campaign," the intervention of several Western powers against the young Soviet Russia in 1919 (Churchill called it an attempt to "smother Bolshevism in its cradle"). Hitler came out as the grave-digger of communism in 1941. It is another matter that the ambitious idea to bury communism boomeranged at Hitler and those who believed his anti-communist ravings. The Soviet Union, as you see, has continued to exist and make giant strides toward communism since the war.

The building of communism in the USSR is not fraught with military menace to either the West or the East. A communist society is the most peaceable society in the history of the human race. Communism makes peace and friendship the basis of international relations. "... As distinct from the old society with its economic poverty and insane policy," Karl Marx wrote about communism, "a new society is coming into being, whose international principle will be **peace**, because each people will have the same sovereign—**labor!**"

Developing the ideas of Marxism, Lenin, founder of the first state that inscribed on its banners the slogans of communism, advanced and asserted the ideas of peaceful coexistence of states with different social systems. The Communists have thereby proved by deeds that they do not wish to "bury the West" by military means.

The proclamation of peaceful coexistence was a sort of challenge for peaceful competition between the two systems—socialist and capitalist. The Soviet state contributes to spreading the ideas of communism by the successful solution of economic and national tasks, by creating better living conditions for the broad popular masses and not by war and violence. This is fully in keeping with the behests of Lenin, who pointed out that "... we exert our main influence on the international revolution through our economic policy ... The struggle has been shifted to this sphere on a world-wide scale. If we solve this problem, we shall win on an international scale once and for all."

Now the reader can judge for himself what the allegations about the Soviet Union's intentions to "bury the West" are worth.

It is quite possible that many of those who refer to this formula hold the "West" to mean capitalism as an economic and social system. By claiming that the Soviet Union wishes to "bury the West," they actually want to say that socialism is bent on achieving a victory over capitalism.

Well, here we can give a positive answer: Yes, Communists believe in socialism's supremacy over capitalism. Yes, we proceed from the belief that in the final count communist relationships, being fairer and more capable of fully meeting the requirements of the people, will prevail over capitalist relations.

But we are categorically against the "export of revolution," and, as a matter of fact, equally against the "export of counter-revolution."

You must agree with us that military intervention is not a revolution. In keeping with the actual state of affairs, Marxism-Leninism teaches that a socialist revolution is the apogee, the culmination point of class struggle. Some classes, expressing the historical tendency of development, fight for the establishment of a new progressive order, while others, representing the bygone days of history, uphold the old, reactionary systems. There is always a class struggle going on in a society which is divided into classes with opposing interests (strikes, demonstrations, meetings, etc). At a definite stage the progressive classes arrive at the conclusion that it is in the interests of the majority of the population to establish a new social system. This is when class struggle comes to a head and a social revolution breaks out. The replacement of the capitalist system by socialism is also possible and legitimate only when the people of a country want socialism, and actually carry out the social changes suiting them.

This is why the word "bury" can be used in this case only in the sense it assumes when we say that feudalism has "buried" the slave-owning system, and capitalism has in its time "buried" the feudal system, i. e. had replaced it at the will of the working people themselves.

## **Is Transition to a New Society Necessarily Linked with Violence?**

Marx called violence the "midwife of history." Indeed, the entire history of mankind is marked by violence, all the notable social upheavals of the past (and, unfortunately, today, too, as a rule) were linked with violent overthrows and armed struggle. But are the Marxists to blame for this?

Analyzing the development of human society, Marxism was able to bring to light the reasons engendering violence and war—they stem from social injustice and exploitation of man by man. This is why the advocates of scientific communism are striving to build up a society in which the social causes of violence in any form or manifestation would be abolished forever.

The new is always born in throes. We could cite thousands of facts when sensible changes in social life, supported by the majority of the people, could not be carried out without violence, without an armed struggle. And this has always happened and happens only because there are influential groups of people, a social stratum or class, who do not want these changes and resist them with all the means at their disposal.

Let us take the following example.

The population of the British colonial territories in North America began demanding independence in the latter half of the 18th



century. Was this a sensible and just demand? Without doubt! But the British, the aristocrats and dealers, who derived huge profits from the overseas territories, did not wish to give up their privileges voluntarily and resorted to suppression and terror. The people **were compelled** to take up arms in order to win their freedom and independence. And their righteous cause triumphed.

A good many cock-and-bull stories about the "atrocities" of the 1917 Revolution in Russia were circulated in the West, and, unfortunately, are repeated to this day. People of the older generation still remember cartoons of the "terrible Bolsheviks" in fur hats, with a knife in their teeth and a bomb in each hand... Alas, in our days, too, there are enough attempts to picture the advocates of scientific communism as bloodthirsty people, who worship terror and do not care a hoot for human lives.

The democratic revolutionary movement was subjected to ruthless persecution in tsarist Russia. The struggle of the workers and peasants for the most elementary economic demands was cruelly suppressed. Everybody who is even slightly familiar with the history of those days cannot fail to recall such facts as the brutal massacre on January 9, 1905, of a peaceful demonstration of workers, who proceeded with a priest at their head and carried icons to the royal palace in Petersburg to "implore the grace of the tsar." Or take, for instance, the 1912 massacre of work-

ers at the Siberian gold fields. But very few people know that it was no other but Lenin, the leader of the "terrible Bolsheviki," who called in April 1917 for the peaceful development of the revolution.

In the conditions of unprecedented social upsurge which then prevailed in the country, the Bolsheviki hoped that the broad unity of the left-wing forces, backed as they were by the people (including the Social-Democratic and Socialist-Revolutionary Parties), would be able to isolate the counter-revolutionaries and achieve power by peaceful means. However, the reformist parties did not support Lenin's initiative. Plucking up courage, the counter-revolutionaries launched an offensive: the cossacks and gendarmes of the Provisional Government massacred a demonstration of unarmed workers in cold blood in July, 1917. The chance for a peaceful revolution was lost. The representatives of the working people had no choice but to answer this violence with force. In October 1917 the armed workers and peasants seized power in order to start building a new life.

However, the young Soviet Republic was unable to go over to peaceful construction right away. It was confronted with the sabotage of reactionary officials, plots, conspiracies, subversion and terror on the part of the tsarist officers' corps, assassinations of outstanding revolutionary leaders. The internal counter-revolution received broad and very generous support from the Western powers.

The workers and peasants of Russia **were compelled** to rise in arms to defend the freedom and independence of the newly born socialist state. It took more than three years to repulse the foreign invaders and fight the civil war in terribly difficult conditions of hunger and devastation. But the righteous cause triumphed in spite of everything.

Since we are considering the attitude of Communists to violence, it is pertinent, in our opinion, to make clear one more rather important aspect of this problem. It is often forgotten that true Marxists have condemned individual terror at all stages of history. Karl Marx waged a vigorous ideological struggle against the anarchists led by Bakunin. Lenin came out most resolutely against the anarchists and socialist-revolutionaries, who regarded assassinations and bombings as a revolutionary panacea. We may be asked: And how does all this accord with the terror of the Stalin personality cult period? But the point is that both the personality cult and the crimes and unlawfulness it engendered are flagrant departures from Marxism! This was the exception that proves the rule.

Marx and then Lenin envisaged the possibility of a peaceful transfer of power to the working people. They predicted the possibility of a situation when it would suit the owners of the means of production to have their property bought by the socialist state, and the supporters of socialism—to pay reasonable compensation for it. Very few people

know, for instance, that a number of prominent capitalists (Bromley and others) voluntarily transferred their enterprises to the people during the October Socialist Revolution in Russia, while Soviet power allowed them to keep their private homes, etc. Unfortunately, this sensible trend was ruled out by the onslaught of the counter-revolutionary forces, confident they would be able to make short shrift of the socialist revolution.

A historical situation has developed in our days when the possibilities of peaceful achievement of power by champions of the socialist road of development have grown immensely. A peaceful socialist revolution, without civil war, is perfectly feasible on the basis of a broad movement of the popular masses, given the unity of all the democratic and progressive forces and the political isolation of the reactionary quarters. Only adventurers, who have nothing in common with scientific communism, can demand an armed struggle, cost what it may, in all conditions.

The transition to socialism may only be achieved if the people want it. The "export of counter-revolution" is also more difficult today than ever before. The countries of socialism are able to prevent the interference of the forces of international reaction, should they attempt intervention against a people who resolutely embarked upon the road of socialism.

These truths are now advocated by all true Marxists everywhere. They are recorded in

the decisions of the 20th Congress of the CPSU (1956) and in the new Program of the CPSU, endorsed at the 22nd Party Congress (1961). It goes without saying that in every country the expediency of this or that method of going over to socialism depends on the actual situation, on the correlation of internal forces. It is wrong, of course, to overlook the possibility that, contrary to the expressed will of the majority of the population, the ruling class may resort to violence and force the supporters of socialism to battle. But be that as it may, it is a definite fact that if it were solely up to the Marxists, revolution would be attained by peaceful means only.

## **Can There Be a National Form of Communism?**

The true followers of Marxist-Leninist teachings throughout the world share the same views on the course of social development and the prospects of social progress.

Having attempted to outline what communism means in some detail, we shall briefly summarize: a classless society and full social equality, single national ownership of means of production, abundance of material wealth and its free distribution in keeping with the principle "from each according to his ability, to each according to his needs," self-administration of free and conscientious working people. All these features are interconnected

a big community of socialist states, which possess a mighty industrial potential, facilitates the transition to socialism of the young states of Asia and Africa, which are also advancing toward it by their own, special ways. As distinct from the first country of socialism, they will not have to begin in conditions of a hostile encirclement, and, although they are still subjected to the pressure of the forces of international colonialism, they are able to rely on the unselfish assistance of the Soviet Union and the other socialist states.

One thing is absolutely clear: no claim that any "national form" of socialism (or communism) is the only right one, no attempt to foist concrete ways, forms or methods of socialist construction of any country on other states has anything in common with genuine Marxism.

Many great discoveries and teachings were distorted by ill-willed or erring interpreters. Marxism-Leninism has not avoided this fate, unfortunately. This is why true Marxism must be drawn not from the turbid streamlets of "nationalistic" dogmatism and narrow-mindedness, but from the pure wellspring of genuine science, from the mainstream of international experience of peoples, building a new society successfully and confidently.

## **Will the Communist Party Remain?**

Have you ever seen a house on fire? Have you ever heard the cry of a child caught trap-

ped in the house on the top floor? Have you ever seen a stunned and frightened crowd watch the tragedy in silence, and then one of them, outwardly no different from the rest, rush bravely into the flames to save the child?

Such people always step forth in time of danger when tremendous willpower, reason, and moral force is needed to overcome a hardship, forestall a calamity, stand up for the weak or the oppressed, uphold justice. If you were to group them together in your mind's eye, inspire them with the ideas of struggle for the most just society, cement their ranks by conscientious discipline and loyalty to the interests of the working people, equip them with a scientific understanding of the laws of social development, you will realize what the party of Communists is.

Let us recall what the world was like in the middle of the past century, when the founders of scientific communism Marx and Engels wrote their famous **Manifesto**. It was a bundle of stark contradictions, crying contrasts, and continuous catastrophes. This was a world where everything was bought and sold for money, while a human being, the working man, was turned into a hired slave, into an adjunct of the machine. It was a world where a few, so-called civilized nations enslaved and robbed whole continents.

Such a world could not exist for long. It needed a change. And this need was felt by many. A number of utopian projects appeared in those years (they are all forgotten today). Many political leaders, economists, and sociologists claimed they had the answer for leading mankind out of this dilemma. Where are their prophecies now? They are things of the past. Only one teaching—Marxism—has stood the test of time.

It happened because the Communists didn't linger in the clouds of purely moral protest but came down to the earth of economic and political relationships. They did not engage in daydreaming. They did not invent anything. They simply studied the past, investigated the present, sought and found a footing to reshape the world.

The social and philosophical teachings of Marxism are based on a wealth of facts, on the scientific analysis of social development. Herein, and nowhere else, lied the secret of the success of Communists. It lies in the strictly scientific nature of their program of action. Marx was not only a passionate revolutionary, but also a level-headed analyst. This is why for Marxists the objective laws of the development of human society, which he had discovered and formulated, are like a beacon showing the way to realize the aspirations of all working people.

The Communist Party was the political headquarters, the vanguard, which provided



the working people with a clearcut program of struggle, channelled this struggle into the correct path: against the exploitation of man by man, of one class by another, of one nation by another.

The time has long since passed when Communists were only the opposition. Today, they are at the helm in fifteen countries with a population of more than one thousand million people. This, naturally enough, has changed the character of their activity. Destruction of the old world is the first and not the most difficult step. It paves social conditions for the main effort—to build up a new, fairer, and prospering society.

The Communist Parties direct the construction of a new society not because of special material privileges, but because they consist of the finest, most politically aware representatives of the people, people who are equipped with a knowledge of the laws of social development, firm in their ideological convictions, courageous, able to look ahead to the future.

That in no way means the Communist Party consists of only heroes or angels. Even before the Revolution of 1917, when the Party was driven underground and every Communist was threatened with tsarist jail or exile, there were cases when chance people became members. Moreover, when the Communist Party became the ruling party in the Soviet

Union, place-seekers, bureaucrats, and other parasites sometimes tried to join it.

This is why the CPSU, consisting of working people—workers, peasants, and intellectuals who come from the people—makes high demands of its members. A Communist must be a model of behavior everywhere—on the job, in public life, and in the family. Loyalty to the interests of the people; active, dedicated participation in building the new society; principled behavior and ability to uphold his ideas—these are the qualities of a real Communist. Criticism of any member of the Party and self-criticism are the law of inner-Party democracy. A Communist must vigorously refuse to compromise with shortcomings, all manifestations of egoism, red tape, unwillingness to heed the demands and needs of working people.

The Communist Party emerged in the political arena as a political organization of the working class, which leads the broad masses of the people and society in their struggle for social progress.

The steady growth of the social foundation of the Communist Party under socialism inevitably brings nearer the historical hour when the Party, having fulfilled its task, will cease to be a political organization, will cease to be a party in the scientific sense of the word.

So far the history of civilization has been encompassed in a political-legal framework.

It remains so under socialism, but to an ever lesser extent and the time will come when it will become absolutely unnecessary. The state will change into public self-administration. The law will be replaced by moral standards and rules of communist relationships. The system of political relationships will disappear altogether, and there will no longer be a need for a party. The party will become a non-political public organization.

There is hardly any sense in guessing today what form will be assumed by this organization, what its rules and program will be. In any case, speaking of the foreseeable future, a developed communist society, will, apparently, have an association of the most active, most energetic, resourceful people. Every society needs a vanguard to lead mankind.

But it will no longer be a political struggle, no longer a case of man versus social injustice, but man versus nature. That will constitute, to our mind, the main contradiction of future epochs. It will never be resolved to the end. Each generation will tackle it from different angles. This is why there will always be a need for pioneers of intellect and endeavor, who will take the torch from the Communists and carry on.

Such are the dialectics of history: the Party of Communists, the party of the future, is fighting for the future without any party.

## **What Will Happen after the New Social System Is Built? Does the Achievement of the Present-Day Ideals Mean that Everything Is Attained, Especially in Social Development, in the Development of Democracy and of the Individual?**

Marxists do not consider a communist society as such where all the problems facing us now, or those liable to crop up in the future will be solved.

They mean only the problems engendered by definite social conditions—private ownership of the means of production and such attendant factors as social inequality, exploitation of man by man, oppression and injustice.

No matter how harmonious and free we may imagine the society of the future, history is bound to confront it with new problems and questions.

And this is a guarantee that mankind will never lose the joy of exploring the unknown, the joy of creativity, the thrill of struggle, and the excitement of surmounting difficulties.

Even now we can envisage some of these future problems. The tasks of combatting the elements will never disappear, for instance. The people of communism will have to har-

ness its forces even more thoroughly than we have.

They will have to seek fantastic potentialities, from the viewpoint of our epoch, to meet the material and spiritual requirements of rapidly growing mankind. Who knows, maybe mankind will be faced in the very distant future with the problem of moving to other worlds and planets!

The changing mode of life, the growing culture of the people, their changing psychology and morals—all this will require the streamlining of society and forms of its administration. It is up to the members of a communist society themselves to form such conditions which would ensure the fullest and most harmonious combination of the personal freedom of the individual with the interests of society as a whole. There is no avoiding these problems. And, finally, society will be faced with the tremendous task of developing the endowments of every individual, of securing the most favorable conditions for nurturing his personal talents, for the physical and spiritual perfection of the human race.

There is no need to worry about the members of a communist society. They will have their own troubles, difficulties, joys, and accomplishments. They will have much to consider and solve. And these tasks, most certainly, will be as important and stupendous as those tackled by our contemporaries.

## **Is the Teaching of Communism Immut- able? Has It Been Supplemented or Amended after Marx, after Lenin, or as a Result of the Experience Accumu- lated in the Building of a New Society in the USSR?**

Just as with every science, the theory of scientific communism is constantly developing and becoming enriched. Marx never tired of saying that his teaching was by no means complete in itself and that it had nothing in common with a code of canonical laws or untouchable dogmas.

The fundamental laws of mathematics, recognized in the 19th century, remain true to this day. But can the present-day development of this science and its practical application be compared with what it was 100 or even 50 years ago? This analogy should not be understood literally, of course, but we can say with confidence that the teaching of Marx has gone through a no lesser evolution during the past centenary. But the basic principles of scientific communism have remained the same to this day.

Whole volumes would be needed to furnish a more or less complete picture of the development of Marxism. Therefore, let us dwell on only a few examples of its evolution.

Take, for instance, the doctrine of social-

ist revolution. As distinct from Utopians, who placed all their hopes on enlightenment and earnestly believed that the powers that be would voluntarily give up their domination and wealth, Marx showed that socialism could only be achieved by a socialist revolution, which would transfer the principal means of production from private ownership into the hands of society as a whole. And along with it political power must be simultaneously transferred from the bourgeoisie to the working class.

This tenet of Marxism remains true to this day. Moreover, it will remain so in the future, too, until final victory of the new system is achieved on a world-wide scale.

The concrete conditions and methods of its implementation are quite another matter, however. The founders of Marxism believed that a socialist revolution could be victorious simultaneously in all countries or in the most advanced industrial ones. This was perfectly correct for the period when capitalism was on the upgrade, and all Marxists accepted this thesis prior to World War I.

At the turn of the century, however, capitalism entered the stage of imperialism, when its development assumed a particularly uneven, spasmodic character. Proceeding from the Marxist theory, Lenin arrived at the conclusion, after studying the new situation thoroughly, that in the period of imperialism the victory of a socialist revolution was possible first in one country. Lenin believed that the

working class of a country, where all conditions for a revolution were ripe, could manage to break through the front of imperialism and seize power without waiting for an identical situation to develop in the other countries. He believed the victory of a revolution and successful construction of socialism in one country would be an example for the other nations.

And this is exactly what happened in Russia.

Time and changes in the actual historical situation have altered substantially the interpretation of the question of how and when a revolution can be victorious. Marx, and Lenin after him, pointed out that this victory was not necessarily linked with an armed uprising. It might be achieved under certain circumstances by peaceful means. The possibility of such a peaceful transition to socialism has grown immensely in our days when there is a whole system of socialist states in the world, when the international liberation movement is gaining momentum. There are concrete prospects for the peaceful transition to socialism in several countries, especially industrially developed nations, which have a powerful and well organized labor movement.

It is pertinent here, perhaps, to draw a historical parallel. Remember how capitalism was established in the world? The two great revolutions that triggered this process—the English and the French—were effected by



armed uprisings and accompanied by civil wars, because the outlived feudal class did not wish to relinquish power voluntarily and give up its privileges. Subsequently, in other countries, capitalism was achieved with practically no bloodshed. Something of the sort is taking place now, in the process of capitalism's replacement by socialism and communism.

Another example of the evolution of Marxism is the development of the teaching on the socialist state. One of Marx's main conclusions was that transition from capitalism to socialism requires a dictatorship of the working class, which will organize the popular masses for the construction of a new society and suppress attempts to restore the old regimes. Marx also foresaw the final stage of this process—the complete withering away of the state under communism, its replacement by public self-administration.

Equally typical, finally, is the following example. Marxists believed, even a quarter of a century ago, that world wars were inevitable, that their causes were inherent in imperialism, in the struggle of monopolies for markets and spheres of influence. This thesis on the cause of wars remains valid to this day. But since we now have the world system of socialism, which is growing stronger all the time, the correlation of forces has changed in the world arena, the sphere of imperialism's influence has narrowed down, and it is no longer able to command world economy

and world politics unilaterally. In view of this, Marxists have arrived at the conclusion that war is no longer inevitable, that in the present conditions it is possible to prevent a world war.

We could trace in the same way the evolution of other ideas of scientific communism. If we try to survey this development, even superficially, we see that Marx and Engels laid the foundations for the science of communism. They discovered the laws that govern the origin, development and disappearance of the capitalist system, and formulated the key principles of the origin and emergence of the new, socialist system.

After Marx and Engels, the theory of scientific communism was developed in new historical conditions by Lenin. He elaborated the theoretical foundations for the proletarian party's efforts once it is in power, directing the construction of a new society. Lenin's contribution to the theory of scientific communism has been so great it is now called Marxism-Leninism.

And, finally, the changes that took place in the world during the past quarter of a century necessitated the further development of Marxist theory, to which Communists the world over have contributed.

There can be no doubt that the development of scientific communism will not end here. The science of communism is being enriched by the social experience of the struggle

waged by the masses for their interests. Gradually it critically interprets and absorbs all the valuable ideas evolved by progressive socio-political thought the world over.