

Novosti Press Agency



Publishing House

ELEAZAR BALLER

(b. 1918),

MASTER OF ARTS (PHILOSOPHY),
IS A GRADUATE
OF THE MOSCOW CHERNYSHEVSKY
INSTITUTE OF HISTORY,
PHILOSOPHY AND LITERATURE (1940).

DURING THE WAR

AGAINST FASCIST GERMANY

HE WAS A PARATROOPER

AND FOUGHT IN THE BATTLE OF STALINGRAD

AFTER THE WAR ELEAZAR BALLER

WAS DEMOBILISED WITH THE RANK

OF A LIEUTENANT-COLONEL

AND FOR A NUMBER

OF YEARS WORKED AS AN ASSOCIATE-PROFESSOR

IN THE PHILOSOPHY DEPARTMENT

OF THE MOSCOW STATE LENIN

PEDAGOGICAL INSTITUTE.

HE IS NOW A RESEARCH ASSOCIATE

AT THE PHILOSOPHY INSTITUTE

OF THE USSR ACADEMY OF SCIENCES.

ELEAZAR BALLER

IS THE AUTHOR OF A NUMBER

OF PAPERS ON THE PROBLEMS OF DEMOCRACY.

TWO WORLDS.TWO IDEOLOGIES

**freedom,
for what?
for whom?**

TWO WORLDS.TWO IDEOLOGIES

Contents

- 7 Introduction
- 8 Freedom and What It Is
- 10 The Mad Bomb Thrower
- 13 Lines We Have Read
- 15 Charles Parsons Studies Midwifery
- 17 The Price of "Free Enterprise"
- 21 A Diagram
- 25 Ivan Tupikin Makes a Calculation
- 29 The Cost of a Seat in Parliament
- 35 De Jure and de Facto
- 40 "Maintenance of Order"
- 43 Of the People and for the People
- 52 Where the Frogs Croak
- 61 The Other Half of Mankind
- 67 "I Am Your Boss"
- 75 Science and Business
- 79 The Four Words
- 86 The Future of Freedom

AT THE ROADSIDE A HUGE CROWD WAITED.

— WHO ARE YOU WAITING FOR? A WISEMAN
ASKED.

— WE WERE TOLD THAT FREEDOM WILL PASS
HERE.

— FOOLS! IF YOU DON'T MEET FREEDOM
HALFWAY YOU WILL NEVER SEE IT.

— WHERE IS IT?

— IT IS WHERE YOU WANT TO FIND IT, NOT
A METRE FARTHER. YOU WILL FIND IT ONLY
WHEN YOU WISH TO, NOT A MINUTE EARLIER.

GIANNI RODARI

Introduction

There is probably no other word, whose original meaning has been so badly distorted as "freedom."

In the 18th century freedom was demanded by the French aristocracy, who understood it as defence of their feudal rights and advantages, and by the French bourgeoisie, who thought that the road to freedom lay through depriving the aristocracy of their age-old privileges.

"Freedom of the seas!" demanded the British East-India Company as it pocketed more and more overseas territories by means of treachery and bloodshed.

In the name of Christ the Spanish inquisition "freed" the souls of "heretics" from their sinful earthly prisons.

In the name of "freedom of development for the chosen German race" the nazis massacred millions of civilians and entire peoples during the Second World War.

How often have the words "freedom" and "free" actually signified "enslavement" and "oppression," "slaves" and "persecuted"...

"Determine the meaning of words and you

will deliver the world of half its delusions," said Descartes.

How do we understand these words? What freedoms can modern society have? In what social conditions are these freedoms merely proclaimed, and when are they given real meaning?

Freedom and What It Is

"Freedom" is a very wide and varied notion. The Canadian sociologists Dyson and Charlotte Carter wrote a book *The Future of Freedom* in which they enumerate thirty-two aspects of freedom. There is the "freedom to plan prosperity," "freedom of sports," "freedom of creative endeavours," "freedom from mental disorder," "freedom from criminality" and the "freedom to love"... Evidently thirty-two is not the limit, and if we tried hard we could find the thirty-third, thirty-fourth and perhaps even more concrete forms of freedom.

All the numerous forms of freedom could be conditionally divided into two groups: freedoms in relation to nature and freedoms in relation to society.

The question of how people come to know and use the laws of nature is vast and interesting, but it is not the subject under discussion. When opponents of communism say that the Soviet people lack certain freedoms, they are not talking about man's relationship with nature, but about the complexity of social freedoms: relationships between people in society and relations between the individual and society. It is their opinion

that these freedoms: economic, political, moral, etc., belong to the capitalist system ("a free society") and that they are absent in the USSR and other socialist countries, which they call "totalitarian."

Some people understand freedom as an absolute lack of restrictions on desires and actions. I do as I like! But is that true in practice? Of course if you wish to, you may go out into a field during a thunderstorm and wave a metal rod about just as much as you like—"in absolute freedom." But the consequences of such a foolhardy act could be very sad.

This also applies to society. Actual, as opposed to imaginary, freedom of the individual in society is possible as the interests and abilities of the individual develop. These interests and abilities greatly depend on the relationship between the individual and other people, which leads to the pattern of relationships in the society's social system. If private ownership dominates a society, it ensures the property owner the right to exploit other people and gives him freedom in dealing with them. It restricts, therefore, the freedoms of the exploited, who form the great majority of the nation. Thus man's actions in the face of nature, as well as his actions in relation to society, cannot be reduced to the formula "I do as I like."

On the other hand, should we undertake an action to achieve a predetermined result, it is insufficient to desire it, we must know. We must know the laws of nature in order to cultivate nature. We must know the laws of society's development if we want to improve relations in society.

In other words, only those who act on their knowledge of laws are truly free, and not those who ignore the objective laws of the world's development and act according to their own wishes. The desired results can be obtained effectively and speedily when you are aware of the laws involved.

True freedom is obtained through a knowledge of the laws of nature and society and a conscious implementation of this knowledge in practice.

In such a small book we can only discuss a few questions but, for our readers' information, this pamphlet is only the first in a series on *Freedom*. The other pamphlets will discuss *Society and the Individual*, *Freedom and Labour*, *Freedom of Consciousness*, *Freedom and Creativity*, etc.

The Mad Bomb Thrower

Many New Yorkers can remember the story of the "mad bomb thrower."

...The first bomb, made of a sawn-off piece of water piping, exploded in a waste paper basket standing next to the manager's office at the Cohn-Edison Electrical Company in New York. It happened in November 1940.

In 1941 bombs exploded in four other city offices of Cohn-Edison. These, too, were made of piping. No results were obtained from questioning the staff or watching the premises. Since the motive for the crimes was unknown, the criminal was considered to be mad.

The war broke out and the blasts in the offices of Cohn-Edison stopped. Little by little the mad bomb thrower was forgotten. In 1944 the case was closed and transferred to the archives. The police thought that the criminal must have been called up for military service. Many years later it became known that the bomb thrower continued to live in New York throughout the war, but abstained from setting off any more blasts as he considered it dishonest to interfere with the business of crushing Nazi Germany. Exactly three days after the war ended the blasts started again. Now the scale was stepped up and explosions went off in telephone booths, subway stations, shops and cinemas. Each time they were stronger and more devastating. When bomb No. 36 exploded on the world's most traffic-laden intersection, Broadway and Forty-Second Street, the New Yorkers started to panic. True, the scare was fed by many practical jokers who put pieces of piping in the most unexpected places. Late in 1956 the panic spread to several other cities.

Early in 1957 the New York Journal American tried a bold experiment. It addressed an open letter to the mad bomb thrower, saying that he must hate New York and promising to help him if he stated the reasons for his hatred convincingly enough.

Strange as it may seem, a reply came.

"I hate you all," wrote the mad bomb thrower. "Help? Ha, ha! Where were you and your help when blood gushed out of my mouth as I lay on the cement floor in front of the furnace? Where were you people when I asked the company at least to pay for my hospital bed? All I

got was refusal after refusal. I was dying when I asked for help and all I got in reply was refusals. . .

“How well I came to understand you, people! I came to understand what you call ‘democracy’, ‘justice’, ‘brotherhood’.”

The second letter from the mad bomb thrower told how he had lost his health working for Cohn-Edison and was a dying man when he was thrown out onto the street. He wrote to the law courts, the company’s president, the Governor, the city administration and to the papers. All in vain. “A car driver in America is answerable for a dog he hits,” the letter went on, “but nobody is answerable for the life of an ordinary worker the company crushes. The life of worker is cheaper than the dog’s.” The third and last letter came in on January 18, 1957. The mad bomb thrower wrote: “Now people know why I had to use bombs. There is nothing else I want. My days are numbered. I promise you that there won’t be any more explosions. I promise you this and I thank the paper for speaking to me as a human being. That is all I wanted. . .”

Thanks to the letters the mad bomb thrower was found and arrested. His name was George Metesky and he was mortally sick. George was seven years old when he came with his father and sisters from Lithuania to America, but he found no happiness in his second country. In 1931 he was a stoker at a power plant. George was poisoned by gas leaking into the furnace room and fell sick. He had haemorrhages and had to spend a few months in hospital, where he ran up a hospital bill which was way beyond his means. What was worse, he was unemployed

afterwards. He was refused a grant, refused disability compensation and refused a pension. That is how the mad bomb thrower came into being. When he had nightmares he shouted: "People, where are you? People!" On Sundays he would go to church and pray for the people who had been injured by his bombs.

A man was driven to desperation, a man was mercilessly refused the right to live. Small, helpless and crushed by "free society" though he was, he didn't commit suicide. Instead he took to bombs.

So who is to blame for the 36 bomb blasts?
George Metesky?

Lines We Have Read

The sad story of the mad bomb thrower gives food for thought. It also induces us to make a comparison of facts and laws.

Supposing we make a wider analysis of the reasons why the American performed acts of such senseless cruelty (senseless because his victims were not in any way responsible for his personal tragedy).

This case is exceptional in its outward manifestation and consequences. But, if you think about it, you will find it basically quite ordinary.

Unemployment, with its ensuing poverty and loss of prospects for the future, is the reason for many tragedies, great and small, and for the ruin of hundreds of thousands of Meteskys.

But let us turn to figures. The present unemployment level in the United States of America is

five per cent of the entire labour force. It wasn't any lower last year or the year before. The average unemployment was six per cent of the labour force in the past ten years. Apart from the wholly unemployed there is an army of part-time workers. We have quoted the bare average figures, which do not describe the situation of different age-groups which make up the unemployed. Among teenagers the percentage is 14.5 and for Negro youth it is 30. These figures are taken from President Johnson's address to the Consultative Council of Industrialists, late in 1964. The President justly called the level of unemployment tragically high. Delivering his State of the Union message to the joint meeting of the House of Representatives and the Senate on January 4, 1965, the American President deemed it appropriate to acknowledge that there are still too many Americans living in poverty, without jobs and in constant anxiety.

On January 30, 1965, the Soviet press carried a statement of the USSR Central Statistical Board on the implementation of the national economic development plan for 1964. The statement quotes a number of figures characterising the Soviet economy over the past year. There is a line in the last section on improving the material well-being and cultural level of the population, which doesn't quote a single figure, and yet is more eloquent than figures could ever be: "As in former years there was no unemployment in 1964."

Soviet readers usually skim through these well-known lines. Years pass, things change, but this line remains in each of the annual statements released by the Central Statistical Board.

It is one of the greatest gains of the new social system, which opposes "freedom from labour" with a guaranteed right to work.

Charles Parsons Studies Midwifery

Soviet people are also used to the fact that the trade union pays for every day they are sick, and that the government gives them grants in case of disability and pensions when they are old (men are eligible to pensions at 60, and women at 55). They are also used to free medical treatment, including free hospitalisation. Soviet women enjoy the free use of maternity homes and women's and children's consulting centres, and receive 56 days' leave both before and after they give birth all paid for by the government.

When Charles Parsons' family were expecting a baby, this American office worker started studying midwifery in order to deliver the baby himself. He had discovered that having the baby in hospital would cost them 300-400 dollars. This would have undermined their shaky budget and Charles Parsons decided to risk two lives simultaneously.

Soviet people have no such worries. At present they get free medical treatment and cheap medicines; soon medicines will be free and so will sanatorium accommodation for the sick.

This reminds one of George Metesky. When he was poisoned by gas leaking into the boiler room he became unemployed. What's more, he was left without any means of subsistence, not

even a disability grant. The doctors saved him from death, but finished him off with their bills.

Old Romans ended their letters with the word "vale." Russians greet each other by wishing good health—"Zdravstvuite." A man's health greatly determines his vitality, social activity and morale. That is why it is basically inhuman for a man's health, and even his life, to depend on his financial status and the size of his bank account. Alas, this dependence is an axiom for many doctors in the capitalist countries. For example, the American Medical Association, with a membership of 185,000 practising physicians, opposed President Kennedy's very modest 1962 programme on medicare for persons over 65 through federal social insurance. Appearing on the American television, the AMA leaders asserted that a doctor is actually a small businessman. He sells his services and for this reason is interested in business as much as the person who sells his wares over the counter. AMA is still fighting hard for its privileges, torpedoing even the slightest change in the status quo in order to preserve the doctor's fee system. The medical businessmen frankly say that they would prefer that the population dispense with medical treatment altogether rather than the private practitioner should get involved in a system of general medical service, alleging that this would destroy the tradition of "free American enterprise."

Thanks to the system of free enterprise the Americans pay out some 35 thousand million dollars a year; insurance grants cover barely a third of some people's expenses and help least those who need help most—old people and the unemployed. Professor Harris of Harvard Univer-

sity has calculated that the population of the United States annually overpays no less than a thousand million dollars for drugs sold by various concerns. According to research carried out in America, medical service in 1960 was down to the 1940 level. The reason is that only six cents out of every dollar in the budget go to the health service, pensions and social security as compared to 63 cents spent on military needs.

Dr. Field, an American, had an opportunity to come to the Soviet Union and compare the Soviet and American health systems. His article, carried by *The New York Times* says that the American public would be astounded to hear that the Soviet Union is forging ahead of America both in launching sputniks and luniks and in other fields, where the Americans complacently considered their superiority as assured. He was talking of medicine and especially of medical training. Soviet doctors comprise one-fourth of the entire number of doctors on the globe.

The Price of «Free Enterprise»

In enumerating the reasons why Metesky made his horrible decision to revenge himself on New York we haven't gone much further than to discuss the facts he listed himself.

There is one basic cause of all the facts enumerated in his letters to the *American Journal*; and why a million workers and farmers, sick old people and young men in the prime of life annually become unemployed and have no money to pay for medical treatment and why,

when they fall ill, they become poor and find themselves on the lowest rung of the ladder in capitalist society.

This is a problem examined in the last century by Marx and Engels, who were the ones to provide the only correct and scientific answer.

After analysing thousands of facts, they uncovered the scientific laws of human society, particularly of capitalist society, and its development. They were the first to prove irrefutably and scientifically that private ownership, of factories, railways, power plants, land and forests, millions and thousand millions of dollars, and its concentration in the hands of a few people allow these few people to dominate the majority, the people who create the material welfare of society. This is the main reason for social inequality in general, and social inequality under capitalism in particular.

It was not because the slave owner or feudal lord had exceptional organising abilities denied to a slave or serf that they stood at the helm of a state, but because they had all the economic wealth in their hands.

It was not because he was less capable of learning than his owner that a slave or serf was illiterate, but because he didn't have the economic opportunities for receiving an education and giving one to his children.

This is applicable to modern capitalist society. *The Capitalist Manifesto*, a book by the American sociologists L. Kelso and M. Adler, asserts that only capitalism, due to the good sense and consistency of its principles, strives for the truly humane goal—a good life for all people. To the authors of the book the principles of

capitalism make good sense because capitalism gives equal opportunities—freedom of enterprise—while capitalist competition picks out the most capable. But facts are very stubborn things. And facts do not corroborate the theory of “popular capitalism” and the “democratisation” of capital.

When J. Livingston, financial editor of the *Philadelphia Bulletin*, made a study of 8,600,000 American shareholders he discovered that the number of shares in a capitalist company bought by the population at large does not make any considerable change in the economic structure of capitalist society. He established that the vast majority of shareholders possess but few shares, and that dividends from them play practically no part in the budgets of the “people’s capitalists.” The dividends of only 17,187 shareholders (approximately 0.009 per cent of the US population) exceeded their earnings.

Wage-earning Americans possess between them from 0.2-0.3 per cent of the entire volume of share capital. **Each** of the three multimillionaire families—Dupont, Mellon and Rockefeller—possesses five times more shares than all the wage-earning Americans put together.

The following is the data on the incomes of the three finance and industrial tycoons of America in 1963 (as given by the *Life* magazine):

	Total sales (thous. dol.)	Clear profit (thous. dol.)
General Motors	16,494,818	1,591,823
Standard Oil (N. Jersey)	10,264,343	1,019,469
Ford Motors	8,742,506	488,547

According to the same magazine, the assets of the 500 leading American corporations rose from 107.9 thousand million dollars in 1954 to 208.7 thousand million dollars in 1963.

Who gets the dividends from these super-profits?

Not the workers, for the simple reason that 98.6 per cent of them possess no shares whatsoever, nor the small farmers, nor the thousands of other rank-and-file toilers of America. The only way in which they learn about the boons of people's capitalism is by reading the papers. According to official sources, such as the report of the American Bureau of Trade Union Statistics, families with incomes under the subsistence minimum, numbered in 1963 no less than 77,000,000 people.

But there is also the other extreme.

It is the moneyed class, numbering approximately 13,000 persons (in the early sixties). One hundred and twenty of them have annual incomes exceeding a million dollars.

"Freedom of private enterprise" has actually been fiction for a long time. To enjoy this freedom you have to have more money than a man can earn by his own labour. Another reason why this freedom cannot be enjoyed is because the monopoly associations, which now dominate most branches of the capitalist economy, practically rule out freedom of enterprise. Free competition has long ago become an anachronism and has been replaced by monopoly domination.

Without batting an eyelid the "big business" press shouts about the "quiet revolution", which has occurred in the United States to change the relationship between the workers and employers.

This is exactly what *The New York Times* declared on Labour Day, September 2, 1963.

Isn't it a paradox for a country with millions of unemployed to be celebrating Labour Day at all? Undaunted, the papers on that day happily wrote about American prosperity. They called the contradiction between labour and capital "class peace and harmony" and chronic unemployment—"general employment."

"Class peace and harmony" is conspicuous by its absence in the USA. The chasm between wealth and poverty gapes wider every day. The Americans say with bitter irony that God probably loves the poor because he has created so many of them in the United States.

It is a result of economic polarisation that 1965 was ushered in by a strike of 12,000 employees of a municipal department concerned with public aid (!), demanding higher pay and better working conditions. How is it then with those *who are given this aid*?

Incidentally there is one thing in common between the two poles. Both up aloft and on the ground people enjoy the right not to work. The only difference is that the millionaires who are freed from work can spend their lives enjoying themselves, while the unemployed, who are freed from work, can only afford to commit suicide if they wish to.

A Diagram

This diagram shows rates of industrial growth in the USSR and several capitalist coun-

tries (with 1913 as a base year in each case):

	USSR	USA	Britain	France	FRG
1913	100	100	100	100	100
1921	31	96	70	55	73
1928	132	166	93	127	115
1932	267	99	82	102	68
1937	588	190	122	114	141
1940	769	210	121	111	143
1946	589	285	115	87	43
1950	1,332	358	148	135	140
1953	1,936	437	158	155	194
1955	2,463	462	177	183	249
1957	2,997	482	180	212	283
1958	3,305	448	178	220	292
1960	4,032	520	201	240	347
1963	5,231	595	212	283	400

Let us take a closer look at these columns of seemingly dry figures.

You needn't be an expert economist to read their meaning.

The first thing you will notice is that over an equal period of time the gross industrial output of Britain has little more than doubled, the output in France has grown almost three times, in the FRG—four times, the USA almost six times, and in the USSR more than fifty times.

Another thing to notice is that beginning with 1921, the year of transition to peaceful construction after the Civil War, Soviet industrial output grew without any of the fluctuations that characterised the other countries.

The reason is that public ownership of the means of production has created an objective economic basis for effective, planned development of all branches of the economy.

As we have said earlier, freedom does not end at man's freedom in relation to the forces and objects of nature. There is another aspect: relations between people, their intentions, goals and plans, and social processes. Under private ownership, freedom of the individual is implemented as the freedom of the exploiters and simultaneously as an usurpation of the freedom of the exploited. Liquidation of private ownership signifies the liquidation of the non-freedom of the working people.

Why do the Communists uphold public ownership?

We shall start out with a simple example: 108 million, or almost a half of the Soviet population, have moved to new, modern homes in the past decade. Naturally, a great deal of land was required to build such a tremendous number of houses. New buildings in Moscow, Leningrad, Kiev and hundreds of other cities were erected on spare lots as well as on the sites of old, dilapidated houses. If the land and the buildings had been in private hands, it would have caused feverish speculation in land prices which would have soared sky-high. Thousands of families would have been ruined and thrown out into the streets while a handful of lucky people would have pocketed millions.

All this is impossible under socialism. Land and houses (exception being made for small homes for one or two families, or cooperative houses) are **national property**. And this is why people who moved from the old, overpopulated houses to spacious new apartments built at government expense, **did not pay anything** for their new housing.

It is the conviction of Marxists, confirmed by life itself, that social progress is impossible without public ownership of land and its underground wealth. Public national ownership liquidates the economic basis for the social inequality of people and opens real opportunities for building the most just and most prosperous society in mankind's history — a communist society.

Public ownership makes it possible to **guide the entire economy** of the country as a single body, to do it according to scientific plans, whose only aim is the utmost satisfaction of all material and spiritual needs enjoyed by the members of society.

It makes it possible to exercise good sense in concentrating resources and efforts of the people on the most urgent tasks. This is why in building socialism the Soviet Union and the other socialist countries can concentrate so much capital on the most important aspects of the economy, science and engineering, and still spend as much on rapid cultural progress, on expanding the social security system, on housing construction, free medical care, education and other public services.

Public ownership of the means of production creates a basis for the free manifestation of the personality at its best. Man emerges from the narrow little world of egoistical and proprietary interests and mercenary calculations, which lead to a hatred or contempt for mankind.

Members of a socialist society feel that they are co-owners of the entire country and all its economy. They develop a sense of responsibility for their own work, for the well-being of their

relatives and everyone around them—the whole of society. This makes man a fully-fledged and conscientious citizen, giving birth to such things as socialist emulation, the movement for technical innovations and improvements and the youth movement to cultivate virgin lands and develop mineral wealth in Siberia, the Far North and the Far East.

Socialist ownership and planned socialist economy, precludes unemployment, production crises and slumps, and the exploitation of man by man. This doesn't mean that the construction of a socialist society takes place without a hitch, or that there are no difficulties, shortages, errors or distortions—very grave ones at times. It would be naive to think that a beginning can be made without errors and difficulties, especially if it is the construction of a new society and is carried on under extremely complicated historic conditions.

But no errors or temporary difficulties can negate the central fact; the experience of the Soviet Union and the other socialist countries has confirmed the viability of a system based on public ownership. In a very short time all unbiased people will realise its advantages.

Ivan Tupikin Makes a Calculation

The establishment of public ownership in the Soviet Union liquidated the main contradiction of capitalist society—the contradiction between

public production and private acquisition. Under socialism people work together to produce and are masters of all the benefits produced. The revolution has wiped out the freedom of private ownership as well as the right to private enterprise and freedom from labour.

Under socialism each person has an equal opportunity to work—youths and mature people, men and women, representatives of the biggest and the smallest ethnic groups. Equal pay for equal work has become law. We feel that this is much more just than a private-ownership system of “to each according to his property.” Even in the richest countries of the West, millions of people comprising the vast majority of the population, have no profitable property. They live on what they earn by their labour. Under socialism the importance of an individual and the remuneration he receives from society is measured by the labour contribution he makes to the common cause and not by his inherited privileges, the size of the rent he receives or the property he owns.

When we speak of the principle “to each according to his labour,” we don’t mean that all distribution in the Soviet Union is according to this principle alone. The working people receive many benefits from the **public consumption funds**—free or on reduced terms.

A good example to quote is public education. Education in general school, technical school or college is absolutely free in the Soviet Union. Moreover, students of technical schools and colleges receive government stipends. The cost of keeping one child at school is 80-90 roubles (150 roubles at schools where children are kept

under supervision after classes) a year. The cost per child at boarding school is approximately 900 roubles. The figure for technical schools is 450—500 roubles a year, and for colleges it is 840—850 roubles. The government bears **all this expense** regardless of the usefulness to society of the work done by the children's parents.

Or take housing. Almost 10.7 million people moved to new homes in 1964, 8.5 million of these received housing in new buildings. The expense to the government of each newly-built apartment is some 4,000 roubles.

Incidentally, rent for housing is extremely low in the Soviet Union—approximately 4-5 per cent of the family expenses. In the period between 1970 and 1980 apartments will become rent-free as will electricity, water, gas and heating.

How much additional income does a Soviet citizen get from the government?

Here is a calculation made by a Volgograd veteran of the metallurgical industry, Ivan Tupikin.

Ivan Tupikin is a senior citizen receiving a pension of 120 roubles a month.

He has a large family : two married daughters, a married son and grandchildren. All of the Tupikin children have finished secondary school and one of the daughters is a graduate from a mining and metallurgical school. The government has given Tupikin an apartment and at various times all members of the family received accommodations at rest homes and sanatoriums at reduced prices. All of them enjoy free medical care. The children have had free school education and the five grandchildren free maintenance at

nurseries and kindergartens. The cost of keeping one child in kindergarten is 266.3 roubles a year.

What are the results of his calculations?

The government annually adds about 1,500 roubles a year to the budget of this family.

The public consumption funds are a great achievement of socialism. They give many important social and cultural benefits to every family and every citizen free or at reduced prices, regardless of their ability to work, their wages or the size of their family.

The four million people employed in the health service and the six million in education and the arts were paid from the public consumption fund in 1964. Twenty-six million people received pensions; stipends and hostel accommodation were provided for five million students of colleges, technical and vocational schools; some ten million children were maintained at nurseries and kindergartens and six million mothers with large families and mothers without husbands were given grants.

All these payments and benefits enjoyed by the Soviet people, thanks to the public consumption funds, increase every year. This can be seen from the following table (in thousand millions of roubles):

1940	1953	1958	1962	1963	1964
4.6	14.8	23.8	31.9	34.5	36.6

The growth of the public consumption fund testifies to the real gains of socialism and is a means of improving living standards.

The new Programme of the Communist Party of the USSR, which provides for a rise in the

real wages of the workers (abolition of income taxes, a pay rise for the lower-income employees, etc.), plans a still greater role for this form of distribution in the future. At the end of the next twenty-year period the public consumption fund will constitute almost a half of the population's real wages. These funds will pay for the free meals and uniforms that children will receive in school, the free meals for factory and office workers at their places of employment, and for the free use of city transport—tramcars, buses, trolleys and subways.

The Cost of a Seat in Parliament

One of the most frequent accusations hurled at the socialist countries is that their citizens enjoy no political freedoms.

For example, Thomas Sowell wrote in his article *Marx and the Freedom of the Individual* that political freedoms do not exist in the USSR. It is curious that in his article he makes a bow to Marx whose theory proceeded from the necessity of giving man the maximum political freedom. But he alleges that the Russian Communists did not fulfil Marx's instructions. He says that the Russian Communists are acting in defiance of the Marxist theory and that the result is a country without traditions of freedom of the individual, traditions which it never had. He asserts that Marx's theory has been changed in accordance with the principles of a one-party state and iron party discipline.

Sowell therefore charges the Communist Party of the Soviet Union with deviating from Marxism and demands that the Soviet people be allowed to enjoy political freedoms.

In quoting Marx, Sowell repeats the "accusation" which the opponents of socialism have been making for decades with a zeal that could have been put to better use.

The famous American writer Theodore Dreiser published his *America Is Worth Saving* in 1941. In this book he wrote that you should stop the first political babbler you meet and ask him to give a definition of the word "democracy." You should then ask the first ten people you meet. You shouldn't allow them to hide behind high-flown phrases but make them come down to earth. You should listen to their impotent babbling and it will convince you that there are no two similar opinions as to what democracy is like. Dreiser raises the question of the origin of this divergence in opinion and comes to the conclusion that democracy is not something absolute and consequently cannot exist in the absolute sense.

In actual fact "general" democracy and "general" political freedoms are non-existent. In a class society, democracy always means freedom for the dominating class. In a slave-owning state it is freedom for a handful of slave-owners combined with the dictatorship of the slave owners over masses of slaves. The freedom of feudal lords means the dictatorship of the feudal lords over the oppressed peasantry.

In capitalist society too there is no "general" freedom or "general" democracy. A thinking person will always ask:

Democracy for whom? Freedom to do what?

In capitalist society we again have political freedom and democracy for the dominating minority, coupled with the dictatorship of the minority over the exploited majority of the working people. Bourgeois democracy, consisting of elections and various other solemnly pronounced freedoms, is actually a form of government under which finance capital is in a dominating position: those who dominate economically, dominate politically.

The same book by Theodore Dreiser says that Americans are proud to live in a democratic country and have reason to be so. The various people who came to the United States from all parts of Europe, Asia and Latin America found asylum from the social yoke they suffered from at home, were attracted by the new material opportunities and the spirit of free brotherhood. . . These people were allowed a taste of the freedoms they had never before known.

But when it came to life in contemporary America, Theodore Dreiser grew bitter and said that the American powers-that-be are incited by the great corporations to mock the rank-and-file Americans and trample their legal rights underfoot. . . Who are these men who have seized America's wealth? Absolute nobodies. They do nothing. They produce nothing. They simply amass money, which they shower ever more liberally on their families and associates.

The writer came to the conclusion that democracy in the United States has receded into the distant past, and that the Americans are moving further and further away from it with every passing day.

If this were not true, where is the explanation for there being not a single worker, of whom 47% of the population of the United States consist, in either of the houses of the American Congress in its 88th convocation (1963-64)? Neither is there a single farmer or office-worker congressman. Meanwhile 83 per cent of the able-bodied population of the United States work for wages. Who are the members of Congress? 200 bankers, businessmen, big landowners, planters, and some 300 professional politicians and lawyers, most of whom are employed by big firms and corporations. A few score congressmen are millionaires.

Neither is there a single worker in the 89th convocation of the Congress.

The January 1965 issue of the weekly *United States News and World Report* gives a surprisingly frank explanation for the composition of the United States Congress.

The weekly quoted some very interesting facts and figures. It transpires that a typical campaign to become a state senator costs 500,000 dollars. A typical campaign for membership in the House of Representatives costs 75,000 dollars both to the winner and the losers.

The editors add that these are only average figures; some of the elected dignitaries often pay a much higher price. Robert Kennedy and his sponsors announced that two million dollars had been spent in obtaining his senatorship for the State of New York. The highest price for a seat in the House of Representatives was paid by Richard Ottinger (New York State)—a total of 190,000 dollars. Incidentally, it cost John Wolpe 587,000 dollars to become Governor of Mas-

sachusetts.

So, before he is elected, a candidate must have a huge bank account and the backing of Big Business. This is the reason why there are no rank-and-file Americans in Congress. The magazine says that if you want to run in the elections and are not prepared to spend big money then you had better just forget it.

And who are the members of bourgeois governments? Again the big capitalists or stooges of the monopolies. When the finance tycoons contribute to the election fund of any party they are procuring the complete obedience of the party and its politicians.

Let us compare membership in the American Congress and the Supreme Soviet—the highest body of government in the USSR. Over 55 per cent of the deputies to the Soviet of the Union—one of the houses in the Soviet parliament—started their working careers as workers or peasants, and over 45 per cent of them continue working in production. In the Soviet of Nationalities—the other house of the Soviet parliament—52.9 per cent started their careers as workers and peasants and 44 per cent of them continue working in production.

The Soviet deputies are not professional MPs, who know of no other activity but politics. They take an active part in the nation's production and cultural and political life. Combining their duties in parliament with their work, the deputies elected by the people are always in contact with the masses and live by their needs and interests.

A candidate who is nominated in the Soviet Union is not required to possess any property or to bear any expenses in connection with the

elections. A deputy is required to report regularly to his voters, who can recall him if he doesn't justify the trust placed in him. Another very important point is that all citizens over 18 take part in the voting regardless of their race or nationality, sex, religion, education, place of residence, social and property status or past activity.

There are millions and scores of millions of people in the capitalist countries prevented from voting under all kinds of pretexts. Many requirements—property above all else—restrict suffrage.

In the United States there are property requirements in the states of Michigan, Montana, Nevada, New York, New Mexico, Tennessee, etc. Beggars are barred from voting in the states of Virginia, Delaware, West Virginia, Massachusetts, Missouri, Maine, New-Hampshire, Rhode Island, Texas and South Carolina. Burdens on the state are not allowed to vote in Missouri, Oklahoma and Nevada, and Indians who haven't paid their taxes cannot vote in the states of Idaho, Washington, Mississippi, Maine, New Mexico and Rhode Island.

There is a triple residence requirement in the United States: of a certain length of time for a local election, slightly longer for country elections and the longest, from six months to two years, for a state election. Eight million American voters were barred from the polls during the last presidential elections because of this requirement.

There are very many restrictions barring the national minorities from voting. As testified by the Presidential Civil Rights Committee in 17 districts in the southern states 97 per cent of the adult Negro population were barred from voting

in November 1964. But that is a subject to be dealt with separately. . .

There are also educational requirements.

There exist no property, educational or any other requirements in the Soviet Union. This country exercises really general and equal suffrage.

De Jure and de Facto

You can declare or write down on paper whatever you wish. It is one thing to proclaim de jure any right and the freedom to exercise it, and quite another to ensure implementation of this right, i. e. to ensure it de facto.

There is a big gap between wanting and having, between abstract opportunities and reality.

You will find a multitude of "freedoms" in the constitutions of bourgeois countries, including the "right to work," "the right to receive an education," etc. But can a bourgeois government guarantee the universal right to work?

It makes no difference to an unemployed person that "the right to work" is inscribed in the constitution when he is actually deprived of the right. His hungry children will hardly be able to make use of their right "to receive an education," no matter how solemnly this right is declared. When the American sociologists Riesman and Jenckes made a special study of education opportunities and prospects in the United States, discussed in their book entitled *The Viability of the American College*, they came to the conclusion

that the majority of young people from poor families were either unable to go to college at all or dropped out after a short time. And it is true that most of the American college graduates come from families whose annual budget exceeds 10,000 dollars.

There probably is not a single constitution in the bourgeois democracies which does not solemnly proclaim the "freedom of the press." Each citizen, therefore, has the right to propound his ideas and political views through the medium of newspapers and magazines and to publish his own newspaper or magazine if so inclined. But who actually does enjoy these freedoms?

As an example we shall discuss the political and economic weekly *United States News and World Report*. It is published by a company whose shares are owned by the Chase National Bank, the property of the Rockefellers. All its articles go unsigned, save only the editorial, but "Big Business" would be an appropriate signature under any of the articles. The magazine is closely related to Wall Street and the steel, oil, automobile and aircraft corporations, which use its space to further their own interests. The magazine shows particular interest in military business and is prolific on problems of military strategy.

Some 20,000 publications appear in the USA, which boasts of having a free and independent press.

But can a paper be independent if it is published on monopoly money?

Publication of the biggest US papers and magazines is concentrated in the hands of a few publishing concerns, newspaper trusts, informa-

tion agencies and press syndicates whose owners are closely related to the most powerful sections of the American finance oligarchy—the Morgans, Rockefellers, Mellons, Duponts and others.

The Hearst trust, which publishes ten newspapers and eleven magazines with a circulation of 4.5 million (over 5.5 million on Sundays), is closely connected with the huge Giannini Bank of America. The McCormick-Patterson family of millionaires also owns a newspaper trust. The Scripps-Howard newspaper trust publishes 17 dailies in various parts of the country, the Newhouse trust—20, and so on.

Hearst and other bourgeois press tycoons naturally try to hide their dependence on monopoly capital and shout from the rooftops about the so-called freedom of the press in the United States. But it is no more than mere verbiage. Actually the modern capitalist press of the USA is a complex and very powerful tool in the hands of the ruling class.

The freedom to propagate ideas means, to a very large extent, the freedom to propagate the ideas of the newspaper trust-owners and the circles with which they are connected. Thus the solemnly declared “freedom” is something which the vast majority of members of society cannot enjoy.

Let us discuss freedom of speech in the USSR.

Education is probably the best guarantee a country can provide to ensure the freedom of its citizens. Education has always been a guarantee for the freedom of speech, and the entire world is aware of the unparalleled success attained by the Soviet Union in the field of public education.

The vast majority of the population in tsarist

Russia was illiterate. Immediately before the October Revolution a mere 9.6 million children attended school. The Soviet Union has long ago done away with illiteracy and in 1963 half of all the working citizens had secondary and higher education. The Soviet student body in 1964 totalled 68 million, or a third of the entire school-age and adult population, including 46.7 million people attending general school. The country has eight-year compulsory education today. The student body of the higher-education institutes is over three million, or more than double the number in all the European capitalist countries taken together.

The results are good. The Soviet press, however, constantly criticises the Ministry of Education, the Ministry of Higher and Special Secondary Education and the Academy of Pedagogy. It criticises vocational training methods in schools and colleges, the curricula and textbooks, the level of teaching research and exposes shortcomings in the learning process.

The following is a paragraph from an article by T. Matveeva, carried by *Pravda* on February 13, 1965: "The latest achievements in science and engineering are not spotlighted when quite a number of subjects are taught and too much time is spent on secondaries. The students continue to carry too great a workload. All this is detrimental to the quality of knowledge acquired by our graduates and has a negative effect on the work done by the higher school."

Other articles, lately carried by the press, criticise the evening schools and demand changes in college entrance requirements. Many critical remarks are made about examination methods.

The Soviet people are not satisfied with the eight-year level of education and are discussing transition to ten-year compulsory education in the near future.

We have quoted but one example, but there is no less frank exchange of opinions in the Soviet press on other shortcomings—in organising the national economy, in the activities of the Soviets of Deputies, the health service, trade, communal services, etc.

The leading dailies alone receive over a million letters a year, many of which are published. Others are used as material for investigation. This is genuine freedom of opinion and a form of participation for each citizen in the solution of state affairs, great and small.

Criticisms published in a paper never remain unanswered, no matter who is criticised—a rank-and-file citizen or a minister.

Like any other freedom, freedom of speech cannot be taken as a metaphysical value, detached from the social conditions in which it is implemented.

Soviet law guarantees its citizens freedom of speech, freedom of the press, freedom of assembly, freedom of demonstrating and marching in the streets, the right to join public organisations, immunity of the person and home, and secrecy of correspondence.

Critics of communism often stress that the Soviet Union has no freedom for any organisations, any papers, any speeches.

There certainly is not and never shall be freedom of activity for counter-revolutionary organisations, for war propaganda—in short, for activity against the people in the Soviet Union.

Freedom of the press—only for the people! Freedom of organisation—only in the interests of the people! Freedom of speech—only in the interests of the people! This absence of freedom to act against the interests of the people is a guarantee of the Soviet people's free existence and development.

«Maintenance of Order»

Parliaments and governments, legal bodies and police, the official apparatus and the army have been the political machine in the hands of the dominating class ever since the state came into being centuries ago.

A class character of state in a class society has always been carefully camouflaged by bourgeois sociologists, jurists, economists and historians. They never cease trying to represent the state as an organisation for maintenance of order within society, an organisation standing above class interests.

Maintenance of order?

It is here appropriate to quote the great Russian satirical writer Saltykov-Shchedrin: "When I fry carp in sour cream it is the order in which I like it, but I don't know whether the carp likes it or not."

Naturally the state maintains order with the full force of its powerful machine of compulsion. But the crucial question is **what it is like** and in **whose interests** it acts.

Why can't the richest country in the world

give work to millions of its sons, while the state stands guard over "order"?

How are we to explain that a country, which claims to be the vanguard of freedom, implements laws like the Taft-Hartley and Landrum-Griffin Acts, which sharply restrict the rights of trade unions and place them under government control, laws which cut down on the working people's right to strike?

In whose interests does the USA allow numerous fascist organisations, like the John Birch society, a legal existence?

How does the USA combine high-sounding phrases about political freedoms with the McCarran-Wood Act, which compels "communist organisations" to register, with the law on control over communist activity (which has actually outlawed the Communist Party of the USA) and with the fact that in the postwar years over a million persons and over 200 organisations were persecuted for alleged connections with the Communists?

How do declarations of freedom in bourgeois society coexist with the activities of the Ku Klux Klan? With the mounting of the struggle against racial discrimination, the Ku Klux Klan has stepped up its activity. The crimes committed by this organisation include the murder and beating of Negro public figures, burning of churches where demonstrators assemble, and other acts of intimidation. The Klansmen have become so brazen as to terrorise entire cities such as Bogalusa, Louisiana, and Philadelphia, Mississippi. E. Saivelson, of *The New York World Telegram and Sun*, wrote about many Ku Klux Klan crimes. We will take just one example:

Late in 1964, masked Klansmen seized O. Matthews, secretary-treasurer of the Laurel (Louisiana) trade union of wood-workers. They took him to a lonely spot, threw him down and beat him with woven hide whips, pouring hot water on his wounds. This was done because the trade union had approved a federal order that Negroes be given equal rights in a neighbouring factory. Mr. Saivelson says that the borders of the invisible Ku Klux Klan empire are expanding. R. Shelton the "Grand Dragon" said at one time that there are some 65,000 KKK members in Mississippi alone. The gangleaders of the organisation have openly declared that their goal is to ensure the "purity of the white race" by any means. Are their statements and actions any different from the theories and practices of nazism?

In whose interests is all this taking place?

The only answer to these and similar questions is that it is done in the interests of the ruling class, the handful of monopolists in power, who do all they can to preserve their privileges based on economic power.

The "free" bourgeois state is actually no more than a committee for bourgeois affairs, mainly concerned with bourgeois monopoly interests. Since monopolies compete with each other for domestic and foreign markets, they do all they can to keep government posts concerned with markets in their own hands. They don't stint themselves on expenses when fighting for the desired post because they know that they will be paid back with interest.

When a budget providing for tremendous expenses on armaments is adopted, who pockets the allocations for nuclear weapons, rockets.

atomic submarines and other weapons? All this money streams into the pockets of the monopolies who receive the military orders. What do the people get? Higher taxes.

None of this, however, must be taken too literally. There are times when the bourgeois state has to oppose the private interests of one or other group of capitalists. It may sometimes do things to improve the living standards of the masses. But all this is achieved by long struggle of the working masses and is no more than concessions made by the ruling classes striving to preserve the whole at the cost of a small part. No vote, Gallup poll or anything else will change the fact that any state is an apparatus to preserve the privileges and domination of some social groups at the expense of the interests of other social groups.

So what of the widely advertised freedoms in a bourgeois state? Is it a freedom to vote a monopoly stooge into a government post? Or is it a freedom to spend the night under a bridge after having voted for a millionaire? Or is it a freedom to be killed by a patriot's bullet in a war of intervention?

Of the People and for the People

But, some people may argue, there also exists in the Soviet Union a state system with all its institutions such as parliament, the government,

the army, the courts, the police, etc. So even here we must ask the same question: "Democracy for whom?" "Dictatorship over whom?"

Yes, a state system does exist even in the Soviet Union. But there is a big difference here due to the fact that immediately after the October Socialist Revolution of 1917 all power in the country was assumed by the working people. Having under the leadership of the working class overthrown the capitalists and landowners, they created the world's first proletarian dictatorship (for people like Mr. Sowell who like to contrast Marx with the Soviet Communists we would like to point out that the necessity of setting up such a state had been foretold and scientifically substantiated by no other person than Marx himself).

Like any other state, the state born by the October Revolution was essentially a **dictatorship** throughout the period of transition from capitalism to socialism. But in this case it was not a dictatorial rule exercised by a minority of the population—by the exploiting classes—but, on the contrary, it was a dictatorship of the overwhelming majority of people—former exploited classes—over the numerically small overthrown classes. At the same time it was a **democracy**—a democracy for the workers and peasants, for all the working people—a democracy for the majority.

The founder of the Soviet government, Lenin, stressed that violence is not the main feature of proletarian dictatorship. The most important side of it is its creative function, its role as the organising force of socialist construction in the Soviet Union. And if at times the socialist state

had to concentrate on the solution of military problems, it was because of the need to defend itself from external aggression. Suffice it to recall the campaign launched by fourteen Western powers against the young Soviet Russia, or the total war unleashed by Hitler against the Soviet Union.

The socialist state is a state of a new type, differing in its nature from all preceding states in that it consists of the working people and functions in their interests. That is why Lenin used to describe the socialist state as a "semi-state."

If it is possible to build a society without antagonistic classes, a society in which there is no social collision between public and private interests, then the existence of the state as such is no longer justified; as the Marxists say, the state must disappear, or "die off". It is replaced by a system of social self-government. This system will be communist society.

It does not mean that in the socialist countries the state system disappears immediately after the victory of socialism. Socialism is only the first stage of building communist society. At this stage, as was mentioned earlier, the level of development of the means of production is as yet insufficient, and people who live in a society which has just emerged from an era of capitalism cannot get used to the norms and principles of the socialist way of life overnight. At this stage labour has not yet become a natural necessity for every individual and material inequality still exists. All these factors necessitate the existence of a state system under socialism, since without it, it would be impossible to control production and consumption and to develop the national

economy and culture in a planned way. The most characteristic feature of a socialist society consists above all in the conscientious and planned organisation and direction of its social and economic life. It is therefore natural that such a mode of development on scientific principles requires an appropriate organisational structure, a system of organs which can carry out the planning and forecasting of its social progress, proceeding from the needs of society. Socialist society offers exactly such a system of organisation.

Under socialism the state, operating on the basis of a scientific analysis of the laws of social development, administers the national economy in the interests of the people, searches for the most efficient ways of utilising material resources, directs scientific research and trains and educates its citizens. The state is the mechanism by means of which the people rebuild the whole system of social relations in keeping with the principles of social equality and collectivism.

Now, is that good or bad? First of all it is necessary. And Marxists believe that a historical necessity that expresses the vital interests of broad popular masses is tantamount to historical justice and progress. This is convincingly illustrated by the rate of development of the socialist national economy in the Soviet Union, by the country's steadily rising standard of living and by its amazing cultural revolution which has reached out into all corners of the vast country and into all sections of its population.

When we talk about the disappearance of the state system under communism we do not envisage future society as an amorphous and

disorganised state of anarchy. Under communism it will still be necessary to plan production and to organise the distribution of labour between various industries. It will also be necessary to organise the distribution of the products of labour, the educational system, health services, etc. But all these functions will be performed by society itself, without a state administrative machine, and with the active and direct participation of all members of society.

What does this mean in practice? First of all, it means that there will be no special group of people professionally engaged in social administration. Every individual will devote part of his time to this activity. In other words, when literally all the people become "statesmen" the state machine will become superfluous.

The nature of their activity will also change since it will lose its **political character**. Bodies will exist to deal with such things as economic planning or the planning and direction of scientific research. But these will **not** be state organisations because their activities will be fully divorced from political considerations. As for the "classical" attributes of the state—courts, police, security organs and the army—they will totally disappear as things of the past.

It must also be pointed out that self-government is not tantamount to arbitrary rule. Communist society will be a fine and complicated mechanism based on the very high level of conscientiousness of all its members. For its functioning it requires a very high level of social control and social regulation of its achievements. This will not, however, be a control exercised by one social group, or a special apparatus.

It will amount, in practice, to self-control. Therein lies the basis of self-government.

There is no doubt that some readers are now smiling because they think that our journey has brought them into another land of Utopia. Well, scepticism has always been an indispensable quality of a thinking personality. The most important thing is to be sure that it really promotes a person's reasoning instead of hampering it. Unfortunately views on scientific communism circulating in the West very often preclude any reasonable consideration of the subject.

People who oppose the ideas of the non-political and stateless nature of communist society usually build their arguments on references to "human nature." They assert that it is such that an individual is doomed to be the slave of his base instincts, that people are essentially cunning and aggressive and that only the props of a state apparatus save the society from total chaos and degradation.

We Communists have a different view of "human nature." We believe that this nature is subtle and flexible, that an individual becomes bad as a result of his environment. In order to change people it is necessary to change the conditions of their life, to make them human in the full sense of the word.

How many decades will it take to accomplish this? Nobody can tell. What does it take to do this? This we do know. It is necessary to place economy at the service of public rather than individual interests and to achieve a situation when material need ceases to be the main driving force of man's actions. It is necessary to elevate

the people's cultural level, by which we mean the cultural level of the entire nation and not of a narrow group of intellectuals. It is necessary to create conditions of life in which every individual can become a well-developed personality, intellectually, morally and physically balanced.

This is what we Marxists have in mind when we speak about building Communist society. Ambitious programme? No doubt about it. Mountains of difficult work? Yes. But no one has ever been able to stop the progress of history. Marx was right when he wrote that mankind poses only those tasks which it is capable of solving, since, in the final analysis, it always turns out that the task itself only emerges when the material conditions for its solution already exist or are at least in the making.

That is why the main trait of the developing socialist state is an all-round development and perfection of socialist democracy.

How is this achieved?

First of all, through an expansion of the Soviets, through increasing the number of their deputies.

Above all this refers to the local Soviets, i. e., to local governing bodies in cities and villages.

The Number of Deputies in Local Soviets

1957	1959	1961	1963
1,549,777	1,801,663	1,822,049	1,958,565

Second, through a strict observance of the principle of renewing the composition of the Soviets. For example, during the 1963 elections,

58.1 per cent of the deputies were elected for the first time.

Third, through the organisation of nation-wide discussions of all major legislations considered by the Supreme Soviet of the USSR (the Soviet parliament).

During such discussions thousands of suggestions are made by people in meetings and in the press which help to find the right solutions for acute national problems.

Fourth, through the expansion of the rights of the trade unions (total membership 68 million), the Young Communist League (total membership 22 million) and other public organisations such as women's, sports, scientific, etc.

At present the trade unions control the whole social security budget of tens of thousands of millions of roubles, which was formerly administered by the government. The trade unions' rights have also been considerably enlarged in the sphere of wages, labour protection, and the distribution of housing. They now run practically all the sanatoria and rest homes in the holiday resorts.

Another important move has been the reduction in the number of police, with many of their functions going to volunteers' squads that help to preserve public order in the streets and other public places.

This shows that the share of government activities in the Soviet Union's social life is steadily diminishing. On the other hand, the elements of new forms of social administration—self-government—are becoming more and more pronounced. In a developed communist society this self-administration will become the general

and the only system of adjusting relations between its members.

However, it takes many drafts and detailed calculations, to say nothing of the services of experts, to build a new house. Here we are dealing not simply with a house, but with a whole new society. It goes without saying that such a colossal project requires a special type of expert for its realisation.

The drafts for this project are provided by the Programme of the Soviet Communist Party, adopted at its 22nd Congress. The statistics contained in the Programme constitute the major landmarks of communist construction.

The chief engineer of the project is the Communist Party of the Soviet Union.

People often ask: why does the Soviet Union have only one political party? Let us look more closely at this question. Is it obligatory to have only **one** party? Not at all. The existence of only one party is not based on any principle, but is a result of the specific historic conditions of socialist construction in this country. Several political parties exist and cooperate successfully in Poland and the German Democratic Republic. However, contrary to the assertions of Western ideologists, the existence of a single political party in a country does not necessarily mean that this country has a totalitarian regime. When this party is the political vanguard of the nation and expresses its vital interests, when it considers as its main task the construction of a society in which the interests of every individual shall represent the highest social criterion, then it is certainly not the case. The Soviet Communist Party is just such a party.

Where the Frogs Croak

The great nineteenth-century German poet, Goethe, once said that frogs may not be everywhere where there is water, but there is sure to be water where you hear croaking frogs. Paraphrasing this aphorism we can say that freedom and equality may not be everywhere where there is no racial or national discrimination (there is no equality in a nation living under capitalism), but everywhere where there is national or racial oppression there is neither equality nor freedom. Modern capitalist society, which calls itself the "free world," presents a picture of unheard-of national and racial discrimination.

It was recorded in the United States Constitution more than one hundred years ago that: "The citizens of each State shall be entitled to all privileges and immunities of citizens in the several States." (*Article, 4, Section 2*) And further: "The right of the citizens of the United States to vote shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or by any State on account of race, colour, or previous condition of servitude." (*Article 15, Section 1*).

And here is what the late American President, John F. Kennedy, said in his Civil Rights Message to Congress on February 28, 1963: "One hundred years ago the Emancipation Proclamation was signed by a president who believed in the equal worth and opportunity of every human being. . . Through these long 100 years, while slavery has vanished, progress for the Negro has been too often blocked and delayed. Equality before the law has not always meant equal treatment and

opportunity. And the harmful, wasteful and wrongful results of racial discrimination and segregation still appear in virtually every aspect of national life, in virtually every part of the Nation.”

The late American President knew very well what he was talking about. The same Message to Congress points out that the Negro baby born in America today has about one-half the chance of completing high school as a white baby born in the same place on the same day, one-third as much chance of becoming a professional man, and twice as much chance of becoming unemployed. Every Negro, the late President pointed out, has a life expectancy which is seven years less than a white man's, and prospects of earning only half as much.

To this we can add that President Kennedy was citing average figures. These figures did not bring out the fact that in the past academic year, of the total of 250 thousand Negro children of school age in Southern California, only 11 were studying together with whites, and in Alabama only one Negro child dared to enter the same school as white children.

The summer of 1963 marked the limit of the American Negroes' patience. Following the example of the southern states, Negroes throughout the nation rose to struggle for their civil rights. Twenty million Negroes demand the putting into practice of the century-old bill called the Emancipation Proclamation. We have been waiting equality for more than a hundred years, they say. We cannot, we do not and we will not wait any longer.

The year 1964 brought very few changes.

Addressing a joint session of the Senate and the House of Representatives, America's new President Lyndon Johnson declared (the reason for his address was the explosion in the city of Selma, Alabama, where the racists ruthlessly suppressed a peaceful Negro civil rights demonstration): "Yet the harsh fact is that in many places in this country men and women are kept from voting simply because they are Negroes. Every device of which human ingenuity is capable has been used to deny this right."

The President went on to list some of these devices: "The Negro citizen may go to register only to be told that the day is wrong, or the hour is late, or the official in charge is absent. And if he persists, if he manages to present himself to the register, he may be disqualified because he did not spell out his middle name. . ." If he manages to surmount these barriers he is given a test. "He may be asked to recite the entire Constitution, or explain the most complex provisions of State law." The President says that even a college degree cannot be used to prove that a Negro can read and write. "For the fact is that the only way to pass these barriers is to show a white skin."

And again Johnson pointed out that "a century has passed since the Negro was freed. And he is not fully free tonight." He said that a century had passed since equality was promised, "and the promise is unkept."

If this is the position of Negroes in the United States, where their rights are "recorded" in the constitution, what is then their position in other countries where racism openly flourishes and is elevated to be official government policy? Here

is what South Africa's Premier Verwoerd says about it: "Since childhood the natives should be taught that equality is not for them... I shall close any school propagating different ideas... There is no place for the African in a European community, he can only be admitted to certain jobs performed by the whites... Therefore it's of no use for him to get an education since he will not be accepted in a European community anyway..."

In the Republic of South Africa the mortality rate among African children from one to four years of age is 25 times higher than among the European children. Every third African employed on white colonialists' plantations in "Portuguese" Angola dies while he is still young. Some 100 million Africans remain illiterate.

These are just a few facts which nevertheless give a sufficiently clear picture of some aspects of life in the "free world".

One of the first laws adopted by the Soviet state, that was born in the flames and thunder of revolution, was the Declaration of Rights of the Peoples of Russia. This proclaimed their equality and sovereignty, their right to self-determination up to and including secession from Russia, and to the formation of independent states. It proclaimed the right of ethnic groups and national minorities living on the territory of the country to a free and unrestricted development.

But having proclaimed the equality of all nationalities before the law, the Soviet government had merely made the first step towards a solution of the national problem. A major aspect of civil rights and liberties in socialist society is

that they are translated into practice, that they are exercised in everyday life.

Laws proclaiming the equality of different nationalities could be written fast. But who could say how long it would take to change life over a vast territory where there were neither industries nor railways, to educate peoples who had never had a written language of their own and who did not even know what other peoples were using such things for, to eradicate the mutual distrust and animosity that had been instilled in people's minds for many centuries?

In order to overcome age-old national inequality which manifested itself in virtually every aspect of life, the Soviet government gave priority to the economic development of areas populated by the most backward and oppressed peoples.

In Soviet times a real technological revolution took place in the outlying areas of Russia, which did not have any industries before 1917.

Kazakhstan, for example, now equals Italy in per capita production of manufactured goods. Its output of electricity is larger than that of Italy and equals that of Japan. Before the revolution, Kazakhstan was one of the most backward outskirts of tsarist Russia, while Italy and Japan both possessed developed industries. Armenia, which had a handful of wine-making and cognac factories and small copper smelting plants before 1917, is now producing copper, aluminium, metal-cutting tools, electrical generators, electronic computers, watches, chemical fertilizers and many other manufactured goods. Soviet Latvia's industry turns out more goods in a single month than in the whole year of 1940.

Another Soviet republic, Kirghizia, a traditional cattle-breeding country, exports modern industrial equipment to 25 foreign countries.

This new economic basis, created mainly in the prewar years, gave the formerly backward nationalities and ethnic groups of the Soviet Union an opportunity for accelerated economic development.

The tremendous national diversity of the Soviet population called for such forms of government and state administration as would ensure the interests and the requirements of each Soviet nationality.

The Soviet Union now consists of 15 equal constituent republics—which are national states, each possessing its constitution and its organs of state administration (Supreme Soviets), governments and judicial institutions. Each constituent republic has its own citizenship and the right to enter into direct relations with foreign states, and to conclude agreements and exchange representatives with them as well as to maintain its own armed forces. All education, as well as business and other official transactions in the republics, is conducted in their national language and in Russian, which is regarded as the instrument of communication between different Soviet nationalities.

The Soviet Constitution guarantees full sovereignty of each constituent, or Union, republic as they are called, and their right freely to secede from the Union. All constituent republics have equal representation in the administrative bodies of the Federation. This equality is first of all guaranteed by the fact that in the Supreme Soviet of the USSR, the Soviet parliament, there

is not only the Soviet of the Union, but also another chamber, called the Soviet of Nationalities, where each constituent republic, regardless of its size, is represented by 25 delegates. All decisions of parliament come into force only with the approval of both of its chambers. A two-thirds majority in each of the chambers is needed to ratify constitutional amendments. The equality of the Soviet republics is also guaranteed by another provision—the Chairman of the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet, a post tantamount to that of a president, has 15 deputies, one from each of the republics. Chairmen of the Council of Ministers of each constituent republic, or their premiers, are included in the Council of Ministers of the Soviet Union.

It should also be borne in mind that many nationalities on the territory of the former Russia Empire had never achieved statehood. These ethnic groups do not form constituent republics, but there is a strict observance of their national and territorial autonomy. That means in practice that autonomous republics were formed within the constituent republics (there is a total of 20 of them now) as well as autonomous regions (of which there are eight) and national areas (ten), each with its own local administration. Every autonomous republic is represented in the Soviet of Nationalities by 11 delegates, an autonomous region by five and a national area, by one delegate.

Among the members of the Soviet parliament of the 6th convocation there were people of 37 different nationalities and in the Soviet of Nationalities—55. A total of 100 nationalities and ethnic groups are represented in the Soviets,

or local administrations, at different levels throughout the country.

It is worthwhile to recall at this point that in the latest United States Congress (the 89th) there are only six Negroes in the House of Representatives and no Negroes at all in the Senate.

With the development of socialist democracy, political rights of the Soviet nationalities are steadily expanding. This process is characterised by the combination of the interests of each Soviet republic with the interests of the whole Soviet nation.

Tremendous cultural progress has been made by formerly backward Soviet nationalities.

Suffice it to say that there was not a single institute of higher learning in Byelorussia, Moldavia, Azerbaijan, Armenia, Kazakhstan, Uzbekistan, Turkmenia and Kirghizia before the Socialist Revolution of 1917. Today, each of these republics has its own national academy of sciences as well as several technical institutes and colleges. The above-mentioned Soviet republics now boast an impressive total of 200 higher schools with a student body of nearly half a million.

The results of the cultural revolution in the Soviet constituent republics were well illustrated in the 1959 census:

Let us take, for example, the Republic of Kirghizia, which was perhaps the most backward of the republics.

Before the 1917 Socialist Revolution the people of Kirghizia were not only nearly totally illiterate, but did not even have a written language of their own. Today all the children in

Kirghizia attend school. As well as colleges, the republic has a national academy of sciences, and its research institutions are staffed by Kirghiz specialists. This Central Asian republic has more than 90,000 specialists with higher school or secondary education, and, what is even more significant, some 50,000 of them are women. It boasts more than one hundred students for

	Number of high- er school gra- duates (per thousand of po- pulation)	Number of ele- mentary and sec- ondary school graduates (per thousand of po- pulation)
USSR	18	263
Russian Federation	19	263
Ukraine	17	286
Byelorussia	12	225
Uzbekistan	13	234
Kazakhstan	12	239
Georgia	38	315
Azerbaijan	21	261
Lithuania	13	175
Moldavia	10	186
Latvia	21	344
Kirghizia	13	227
Tajikistan	10	214
Armenia	28	289
Turkmenia	13	256
Estonia	21	304

every 10,000 people. It is interesting to compare this figure with France, which has only 55 students for every 10,000 citizens, with Britain, which has 50, West Germany which has 43, and Italy which has 41 students per 10,000 people.

The Soviet Union has now become a great socialist community of different nationalities, each of which is rapidly developing its economy

and culture. Instead of separating them, their rapid progress tends to unite them even more closely. Since all Soviet nationalities enjoy full equality (not only in theory but in practice); their mutual cohesion becomes even stronger and they develop common characteristics that reflect a new type of social relations embodying the best traditions of each nationality.

The Other Half of Mankind

Since poetry began it has always glorified Woman. "Womanhood is eternal," said Goethe. "Revere women," wrote Schiller, "they intertwine heavenly roses into our earthly existence." For further examples we could recall the wonderful sonnets of Petrarch, the Rubayat of Omar Khayyam, and the poetry of Byron and Pushkin...

But apart from poetic glorification, how little humanity has done throughout the ages to help women take their rightful place in society! August Bebel justly pointed out that women as the most humiliated members of society should be the most interested in the victory of communism.

For many long centuries women have experienced suppression not only as part of the suppressed classes or nations but also within the family circle. All civil and religious laws dictated complete obedience to the will of the father, the husband, etc.

Life has always been especially hard for working women in many "civilised" countries

where their labour is much cheaper than that of men.

A full-time female worker in industry in the United States earns 30 per cent less per year than a man (and Negro women earn some 30 per cent less than white women).

Before June 1964, the United States did not have any legislation at all that provided for equal pay for equal work of men and women. When such a law was finally adopted by the federal government it brought no changes to some 75 per cent of gainfully employed American women since it only applied to women employed at plants with branches in no less than two other states. As a result, women in the United States get only 59 per cent of men's earnings for an equal amount of work.

According to data released by the Women's Employment Bureau of the United States Department of Labour, the overwhelming majority of 32 million of gainfully employed American women earn less than 2,000 dollars a year. This means that they earn about one thousand dollars less than the official minimum wage adopted by the American programme "War Against Poverty" (the programme sets the minimum wage at 3,000 dollars a year)

Here are some figures illustrating the average earnings of American women in early 1965 (in US dollars):

Occupation	Men's wages	Women's wages
Various specialists	8,253	5,073
Office workers	5,974	3,997
Managerial workers	7,566	3,846
Industrial employees	5,570	3,165
Sales-people	6,691	2,578
Employees of service industries	4,497	2,597

This does not mean that all women in America earn very little, but according to data released by the American Department of Labour only 0.5 per cent of the 32 million of gainfully employed American women earn as much as 10,000 dollars a year. Only three per cent of American women workers earn 7,000 dollars a year and the overwhelming majority of American women—three out of five—earn less than 2,000 dollars.

The head of the American Women's Bureau (Department of Labour) Mary Keiserling, who analysed these facts and figures, justly remarked that in fact the American woman does not have the right to equal pay for equal work, and, what is more important, she does not have equal employment opportunities or equal opportunities for promotion.

Even such reactionary American publications as the *Business Week* and the *Wall Street Journal* admit that employers seldom offer women equal opportunities with men. Thus economic inequality is closely linked with political inequality. By means of an elaborate system of restrictions and limitations women are barred from active participation in many social activities. Even now, women in many developed countries are either denied the right to vote, or, even when they have the formal franchise, they cannot exercise it in practice. This brings to mind an incident that happened to a group of Soviet tourists in Switzerland. When they were shown around the parliament building somebody asked how many women members there were in the legislature. In reply the guide pointed to the

Statue of Liberty and said : "She is the only one so far."

Of the 535 members of the United States Congress, only 14 are women, despite the fact that women account for more than 50 per cent of the American population. Not one committee of Congress has a woman chairman, nor are there women governors or mayors in any of the American states.

Yet 390 members of the Soviet parliament are women. This parliament has more women members than all the other legislatures throughout the world added together. There are also more than 500,000 women members of local Soviets at different levels throughout the Soviet Union.

The socialist revolution finally put an end to the limitations on women's rights. Soviet women are an active force in many fields—political, cultural, economic and administrative.

As compared with the 13.7 per cent of women who could read and write in Russia before the socialist revolution, more than seven million Soviet women are now higher and special secondary school graduates. Women account for about one-third of the country's engineers. The number of women who annually graduate from Soviet colleges with engineering diplomas equals the total number of graduates of all American engineering colleges. Of every hundred Soviet intellectuals 54 are women. More than 30,000 women in the Soviet Union are doctors or candidates of science.

...Lieutenant-Colonel John Powers of the United States Air Force had a rough passage at one of his recent press conferences.

The conference followed the flight of the world's first woman in space, Soviet astronaut Valentina Tereshkova. American women attending the conference showered the Lieutenant-Colonel with questions. They wanted to know why women in the United States are barred from participation in the space research programme. John Powers could do no better than to say that "so far we failed to find in the United States a woman that would meet our requirements."

Is that really so?

At least 13 experienced women pilots in the United States have passed the same physical tests as the astronauts training for project "Mercury." One of them, Miss Jerri Cobb, a courageous woman, who underwent all the ground training together with the men, even wrote a book entitled *Woman into Space* but remained on the Earth herself.

When the world's first woman in space, Valentina Tereshkova, read the book she remarked: "They are shouting from the housetops about their democracy and yet at the same time they declare that they won't let a woman go into space. And they talk about equality... When I think about Jerri Cobb's book I sympathise with her failure. But it is not her personal fault. We have different wings, Jerri Cobb and I, and this is the main thing."

Yes, this is the main thing.

The launching pad of the Soviet astronauts is socialism, and socialism gives women strong wings: it opens up all possible opportunities to them.

It was not by chance that after the space flight of Valentina Tereshkova articles began to

appear in the American press about the unequal status of women in the United States. Comparing the social position of women in the Soviet Union and the United States, *The New York Herald Tribune* disclosed that while 36 per cent of the engineers in the USSR are women, the figure is only one per cent in the United States. 79 per cent of Soviet medical workers are women as compared to 10 per cent in the United States. The chairman of the American Society for the Emancipation of Women, Mrs. Meta Ellis Heller, sent a letter to *Saturday Review* saying that there were 1,100 laws and regulations in the United States directed against women. *Life* magazine published a letter from Mrs. Clare Boothe Luce, one-time United States Ambassador to Italy, which said that the space flight of a Soviet woman became possible because "communism preaches equality of men and women."

A woman in the Soviet Union can be anything—a member of the government, a member of the Academy of Sciences, a writer or a painter. According to data for 1965, the Soviet Writers' Union has a total of 700 women members, the Union of Soviet Journalists—4,000, the Union of Soviet Composers—more than 200, and the Union of Architects—about 2,500 women members. For outstanding achievements in science, technology, literature and the arts, 755 Soviet women have been awarded Lenin and State Prizes. In Soviet society there is every condition for the unlimited development of women's gifts and creative abilities. Communism will completely free women from tedious household routine and will create maximum opportunities for her active participation in various spheres of so-

cial life. This will double the strength of mankind.

«I Am Your Boss»

“In case anybody does not know who I am, let me introduce myself. I am your boss. I can hire you, but I can also dismiss you.” These are the words addressed by Henry Luce to the staff of his several magazines, invited for a dinner at the Union Club. Henry Luce is the owner of *Time* and *Life* as well as of *Fortune*, *Sports Illustrated*, four TV centres and a score of other profit-making establishments, such as paper mills, forest concessions and oil-fields.

Are newsmen and reporters the only ones who are forced to regard their writings as a commodity to be sold in a nice wrapper so as to please a boss like Mr. Henry Luce? “I am your boss”—what a splendid formula for “presenting the facts in a free, unbiassed and honest manner to the best of a man’s abilities”! Isn’t it the supreme example of “free public opinion” or of the “uncontrolled press”?

Maybe artists are not so dependent on the “money-bags”?

In early March 1965 there appeared in the United States a report called *The Performing Arts—Problems and Perspectives*. This comprehensive study bears the signature of Mr. John Rockefeller the Third himself, and is the product of some 30 experts hired by the Rockefeller Foundation to produce a picture of the current state of the arts in the United States.

The "problems and perspectives" of American art were found to be far from encouraging. In the most prosperous capitalist country of the world the muses lead a hand-to-mouth existence.

The United States have only four symphony orchestras which guarantee full-time employment to their members. A handful of cities throughout the United States have professional theatres. There is only one permanent ballet company (the New York City Ballet), and only two large opera companies making regular tours of the United States. Not a single choir can offer permanent employment to its soloists. Such is the state of the arts in the country of Big Business.

Since government subsidies are scarce, the performing arts in America are financed by... charity donations. These account for the 60 million dollars a year which come from different private sources. This is almost equal to the sum spent by General Motors on building its pavilion at the New York World Fair.

The majority of artists in the United States can be classed as poor, according to official statistics. Thus a "war against poverty" is needed not only in the interests of the unemployed miners of the Appalachian Mountains, but also of the New York actors and musicians.

The general conclusion of the experts from the Rockefeller Foundation was far from encouraging: We give the rest of the world very good reason to regard us as a second-class nation.

These are some of the problems facing the arts in today's America. What of its prospects? What do Mr. Rockefeller's experts say about that?

It appears that in a country which spends

50 thousand million dollars for military purposes it is necessary to seek for sources for getting the 200 million dollars that are required to keep the arts alive. The question is, who will donate this money? The authors of the report cast hopeful glances at the corporations whose profits skyrocketed by one-third in the past five years. Their donations to the arts, however, increased by only two per cent.

According to Herman Kenin, chairman of the American Musicians' Union, in 1963 more than 260,000 American musicians were in such economic plight that urgent measures were needed to save them from extinction. The secretary of the American Musicians' Guild, Mr. Henry Fain, noted sadly that the great majority of concert performers—both vocalists and instrumentalists—were forced to take part-time jobs as waiters, clerks and salesmen. Of the 13,000 professional actors in the United States more than half get only one part to play in a year. Nearly 90 per cent of them are periodically unemployed. A similar situation can be observed in Hollywood.

The position of the arts in the United States arouses grave concern on the part of all art lovers. The world-famous American conductor, Leopold Stokowski, declared that the future of American art is in danger. He noted that the large American symphony orchestras are suffering from lack of money to such an extent that the musicians cannot earn enough to support their families.

On March 10, 1965, the White House asked for the appropriation of 10 million dollars as subsidies for the arts and humanities. The Con-

gress may approve the request. But what is 10 million dollars for the arts of a country with a population of 193 million? This is just another hand-out. In the richest capitalist country art still has to use the back door. . .

It is therefore not surprising that foreign artists visiting the Soviet Union are astounded when they see the position of art in socialist society. Even if you add together all the cultural life of Washington, Chicago, Pittsburg, Detroit and Boston it would still be impossible to compare it to the cultural life of the capital of just one Soviet republic—Georgia, says an article by American columnist, Harry Freeman, who was stunned to learn that there are ten permanent theatres in Georgia's capital, Tbilisi. In Washington, they are still discussing the creation of just one permanent repertory theatre.

The Soviet Union boasts a total of 23 music colleges, 178 secondary music schools and 2,200 music schools for children. These schools operate 112 correspondence courses and 100 evening courses and departments. About half a million people are engaged in some form of systematic musical studies.

The Soviet Union has an impressive total of 495 government-financed permanent theatres, including 32 opera houses, 356 drama theatres and 107 children's theatres. Besides these, there are hundreds of non-professional or so-called people's theatres. Soviet song and dance ensembles, such as the Moiseyev Dance Company or the "Beryozka" Ensemble, the Soviet Army Song and Dance Ensemble and other groups enjoy world-wide popularity and recognition.

The specific nature of the work of an artist,

a composer or a painter is such that it often takes him years to complete just one of his works. Through all those years he has to live and to support his family. An artist is lucky if he is already well-known, if he can count on an advance from a publishing house, on the royalties from his former publications or from sales of his earlier pictures, etc. But what if he is young and does not have a professional "name"? In view of this special nature of an artist's work, literary, painters' and other special funds were established in the Soviet Union, to give support to artists. There are also a number of vacation hotels for writers, composers and painters which offer all the necessary facilities for uninterrupted work. There is a college for budding authors at the Union of Soviet Writers, where lectures are given by leading Soviet writers.

In the capitalist world a writer, composer or painter is completely on his own. He is free to try out his creative abilities, but as he often discovers, he is free to work only so long as his creations are in demand. "If a writer does not acquire or inherit a fortune," comments American author Lars Laurence, "he may find it extremely difficult to solve the problem of combining serious art with earning a living in America." He goes on to say: "I for one cannot manage to complete my major work *The Seeds*. I am forced to interrupt my work now and again in order to write a script for the 'black market,' or to write and sell something for TV... Every such break means depressing thoughts, material difficulties, and a waste of time and effort. Of the 15 years during which I have been writing *The Seeds*, no more than six were dedicated to the realisation

of my ideal.”

“Artists in our society are regarded as a commodity,” declares the prominent American author, James Baldwin, in an interview with a *New York Times* reporter. Describing the tragic plight of his colleagues, John Steinbeck wrote with bitter irony that in America a writer is valued a little higher than a clown and a little less than a sealskin.

With such an attitude to artists' work, every artist in the capitalist world is inevitably faced with a dilemma: either to work for his ideals or to fulfil the orders of those who buy his creations. In the first case, as Lars Lawrence said, he faces a life full of privation. To this should be added the difficulties and humiliations that are encountered by a progressive author who wants to publish his book. The famous British author James Aldridge remarked that a progressive writer must be cleverer than the devil in order to publish a book proclaiming progressive ideas. It is next to impossible and frequently actually impossible to publish such a book, the circulation is trifling and the fees are beggarly.

Under such conditions it takes a really great and honest author not to swallow the “golden bait” of various publishing houses and newspaper trusts. The author has to have very strong ideals in order not to be swept off his feet by the muddy current of commercial publications and in order to remain honest.

Otherwise he will start trading his talent in exchange for dollars and pounds, for marks and francs. . .

There is also another way. It was described

by the Mexican playwright Ignacio Retes in his play *The City in Which We Shall Live*.

The main hero of the play, Alfonso Guajardo, cannot endure his beggarly existence and remain honest at the same time, but he does not want to cater to the corrupted tastes of the public. He finally finds a way out:

“Today I have changed my profession,” he says to his wife. “Several hours ago your husband abandoned the career of a writer. From now on I shall earn my living with these hands of mine, as a worker.”

But having decided to resume his former occupation of electrician, Alfonso goes on dreaming:

“Maybe I shall give it another try one day, I shall take up my pen and write a poem. . .”

An artist in the United States is free to invent any number of new “—isms;” is free to write anything, even the dirtiest pornographic books, to savour in public the details of the most vicious crime—as long as there is a market for his products he is nearly always sure to find a rich buyer who can help him to make it into good business. But in some rare and exceptional cases he may still tell the truth, or at least part of the truth. . .

“It is impossible to live in a society and be free from this society.” This comment was made by Lenin. He wrote that the freedom of a bourgeois writer, artist or actor is nothing but big camouflaged dependence on a money-bag, on a bribe or a fee.

It goes without saying that the idea of a work of art is first born in an artist’s mind, in his heart. This process is always individual. But,

having been born in the heart of its creator, the work of art always has roots in the life of society and its real life begins only when it reaches the hearts and minds of other people.

Any work of art, be it a picture, a symphony, a novel, or a film, becomes useful and acquires the right to exist only when it becomes necessary to people, when it helps them in life, when it shapes their minds and formulates their behaviour. An artist, no matter how hard he may try, is unable to avoid the problems of contemporary life. Therefore he faces a choice of only two ways: either to take an active part in the work of his people for social progress, or to preserve a façade of "independence." But it will be no more than a façade, because it is nothing but a private game of pretending to be "independent" on his part.

An artist conscious of his social role must be prepared for active work and sacrifices if he wants his art to be meaningful. He must not hesitate in choosing the only honest and noble path, the path of serving his people. This path has been taken by artists in the socialist countries. By their talent and by their social activities these artists help to shape the outlook of people in keeping with the most progressive ideals—the ideals of respect for Man, Freedom and Justice.

Does that involve limitations on their creative freedom? Of course not. On the contrary, it is the betrayal and repudiation of these ideals that leads to the impoverishment of an artist's spiritual world, to the degradation of his art.

"Our ill-wishers abroad say about us Soviet writers that in our writings we obey the Party's dictate," says the prominent Soviet writer

Mikhail Sholokhov. "In fact the situation is somewhat different; each of us writes according to the dictate of his own heart, but our hearts belong to the Party and the people, whom we serve with our art."

Science and Business

Business lays its heavy hand not only on art, but on science as well. Suffice it to recall the tragedies caused by the use of such drugs as CongerGAN, Thalidomide, Preludine and Distaval. Only recently all these drugs were widely advertised as tranquilisers for expectant mothers. Without conducting sufficient experimental research, medical firms seeking immediate profits launched the production of these drugs by the ton, and advertisements did not rest.

When the Australian doctor McBride, the director of a women's clinic in Sydney, raised the alarm on noting that two deformed babies were born in his clinic within a week, the officials of the local branch of the company producing Distaval did not even want to talk to him. Then McBride wrote a letter to the directors of the company in London. He got a reply telling him not to try to judge things which he did not understand. Meanwhile another six deformed babies were born one after another in Sydney to mothers who had been taking Distaval.

Almost simultaneously the birth of deformed babies attracted the attention of Doctor Lenz of Hamburg University. He was quick to establish that during pregnancy mothers of the deformed

children had been taking another drug, Contergan, which is very similar to Distaval. A total of more than 5,000 babies were victims of the drug in West Germany. They were born without arms and legs, some did not have fingers or ears others were deaf or mute and still others were born with a paralysis of the facial muscles.

News of the birth of deformed babies was coming in from the United States and Britain, from France and Japan. In the city of Liège, Belgium, a court acquitted a mother who had poisoned her newly-born child when she discovered that it did not have arms and feet.

Thus thousands of families bought tragedy in a nice cellophane wrapper...

What of the companies that were selling this poison? They continued production. In West Germany alone, a monthly average of 20 million pills of the monstrous drug were being sold before production was discontinued. Doctors in different countries are now busy developing artificial limbs for the deformed children. But who can invent a remedy to make thousands of parents forget the terrible tragedies caused them by the money-seeking businessmen, who still (and this is highly significant!) remain unpunished?

No matter how striking, this fact looks pale against the background of a number of others which occurred as a result of the interference of business interests with scientific research. This interference threatens the existence of mankind and human civilisation. In these conditions the greatest achievements of modern science may turn against their creators—the people.

A scientist who fails to gather enough strength

to withstand the pressure of Big Business, becomes its humble servant. If, on the other hand, a scientist dares to raise his voice in defence of science he is likely to provoke comments such as "It's high time to hang scientists."

Bitter irony imbues the answer of the great Albert Einstein to a letter from an American newspaper editor. He said that instead of trying to analyse the problem he wanted to express his feelings in a brief remark: if he were a young man and had to choose an occupation, he would never try to become a scientist or a teacher. Instead he would prefer to become a tinsmith or a pedlar in the hope of attaining that small degree of independence which was still possible in present conditions.

The great scientist's position will become even more clear if we recall that as far back as April 1945, before the barbaric nuclear bombing of Hiroshima, Einstein had sent a letter to the President of the United States begging him to consider the danger for the world that may emerge if, after the defeat of the nazis, a new destructive force would be made into an instrument of American foreign policy. However President Truman, who had replaced Roosevelt, not only ignored the scientist's warning but did his best to turn the atom bomb into the main argument of his power politics.

When Einstein joined the protests against the aggressive policy of the United States and expressed anxiety that the fruits of the scientists' work had been captured by a negligible minority which had concentrated in its hands first the economic and then the political power, the 70-year-old scientist faced the wrath of the combined forces

of reaction. The pro-fascist senator McCarthy declared him an enemy of America and the senator's followers labelled him a communist plotter.

Genuine freedom of scientific research is incompatible with the selfish calculations of a businessman, with the considerations of commercial advantage, with calculations of profits and dividends. The genuine freedom of a scientist consists in his ability to help mankind to acquire an understanding of the laws of nature and of the life of society, and in helping people to use these laws for the benefit of mankind.

Soviet scientists see the ultimate aim of their quest for knowledge, of their work and of their whole life not in catering to the selfish interests of businessmen, but in serving their nation, in transforming science into a great creative force to serve human progress, a force that can create a new and more perfect world. This they regard as genuine freedom of science.

The spiritual emancipation of man is the key to the phenomenal progress of science and technology in Soviet society. Even people who can hardly be accused of having communist sympathies have to face this fact. Here is just one admission of this kind: Professor Whitaker of San Francisco writes that in 40 years of life under communism the Communists have literally made technology into a star and reached out into space. It appears that communism does not suppress creativity. He goes on to say that it was a knock-out to everybody in the United States, including the official propagandists, who had been telling people a lot of stories when the Russian sputniks were launched.

The Four Words

When the prominent American psychologist, Dr. Edward Hellman, decided to find out which meaningful words are used in the United States most often, he discovered that they were: **money, to save, to figure out** and **security**. They all boil down to one single meaning—money.

Money, money and more money. . .

Every minute and at every step, a man in bourgeois society feels the power of money. It is the decisive factor in the family circle, at school, in hospital and even in the cemetery.

When the dollar rules man's life, people inevitably develop a mania for "making money" everywhere and at any price. Banks in Switzerland are still guarding the deposits amassed at the price of innumerable gory crimes committed by the nazi leaders. Perhaps it is high time to remove the cloak of secrecy from these deposits hidden in safes buried in the "neutral" Swiss banks? "There is no genuine freedom without the secrecy of deposits," as the general secretary of the Swiss Financial Institutions Union keeps saying.

Money is responsible for the growing number of crimes in the United States where in the past five years, crime has been increasing five times faster than the population.

Here are some official American crime statistics for 1964: there were 9,249 murders, an increase of eight per cent over 1963; 184,908 aggravated assaults (with intent to kill or inflict severe injury), an increase of 17 per cent; 111,753 cases of robbery; and over one million report-

ed burglaries. Crimes of violence taken together rose by 15 per cent over 1963.

The FBI reports indicate that a murder takes place every 55 minutes, and there is a hold-up every five minutes.

In an article published in the *Nation* magazine, Mr. Woody Klein writes that they are living through a period of moral degradation and of growing disrespect for the law and authority. He goes on to say that this mainly refers to that part of American youth who are described as hoodlums, which perhaps they really are. He points out, however, that there are considerable numbers of other people who must analyse their consciences and their behaviour. He says that the problem of crime in the United States has grown into a national problem. We would not disagree.

In fact, moral degradation in the present-day capitalist world has assumed such appalling forms and dimensions that even bourgeois public leaders, writers, social scientists and psychologists have to discuss it openly. Demoralisation in the literal sense of the word is threatening our perspective, declares Professor R. Angell of the Social Studies Department at the University of Michigan.

It is very significant that people of the younger generation occupy the most prominent place in these appalling crime statistics. According to New York's Mayor Wagner, youngsters below 21 are responsible for 60 per cent of all thefts and 75 per cent of car thefts in the city. An ever growing number of teenagers are becoming drug addicts.

What are the reasons for this tragic tendency? One of them (but not the main one) is the

corrupting effect of cheap literature, movies and television.

A whole army of unscrupulous dealers in "art" in the United States spare neither effort nor ingenuity in inventing and describing in vivid colours more and more appalling crimes, which arouse man's basest instincts.

Businessmen like to keep an account of everything. They have calculated that an average American child watches on television a total of 13,000 violent deaths in the ten years of his life from 5 to 14 years of age. According to a report by Stanford University in the five week days from Monday to Friday TV commercials and children's programme in any major American city show at least one murder by a stab in the back, three suicides, four falls over a precipice, two attempts to run down a pedestrian with a car, 12 premeditated murders, 16 mass exchanges of fire, 32 fist fights, two killings by suffocation and many other manifestations of violence.

Therefore it is not surprising that a nine-year-old girl, when asked which part of a new film she liked best, replied: "The part where they tore out the man's heart." The Social Subcommittee of the United States Senate has estimated that 25 million American children spend more time watching television than in school. What do they see? In New York, Chicago, Los Angeles and Washington 46.6 per cent of the programmes show "various forms of violence." It is small wonder that after watching thrillers and reading breathtaking murder stories teenagers take to the gun or to the knife in order to "pick up an easy dollar".

Mr. Thomas Dodd, chairman of the Senate's

Subcommittee on the effects of "crime-and-sex" programmes on juvenile delinquency, summed up the Committee's findings in the following way: The past two decades have resulted in a general spread of television. Over the same period violence became prevalent on the screen and juvenile delinquency rose by 200 per cent.

This mass production of horror films and crime fiction that corrupts young minds has its reasons: the more such films and books are released, the greater are their makers' profits!

Here again the motivating power is money.

And the mad thirst for money brings about a steady growth in "organised crime" including racketeering, gangsterism and all kinds of underground syndicates. The notorious Cosa Nostra alone controls a capital of several thousand million dollars.

Voicing their alarm over the state of public morals in bourgeois society, its ideologists are unable to expose the real reasons of this situation. Some are blaming technological progress and the growth of material values in society, i. e., the so-called "crisis of the 20th century" for the moral degradation of its members, without seeing the general crisis of the capitalist system.

On the other hand, the unprecedented moral development of the individual and moral progress in the socialist countries is a generally accepted fact. It proves the totally ungrounded nature of pessimistic wailings about the "crisis of the 20th century."

Other bourgeois sociologists look for reasons for the moral crisis in human nature in man's psychology, in his inability to adapt to the rapidly changing conditions of his life. Clergymen are

calling for the reinforcement of religious moral values as a remedy against all the evils of modern bourgeois society.

These schemes, however, based on the advancement of some new moral values are absolutely unrealistic. There are objective reasons for the fact that such concepts as duty, honour and honesty have lost their meaning and value among large social groups in the capitalist countries. The American psychiatrist, M. Shmideberg, remarks that large sections of the population in modern American society have no strong convictions about right and wrong... because having morals is regarded as conservatism. This lack of morals is the natural product of a society in which "no one can tell where honesty ends and crookery begins," as Karl Marx put it.

The moral crisis of bourgeois society is rooted in capitalist economic relations. This means that before changes are made in the whole system of a society and in its economic basis it is impossible to elevate its morals.

A popular saying in pre-revolutionary Russia was: "Catch me stealing first, then call me a thief." It provided a very accurate description of the morals of private ownership, when a luckier or more unscrupulous dealer considered it to be his right to profit at the expense of other people. And nobody could throw a stone at him since this was his legitimate "business."

The socialist society resolutely rejects such patterns of behaviour. In this society a person trying to live at the expense of others as a parasite deserves public condemnation even when his actions are not in an open contradiction with the penal code. Socialist morality is based on a differ-

ent principle which says that: "He who does not work, neither shall he eat."

No sane person in the Soviet Union would build his relations with other people on considerations of their nationality. Manifestations of the racial prejudice in any of its forms are regarded as shameful and offensive to human dignity. Sincerity, sympathy, concern for others and a readiness to come to their aid—these are the most valued human qualities in the Soviet Union. The use of the principles of communist morality in practical behaviour is considered today as the main determinant of a person's character, and is of decisive importance in estimating his social value and his relations with others.

Communist society, as envisaged by the Marxists, is a society of the highest level of human morality in which ethical and moral standards will replace criminal and other laws and administrative compulsion. Today, when we are engaged in the large-scale construction of the new society, the Soviet people are guided in their daily life by the moral code of the builders of communism, which is an indispensable part of the new Programme of the Soviet Communist Party. The code lists the main moral standards and principles which correspond to the ideals of the future society.

The communist moral code was not just invented. It is the embodiment of the most important moral principles developed by mankind throughout the centuries, such as the love of one's country, of free labour, justice, honesty, modesty, opposition to all forms of parasitic existence, humanism in relations between people, mutual respect in the family, care of children,

considerate and attentive treatment of the aged. These moral standards were being shaped and passed from generation to generation for ages because they express the moral convictions of all honest people. These rules will become the supreme moral law for all members of communist society.

Besides the general human moral norms that evolved throughout history, the communist moral code includes rules and principles developed in the course of the construction of the new society. They include loyalty to the national interest, to the communist cause, a high sense of social duty, concern for the preservation and expansion of social property, a sense of collectivism and fraternal solidarity with the working people of all countries, with all nations.

These qualities were born and developed in the Soviet people in the course of their struggle for socialist transformation in their country, for its freedom and independence, for world peace.

It goes without saying that moral rules and standards will be further perfected with the development of communist society. All prohibitive norms will gradually disappear. Their presence today is justified and necessitated by the numerous survivals of the past in people's minds. On the other hand, positive moral standards will be further developed because they correspond to the loftiest ideals of humanism. The creation of the new society will mark an era of genuine moral freedom which signifies not the negation of moral duties to society and between its individual members, but a voluntary implementation and observance of these standards due to the individual's profound personal conviction as to their value.

The Future of Freedom

A truly civilised society should not have aims different from those of its individual members. It can only justify its existence by serving its members, by promoting the realisation of their ideals. The creation of social conditions in which every individual will be able to develop his gifts and talents is undoubtedly a most noble but also a most complicated historic task.

Man's work is always distinguished by its creative nature. But, as we know, in order to be effective and successful, any action should be based on the knowledge of laws governing the properties of matter and natural processes. As people learnt more and more about the laws of nature and society, their activities became more and more conscious and productive (which means that they acquired a greater degree of freedom). On the other hand, the lack of knowledge served to limit the possibilities of men's conscious creative activity aimed at the rebuilding of nature and of social relations.

Now that the science of the most general laws of social development has been created (and the statement of these laws was one of the greatest achievements of Marx), mankind has become capable not only of using them conscientiously but of anticipating social developments and exercising control over the course of social history.

The genuine freedom of man, his spiritual freedom, cannot be created by one or two phrases.

Mankind has earned its freedom by its whole history, by the centuries of forced labour and

political lawlessness, by its entire struggle against social oppression and slavery. The real, as opposed to the visionary, foundation of this freedom is created by people's labour, by the transformation of social conditions in which people live.

Socialism as a realistic form of human freedom is not just somebody's invention, but an objective result of the entire history of the working people's struggle for a full material and intellectual life. That is why intellectual and social freedoms are inseparably linked and are unthinkable one without the other.

The rich daily life of people who have rejected the shackles of social oppression serves to reshape the minds of members of socialist society and to form a new way of thinking. Its basic feature is a boundless trust in man's creative abilities and his intellectual power. Man is liberated from the shackles of the centuries-old idea that he and all his capacities depended on external or supernatural forces of many varieties, including God, the power of money, etc. Socialism creates conditions for the degree of physical and intellectual freedom which was unthinkable in any of even the most prosperous previous social systems.

