

SOCIALISM: THEORY AND PRACTICE

HX
632
A1
W9
NO. 854

the individual



and

communism

5


EX LIBRIS
UNIVERSITATIS
ALBERTAENSIS



WHAT DOES SOCIALISM HAVE TO OFFER MAN? WHAT ACCOUNTS FOR THE VITALITY AND POWER OF SOCIALIST IDEAS? WHAT HAS SOCIALISM DONE TO PROMOTE THE ECONOMY, CULTURE AND SCIENCE? WHAT DIFFICULTIES AND PROBLEMS HAS SOCIALIST SOCIETY ENCOUNTERED?

HOW DOES SOCIALIST SOCIETY HELP THE INDIVIDUAL EXERCISE HIS TALENTS AND CREATIVE ABILITY?

WHEN THEY READ THE BOOKS IN THIS SERIES MANY PEOPLE WILL PROBABLY BE SURPRISED TO FIND THAT COMMUNIST IDEALS, WHICH ARE BASED ON LOVE FOR MAN AND CONCERN FOR THE GOOD OF EACH INDIVIDUAL IN MANY RESPECTS COINCIDE WITH THEIR OWN IDEALS.



Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2018 with funding from
University of Alberta Libraries

Novosti Press Agency Publishing House



the individual



and

communism

MOSCOW, USSR 1966 1/6

CONTENTS

Introduction	5
The Economic Prerequisites of Freedom and of All-Round Development of the In- dividual	11
Intellectual Wealth of the Individual	60
The Arts and All-Round Development of the Individual	75
Morals of Man of Communist Society	90
Conclusion	110

LIBRARY
UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA

Introduction

What is the Marxist, scientific-materialistic conception of relations between society and the individual?

It may be examined in two basic aspects:

(1) from the viewpoint of the interaction and mutual influence of society and the individual and

(2) from the viewpoint of their interests.

Marxism proceeds from the fact that nature and trends of human activity are governed by objective laws of social development and by historical necessity. This Marxist principle opposes subjectivism, which treats historical development as the product of the free will of the "critically thinking individual" or "creative minority". However, Marxism also opposes fatalism, which presents man as a passive executor of the call of fate and confines the course of history into the formula: "Events prescribe—people subscribe." There is no doubt that people do contribute their creative activity to the course of history. This

assertion in no way contradicts the recognition of historical necessity. It is the fact that everything existing by necessity initially exists as possibility that is the source of creative activity. This possibility is put into reality through human activity—an activity that is initiatory and creative and capable of doing away with handicaps and dangers that stand in its way. Such creative activity is not the lot of some individuals, but of the whole mass of people who struggle for social progress. Here we may point out that, when we speak of the parts which the individual and the masses play in history, we do not imply that the term “individual” applies only to those outstanding figures whose names have come down in history or that we consider the masses as being free of any individuality. People consist, first and foremost, of individuals, of toilers, each and every one of whom contributes his share to the triumph of historical necessity, as he takes part, in one way or another, in that struggle. However, the awakening and unfolding of creative activity in the particular spheres of life depend on the nature of the social system and not on any biological or other such factors.

To become an active member of society man must, of course, have the desire and aspiration to do so. This may depend on his individual features, too. But it is on the concrete sum of social relations that the outcome of this aspiration alone depends. Thus, the individual's activity and the spheres of its manifestation acquire dif-

ferent and even opposite features in opposite social structures.

The problem of the relationship between society and the individual, from the aspect of their mutual influence, cannot be treated in abstraction from the concrete social structure involved.

The same applies to the relationship between the interests of society and those of the individual. This relationship changes depending on the social structure.

The interests of various people, of the different classes and social groups may be in various relationships: they may be in concord, or may differ to a larger or smaller extent; they may be antagonistic, excluding each other. This multiformity of relations cannot be reduced to some common denominator suitable for all historical epochs and social conditions, because each and every socio-economic formation is characterised by its own specific system of relationships of interests among people. That is why the relationship between the individual and society has its distinctive features in every given society: in the primitive, slave-owning, feudal, capitalist and communist social structures.

In the primitive community there were no social grounds for a differential of interests of some members of society from those of other members. Common ownership of means of production and collective labour put all members of the community on an equal footing, while extremely low labour productivity resulted in equality in

consumption. Primitive man had practically nothing that he would have called his "own".

But at a certain stage of development, growth of productivity led to a social division of labour and exchange, which resulted in the producers being materially isolated, due to the establishment of private ownership on means of production. The development of social labour division and formation of private property gave rise to the partition of society into classes—into those who exploit and those who are exploited; and their interests came into irreconcilable opposition to each other.

Of course, every society regardless of its structure presents an economic community. A capitalist society is unthinkable without the bourgeoisie and the proletariat, which make up its basic classes and whose relations are characterised by reciprocal dependence: while the bourgeoisie cannot exist without the proletariat, the latter cannot exist without selling their labour power to the capitalists. Here "community" consists of the inseparability of these two poles of bourgeois society. It is an antagonistic "community" and is not "true collectivity", using Marx's and Engels' term. True collectivity implies the solidarity of interests, at least basic ones, but there is not and cannot be any of this solidarity under capitalism. The interests of present-day social development call for elimination of the imperialist system, which now fetters development of productive forces, and for establishment of

socialism which gives full range for development of these forces. These objective requirements of social development are chiefly expressed by the working class, since its class interests coincide with the interests of contemporary social progress, whereas the class interests of the imperialist bourgeoisie call for the preservation of capitalist ownership of means of production and, thus, are opposed to the requirements of the development of society. As the CPSU Programme points out, imperialism widens the gap between labour and capital, between the majority of a nation and the monopolies.

As to the fate of the individual in capitalist society, here we may ask: What individual are you talking about—the bourgeois individual or the toiling individual?

In a society based on class antagonism and on the enrichment of the ruling class through the exploitation of the majority of the nation, freedom exists only for representatives of this ruling class, while the people they exploit are deprived of elementary liberty. Such a division of the members of society into privileged and dispossessed individuals in no way depends on the personal qualities of each given individual. When born, the individual belongs to one or another class, and this class affiliation determines the general conditions of his private life and the general pattern of his personal fate in advance.

Modern bourgeois ideologists strive in every way to reduce the problem of the individual and society to an extraclass prob-

lem. E. Kreitel, a West-German social democrat, for instance, claims in his essay *The Individual and Society*, that the tragedy of human life is not the consequence of contradictions and conflicts among classes, but the result of contradictions and conflicts between the individual and society. Many bourgeois theorists maintain that there are no social evils as such, but that there are only individual defects, personal weaknesses and vices. In this way they lead people away from any criticism of the vices of bourgeois society, suggesting that self-perfection of the individual is the only way to normalising the social organism.

Contrary to all these subjectivist conceptions, which have nothing in common with a scientific approach to the problem of society and the individual, Marxism proceeds from the objective laws of social development and, in conformity with these laws, requires a concrete analysis of the given social system and its inherent specific features, such as mode of production, the entire social structure and the relevant specific laws that govern the relations between society and the individual. This is borne out most graphically when we analyse the problem under examination: the individual and communism.

The given paper deals with some aspects of this problem.

The Economic Prerequisites of Freedom and of All-Round Development of the Individual

The Creation of the Material and Technical Base of Communism and the All-Round Development of the Individual

The process of the creation of the material and technical base of communism involves the development of all the aspects of the new society's productive forces—both the implements of labour and the producers themselves. Solutions of this problem include further extension of the historical boundaries of freedom for development of the individual, as social progress is founded on development of productive forces.

In the conditions of the domination of monopoly capital, technical progress turns against the working class. Labour, due to its scrupulous division, is deprived of its creative aspect, and this gives birth to "professional idiocy", as Marx put it. Henry Ford, for example, used to say that an ideal worker must be nothing but a trained monkey.

The creative aspect of labour becomes the privilege of a limited section of mental workers. The proletarians are the first to fall victim to this division of labour. Their human qualities and abilities are made use of only to the extent to which they are useful to capital.

The worker plays the part of “a little gear in a great machine”, and this machine makes him follow its monstrous rhythm. The workers’ strain often exceeds the limits of human physical capacities. Mental disorders have become an occupational afflictions in capitalist countries. An investigation of hospitals in France has shown 40 per cent of wage and salary earners to suffer from overstrained nervous systems.

Process automation under capitalism puts a large portion of the formerly employed manpower out of work and is fraught with the danger of mass unemployment. The broad masses of workers are haunted by the spectre of being ousted by modern machines. An American trade union newspaper characterised capitalist automation as the “road to disaster”.

But scientific and technical progress and its most important component—automation—are a world-wide phenomenon. And since there is a world socialist system existing parallel with capitalism, technical progress in the last decades has been developing on socialist territory, too. Naturally, in the conditions of the new mode of production, machines have not become “socialist”, but their use produces results that are opposite to those under capitalism. Socialism has been the first in the history of mankind to put science and technology at man’s service.

The world practice of the development of the two socio-economic systems again confirms the Marxist principle that the

point is not in the machine itself, but in what class owns the machine and in whose interests it is used. It is this factor that gives rise to altogether opposite social consequences of automation for man.

Technical progress under capitalism leads to standardisation and depersonalisation of the individual and to obliteration of his personality, whereas in socialist society this progress presupposes the all-round development of the individual.

Under socialism and, especially, under communism, the development of implements of labour is closely connected with man's abilities to produce them and to make efficient use of them in the process of social labour. The harmonious development of implements of labour and of man becomes an economic necessity per se, for the individual's capacity to highly productive labour equipped with the most perfect technical facilities is among the most important criteria of his all-round development.

The creation of the material and technical base of communism will solve in the USSR such important socio-economic problems as putting an end to hard and unskilled work, turning agricultural labour into a variety of industrial labour, wiping out the major distinctions between work by brain and work by hand, considerably raising the living standards of the population, creating the material requisites for completing the cultural revolution, extending spare time for the all-round development of the individual, and many other problems.

All this will guarantee the extension of the freedom of the individual in the sphere of the economic and intellectual life of society.

Technical progress under socialism facilitates and changes fundamentally the content, nature and conditions of labour. Thus, in the period from 1959 to 1962, some 3,700 major industrial enterprises provided with the latest equipment were put in operation in the USSR.

As a result of large-scale technical progress in the USSR, many trades connected with non-mechanised labour have already disappeared or will soon disappear. At the same time, new trades are appearing. Many old trades are acquiring a basically different nature. The very conception of "manual labour" is changing, for it is growing ever more and more intellectual. Mental and physical labour is organically merging in every production process. Labour is constantly turning into a creative process, and the attractiveness of creative labour promotes its human necessity.

The present technical progress in all branches of the USSR's national economy makes steadily rising demands upon the cultural and technical level of those who produce material wealth. It makes high demands upon production efficiency and upon the vocational and general training of all working people.

In conditions where human labour becomes more and more closely connected and fuses organically with science and with

technical and engineering knowledge, this labour is based rather on knowledge than on skills. Radical changes in the nature of labour require that it be performed by a new type of worker who, apart from possessing habits and skills based on automated activity and on empiric knowledge, should be versed in the scientific fundamentals of production and technology and could readily orient himself in many fields of science and technology. A knowledge of the fundamentals of science and an understanding of the scientific principles of technology and production processes become objective necessities for those who produce material wealth. Lenin wrote that efficient management required thorough and exact knowledge of all production conditions, of the techniques of this production on the present level, and the possession of a certain scientific education.*

Bourgeois sociology claims that automatic machines will in the future oust human labour and the thinking individual in general and, thus, will undermine the foundation for all-round development of man. This assumption is based on failure to understand the socio-economic nature of labour and on a mechanical mixing up of machine operation and human labour. The latter is a social phenomenon and is characteristic of man only and of no other organism, either living or inanimate. Any machine, no matter how complicated it is

* V. ĭ. Lenin. *Works*, Vol. 30, p. 401, Russ. Ed.

and regardless of how well it can copy the physical motions of man or perform "mental" operations, is nothing but an implement of human labour, the creation of man's hands and brain. Man is qualitatively incomparable with machine. The work of a machine and human labour are altogether different socio-economic categories.

A machine, no matter how original, complicated and perfectly efficient in some functions it may be, will always remain the result and continuation of human thought which releases the worker to do a more complex job. That is why there are no limits to the development of the individual. An automatic machine, which substitutes for certain kinds of physical labour and facilitates man's work by promoting its productivity, will never exclude the human need of physical and mental work as a natural requirement; consequently, labour can never be eliminated. Even if production is automated to an ideal degree, it will always be man, and not the machine, that will rank first.

Giant technical progress facilitates physical labour immeasurably; many trades which overwork man are disappearing and will continue to do so. But physical labour will remain. The harmonious development of man is unthinkable without physical labour—creative and joyous, strengthening the human organism and promoting its vital functions.

There is a so-called push-button theory among the tenets of bourgeois labour socio-

logy. According to this theory, automation will lead to a state when the worker has nothing to do but to push the appropriate button. And with this kind of work he may just as well "leave his brains in the check room".

There are no reasons whatsoever to think that automated labour under communism will be turned into a pastime, child's play, or amusement. The labour process is bound to involve always a certain strain of man's physical and intellectual powers, but it will be of a quality different from what it is now, because automation, while it facilitates labour and releases the worker from exhausting muscular strain, at the same time makes much higher demands upon his training and education.

It is not for nothing that technical progress in socialist countries is accompanied by a swift rise of the cultural and technical level of the working people. The latter are well aware that controlling present-day equipment implies mental work and extensive knowledge rather than physical labour.

Higher skilled and better educated workers have a deeper understanding of the labour processes they perform and are capable of obtaining a fuller and more versatile idea of the progressive tendencies and available possibilities in the development of production. They are distinguished by an inquiring turn of mind, by more daring quests. The innovators' movement which has developed on a mass scale in the So-

viet Union may serve as objective illustration.

The following table shows the growth of invention and production innovation in the USSR's national economy:

	1950	1956	1957	1958	1959	1960	1961	1962
Number of inventors and innovators (thousands of people)	555	1341	1458	1725	2080	2431	2594	2732

Thus, a new type of worker—the innovator, a type of worker who reasons, thinks and is concerned about his work—has appeared.

While technical progress serves as the economic foundation for shorter working hours and thus for more spare time for the working people to develop in every way their gifts and capacities and to satisfy their versatile requirements, it is on the cultural and technical level of working people that the ways in which they use their spare time depend. Marx is known to have called spare time “the true wealth” of society.

The progress of the material and technical aspect of productive forces under socialism calls for the development of those

who produce material wealth, as well—their general education, vocational and technical training, production efficiency, etc., i. e. for all-round development of man—the main productive force of society. That is why automation and mechanisation under socialism serve as the material foundation for all-round development of the individual, as the source of an unprecedented development of all the vivid and specific aspects of the human personality. As technology grows more complex, many-sided and perfect, favourable conditions are created for the more harmonious development of the individual.

Division of Labour and the All-Round Development of the Individual

Division of labour among people and all-round development of their personalities are two interconnected but not coinciding processes. They are characterised by a complex and constantly developing relationship. The division of labour among people in a socialist society involves some contradictions. On the one hand, there still remain the old forms inherited from capitalism and reflecting the historical succession in the development of society's productive forces. They stand for the experience and habits of people, acquired in the production of qualitatively definite material and cultural values. These forms handicap, to a certain degree, the all-round development

of the individual. On the other hand, in socialist society, there takes place the process of overcoming the old forms and of the rise of new forms of labour division free of class and occupational limitations which reflect the requirement of the communist organisation of social labour and of all-round development of the individual. It is quite a complex process. It does not mean just the negation of everything that is old; here the forms that have become obsolete disappear altogether (hard manual labour occupations, for instance), others acquire a new content, while still others spring up. On the whole, however, the two aspects of labour division and the processes taking place in them reflect the level of socialism's productive forces, viz. the production and technical skills of people and their production and consumption capacities. At the same time, they characterise, in a certain sense, the social and class structure of our society and the tendencies of its development towards transition from socialism to communism.

An individual is the sum total of definite social relations and so presents a historical category. That is why the all-round development of the individual must be treated as a historical process. In socialist society, just as under communism, the all-round development of the individual is a complex and infinite process. At every stage of the development of society, this conception acquires a definite concrete and attainable content which reflects the economic matu-

rity of society, the sum total of social relations, and the development level of science, technology and culture. This is why the problem of moulding an all-round developed individual cannot be dealt with divorced from the present state of labour division.

Most of the present bourgeois naturalists and sociologists examine the prospects of scientific and technical progress apart from social progress, which cannot but bring them to pessimistic conclusions. Capitalism is stable—such is their initial premise in estimating the prospects of the development of mankind. In this case, they reason, even such a mighty tool of scientific and technical progress as cybernetics will lead to the oppression of man by the machine or, to be precise, to man's being ousted from the production process. By its very system, socialism ensures the unity between scientific-and-technical progress and social progress. This circumstance determines the difference of the social consequences of scientific and technical progress under socialism and capitalism, its different influence upon the individual and on the nature of the organisation and division of labour as well. Such great social progress as the transition from socialism to communism organically includes the harmonious development of both factors of society's productive forces: of the material and technical base and of man. Technical progress also serves as the material foundation for improving the social relations of

socialist society and of the individual who expresses them.

The ever growing contradiction between scientific and technical progress and its adverse social consequences which manifest themselves in the one-sided development of the individual is a characteristic feature of the development of capitalist society in general, and of modern capitalism in particular. And, vice versa, the all-round development of the individual, a most important aspect of communist construction, is characteristic of socialism and communism. It is the unity of social and scientific-and-technical progress in the socialist society that alters radically the socio-economic content of labour division and eliminates the contradictions between this division and the all-round development of the individual.

Bourgeois ideologists proceed from the assumption that social division of labour is not affected directly by certain production relations and that its laws function independently, regardless of the mode of production. They allege that in modern capitalist society this leads to the disappearance of classes and there remains but a differentiation of labour which distinguishes people by their occupational activity. Denying the most important aspect of capitalist labour division which preserves both private property and classes, bourgeois ideologists claim it to be eternal in content and to act upon people like a biological law. On these grounds they draw the conclusion that the all-round development of the indi-

vidual is impossible due to the inverse action of the law of labour division. They imagine that people will always be divided into intellectually full-fledged and inferior individuals, into workers by brain and workers by hand.

Development of all known socio-economic formations proves that every system of labour division is determined by the given mode of production. So the issue of how the given system affects the individual depends entirely on what mode of production has brought it about.

True, abolition of the capitalist mode of production is not immediately followed by disappearance of all the forms of labour division inherent in it. The division into mental and physical, industrial and agricultural labour remains in the first phase of communism, as do many forms of occupational division, the latter remaining quite stable for some time. This is quite understandable, for they integrate people's many years' experience, handed down from generation to generation. For instance, according to the now functioning occupational tariff manuals, there are over 15,000 occupations among industrial and building workers in the USSR. Extensive work is now under way to unify them: narrow and fractional craft distinctions are being eliminated. The new *Unified List of Workers' Occupations* will include 3,000 of them, though it will cover all the new crafts and trades that have appeared in the recent years, too.

The existing system of labour division, together with the two forms of socialist property, are known to make up the socio-economic foundation of the existence of classes under socialism. The elimination of the class nature of labour division in our society is among the primary factors promoting the all-round development and moulding of a communist individual. This does not mean, however, that all-round development can take place only provided the present system of labour division in Soviet society is eliminated. Practice has shown the process of the moulding of new man to be steadily gaining scope in the given concrete historical conditions; consequently, the assumption that present forms of labour division must disappear first and that all-round development of the individual will begin only after that is quite groundless.

There are two important features that are quite prominent in the multiformity which characterises the all-round development of Soviet man. On the one hand, this process has grown out of the framework of the class to which the given individual belongs. The degree of the individual's development and his status in Soviet society are determined not so much by his class affiliation as by the level of his consciousness, general and special knowledge, and the social importance of his activities. This is the chief tendency. On the other hand, the development of the individual is taking place within the classes of socialist society.

Soviet workers, collective farmers and intellectuals as individuals experience the influence exerted by the specific status of the given class or social stratum in our society.

But there is no antagonism in this contradictory process. Workers and peasants strive to master the general and special knowledge of Soviet intellectuals. New qualities, inherent in the individual of a classless society and constantly developing as socialism progresses, are an integral part of the very nature and tendencies of the development of socialist society. Such traits as an understanding of public interests and capacity for highly productive labour, steady rise of political consciousness and cultural and technical levels and practical experience in socialist and communist construction are universal indeed. The formation and development of these traits is accompanied by the dying off of craft narrowness and specific class interests. It is in this complex process of the disappearance of class distinctions that the social figures of worker, peasant and intellectual will gradually merge into a new figure—the working individual of communist society.

These processes indicate that under socialism the division of labour ceases to give rise to new classes. The transition from socialism to communism, which involves the overcoming of the class structure of society, is not subordinated to the law of labour division. Consequently, its old socio-

economic essence disappears here, and it acquires a new content in conformity with the communist social structure.

* * *

The problem of all-round development of the individual in the new society is directly connected with the following three questions:

(1) To what extent does the dependence of the worker in Soviet society on one craft interfere with this worker's all-round development? And if the overcoming of this dependence is among major difficulties in wiping out social and class distinctions among people, then how does the steadily developing specialisation of labour conform with the task of promoting all-round development? Doesn't specialisation in socialist conditions mean consolidation of old forms of craft labour division and, consequently, present an unsurmountable barrier to solving this problem? Or maybe specialisation is a transient phenomenon existing only for so long as the worker has not achieved all-round development, and the law of labour division and specialisation will be ousted by another—the law of labour alternation?

(2) What new tendencies are there in the development of labour specialisation under socialism that lead to solution of the problem of the all-round development of the individual? The point is—to what extent Soviet people are free to choose their oc-

cupation, what concrete conditions already exist for passing from one type of labour to another, and to what degree people combine mental and physical work in their practical activities.

(3) May the laws of specialisation and alternation of labour in a communist society be regarded as incompatible or as mutually complementary in the general process of all-round development of the individual? We must right away make the reservation that specialisation cannot be considered in isolation from the change and alternation of labour and from those forms of man's activity that are outside his profession or craft.

Labour specialisation cannot be regarded as a timeless abstraction. It is an objective process reflecting the development level of both aspects of productive forces and the requirements of the given mode of social production. On the one hand, it reflects people's concrete capacity to labour; on the other hand, if people do not possess due specific experience and skills, social production will be impossible altogether.

What objective necessity is there for the specialisation of labour, at least in the period while the material and technical base of communism is being created?

In our opinion, this necessity is determined by four basic factors. The first is that further extension of social division of labour leads to appearance of new production branches and types of labour. Secondly, expanding production speciali-

sation also requires certain stable technical knowledge which reflects the present scientific and technical progress. Thirdly, the implementation of the socialist principle of distribution according to quantity and quality of labour performed in unthinkable without a craft and qualification system of labour organisation. And, last but not least, man's entire useful activity in communist construction acquires an absolutely concrete form. It is quite evident that this concrete labour, producing material and spiritual values, will always remain the foundation of social production and of development of man himself.

Naturally, differentiation and specialisation of labour cannot remain unchanged. Scientific and technical progress, the development of culture are constantly changing the rather stable specialisation of physical and mental work. The boundaries and contents of concrete activity are constantly changing and growing in scope and profundity. This, too, is a form of labour alternation and a condition promoting development of man's capacity to labour.

It is not only an understanding of the general aspect of socialist specialisation that will contribute to correct estimation of its essence. It is also important to take into account the specific features of the concrete spheres of labour in which it develops. We must, for instance, take into consideration the following:

(1) How this process goes on in the sphere of productive labour, in both its "di-

visions"—the work of engineers, technicians and scientists on the one hand, and that of the industrial worker on the other. With the former, specialisation mainly grows deeper, while with the latter there takes place universalisation and unification of trades and crafts.

(2) The specific features of labour differentiation in the sphere of material production and mental activity, especially those connected with the arts, science, etc.

(3) The features of specialisation of farm labour. This involves overcoming of survivals of the former rural universalisation and emergence of workers of new crafts and skills which reflect the scientific and technical progress in agriculture.

(4) The gradual dying off of the old pattern of crafts and skills under the effects of scientific and technical progress and the rapid substitution of unskilled labour by skilled labour. It is this process that reflects most graphically the elimination of the old craft division of labour which fetters man.

An analysis of all these aspects shows the individual's trade or craft isolation in a socialist society to be an unstable and temporary phenomenon. The toiler of a socialist society—as an individual—is steadily extending the range of his skilled activity.

The integrity of Soviet man is manifested in his striving towards many-sided activity, which is a characteristic tendency of

socialist society. And when we speak of the foremost people of our time—the explorers of space, scientists, pilots, shockworkers of communist labour (a fitter, lathe-operator, miner or weaver, for instance) and past-masters in high harvest yields (a tractor driver or combine operator)—we mean that their success in given fields is not the result of their narrow professions or crafts, but is due to their many-sided development, first and foremost to their culture and high political consciousness.

True, in certain circumstances man may become a “slave” of his special knowledge and the relevant narrow professional or craft activity. We do come across people like that in our society too. That is why the specialisation of labour and knowledge in our society may be considered to be progressive only if they are connected with and based on all-round development of man. The chief tendency of labour specialisation has already manifested itself in the first phase of communism. It consists in combining a thorough skill in some specific field of labour with versatile general knowledge and high cultural and technical levels.

Why is the overwhelming majority of working people in our society still dependent on a single craft? The reason for that lies in the development level of productive forces and socialist production relations which still preserve their commodity pattern, though it differs fundamentally from that in a capitalist society. The level of labour productivity of the individual and,

consequently, his prosperity depend on development of his capacity to work and his professional and technical training.

But the commodity form of production will not last forever. It will disappear with the victory of communism. Its elimination begins in the very depths of commodity production—in the planned system of economy, in the attainment of a high level of labour productivity, and in the creation of an abundance of products of labour. At the same time, the fettering system of labour division will disappear, too, and when the communist principle “From each according to his ability, to each according to his needs” is implemented, then the domination of things over man will sink into oblivion.

Differentiation and specialisation of human labour will not die off with the disappearance of the commodity form of social production. But these forms of human activity will, as we have said above, have a content that is altogether different from that of the former craft division of labour. Specialisation, parallel with the change and alternation of labour, will be among components of all-round development of the individual. Being based on a sound foundation of versatile knowledge, it will play the part of a kind of “superstructure” over all-round development. Besides, it will present the concrete form of participation in the production of material wealth and spiritual values and will give the individual a chance to manifest his abi-

lities and talents.

Scientific communism does not limit the concept of society's wealth to abundance of material and cultural values, but considers the versatile individual to be the main value of society. According to Karl Marx, this conception of society's wealth implies that man reproduces himself not in any one direction, but does it in complete integrity—he does not strive to remain as something entirely stable, but is in continuous motion of development. Such an alternative may seem to rule out the specialisation of people in a highly developed communist society. But actually, they only seem to be antipodes. In reality, without the specialisation of man's socially useful activity based on a broad mental outlook and without his penetrating into the essence of phenomena, the individual of harmonious, all-round development will remain an unattainable ideal.

The CPSU Programme, having this tendency of historical development in view, has formulated the principle of man's free choice of occupation. "Each is guaranteed an equal and free choice of occupation and profession with due regard to the interests of society," the Programme reads. This formula stresses equal and free choice of occupation and profession, which, naturally, is only possible on the basis of a broad mental outlook in versatile spheres of socially useful activity, a many-sided general education, and labour skills and habits cultivated in process of training at polytechni-

cal schools. But there cannot be any really free choice if the needs of society are not taken into consideration. The various interests of people for their particular activities coincide and intertwine with the interests of society and ultimately meet the needs of the latter on the whole. The reason is that personal interests do not appear of themselves, but are based on an objective foundation—social production. The value of an individual's activity is in his realisation that it is useful to society. The degree to which social and personal interests coincide in labour depends to a great extent on the level of each individual's social consciousness. The higher it is, the deeper does the individual realise the importance of a given type of work to society. This consciousness reflects, naturally, the fundamental changes that have taken place in the socio-economic content of labour. And, while craft division of labour under capitalism certainly acts as a means for exploiting manpower, under socialism and communism it becomes its own antipode in this respect, i. e. a condition for the concrete creative efforts of man freed of exploitation. The Soviet press frequently publishes reports which illustrate the fondness of people for their professions and crafts, their obsession for useful activity. We shall not hear these people, who realise the social significance of their work, say that their occupation oppresses or maims their personality. This is further proof of the idea that the influence of man's activity upon his personality must

not be treated in abstraction, but examined with due consideration of the socio-economic foundation on which his personality develops. The labour that is free of exploitation does away with the old narrow professionalism or craft outlook among the factors that fetter the individual. Socialism gives rise to an altogether different specialisation.

In the conditions of capitalist society, the versatile activity of people and the specialisation of their labour are indeed two opposite poles. Narrow craft outlook, continuously reproduced on the basis of machines, puts its stamp on the whole system of bringing up and educating the younger generation, on the reproduction of labour power in bourgeois society. In conditions of unemployment, waste of labour power and constant craft competition, practically no individual is free to choose the profession or the particular sphere of activity which corresponds to his abilities or wishes. Change of work (change of craft or shift to another branch of the economy) is usually due to the danger of losing one's means of subsistence, to the struggle for daily bread, but not due to the individual's desire to satisfy his needs in a sphere of activity that appeals more to him.

It is only gifted individuals who escape from these fetters and take advantage of humanity's invaluable gift—the right to engage in versatile activity.

Free change of labour, free choice of

occupation, free shifting from one sphere of social endeavour to another are most important symptoms of a highly developed society and individual, and a practical condition for the most adequate application of every individual's physical and mental capacities. The implementation of these principles underlying the social organisation of labour already becomes possible under socialism, but they reach their full development under communism.

Among the greatest human values of communism is that it creates, even at the first stage of its development, real conditions for all people to bring out and manifest their abilities. This applies to such phenomena in the life of Soviet society as the alternation of craft or professional (production) with non-professional (public) activities. This is an important form of labour alternation, of course. This also applies to the various forms of education and self-education possible without discontinuing one's trade or profession, participation in amateur art activities, etc.

A broad movement for mastering a second trade or profession has been developing at many industrial enterprises and offices. In Minsk Region, for instance, this form of alternating and changing labour has spread equally among engineers and technicians (getting industrial professions), and among Party workers who regularly study agricultural machinery. Most of them have learned to drive tractors, operate self-propelled harvester combines, etc. This re-

markable phenomenon may be observed at many enterprises throughout the Soviet Union, and is spreading in the countryside, too. But it is still too early to claim that all the conditions essential for shifting from one activity to another have already been created. They are in an embryonic state, just the outline of such a development.

Young people in the Soviet Union, particularly those in school, have been showing a great interest for discussions of such topics as, "What occupation should one choose?" and "How to find one's place in life, so as to be a useful member of society?" initiated by the Soviet press. The overwhelming majority of young people choose their occupation deliberately and of their own free will. That is an extremely important factor which manifests the desire of the masses themselves to overcome the spontaneity of circumstances which may, even in our time, prompt people to choose an occupation against their liking. These circumstances arise not out of the socio-economic essence of the Soviet system, but in most cases are purely subjective factors operating when a person is unable straight away to find his right place in life.

The fact that the mass of Soviet people have all opportunities to choose of their own free will their occupation in the sphere of physical and mental labour is a characteristic feature of Soviet reality. This is promoted by a large-scale pro-

portional development of various branches of the national economy, science and culture, by a great network of educational institutions, by the training and raising of qualifications in mass occupations and, last but not least, by the absence of unemployment. Labour which is chosen of one's own accord and is not forced upon the individual by circumstances elevates him. This is borne out by numerous facts of labour heroism performed by innovators in socialist production.

In a socialist society, there still are people, of course, who are unable to choose the profession or trade they prefer. They are prevented by two circumstances. First of all, society cannot satisfy all individual interests and demands that are out of conformity with its interests. And, secondly, the subjective factor, which expresses the individual's attitude towards his surroundings or his behaviour, plays a very important part here, too. This factor may manifest itself in incorrect attitude to some aspects of labour, in a failure to understand their social significance, etc.

* * *

How does Marxism understand all-round development of people?

According to Karl Marx, all-round and versatile development of man in a socialist society consists, first and foremost, in his understanding the laws of society's development and the basic production processes,

and of a high level of general education. The sum total of such knowledge will give every individual the chance of voluntarily concentrating more profoundly on some definite sphere of material production or intellectual activity.

The history of the development of science proves that science and technology are advanced only by combining the extensive knowledge accumulated by society and by each and every individual with the further concretising and extension of the specific fields of knowledge. All the greatest scientists of the past and present, such as Newton, Lomonosov, Darwin, Edison, Mendeleev, Mechnikov, Pasteur, Pavlov, Joliot-Curie, Vavilov, Kurchatov, and many others, are known to have combined extensive knowledge of the great wealth of human culture and science with profound knowledge in a concrete field of science.

Our conception of the all-round development of the individual must be concrete. Under the given historical conditions, it means that the individual oversteps the boundaries of his employment, overcomes its limitations, and expands the range of his interests, needs and possibilities of creative endeavour.

This conception will grow broader as we progress towards communism. Parallel with efficient participation in material production and cultural activities in a chosen field, people will turn to spheres previously inaccessible to them, such as science, creative work in the arts, etc.

When we speak of the individual of all-round development in communist society, all of us understand, of course, that we do not mean the "universality" of ancient Greek thinkers or of the Renaissance. Our conception of a person of all-round development and our experience in no way resemble the pictures painted in the Utopian writings of Campanella, Thomas More, Fourier, and others. In spite of their literary elegance and harmonious systems, these Utopias did not take into account the real possibilities of development of productive forces, science, technology and culture. The present and the future of science affords the human race the opportunity of making a great stride in its development by drawing on these factors under communism. Of course, this applies not only to some individuals that stand out of the common mass of people, but to the human race as a whole.

We live at a time when even the most outstanding individual is unable to master all the achievements of human thought during his lifetime. Only the person who concentrates on a certain specific sphere of activity can make a worthy contribution to the development of science, technology, art, literature, or material production.

All-round development of the individual must not be regarded as something Utopian. It is an absolutely concrete and realistic proposition. It is a process which, just like cognition, is infinite. In the given conditions, the Communist Party has mapped

real tasks in this sphere—to furnish all people the opportunity of combining physical and mental labour in their productive activities, to overcome occupational narrow-mindedness, to turn everyone's labour into a free creative process, and to make the cultural values of mankind accessible to all.

All-round development of all people does not preclude but, on the contrary, preconditions concentration of gifts in the individual. To depict communism as the levelling of people into a uniform, dull mass deprived of all individuality means to play into the hands of the bourgeois critics of communism. All-round development of people's attitude to labour, education and to consumption of material and cultural wealth, in general, creates unexampled opportunities to every individual to manifest his abilities and not to lose them in the stream of everyday circumstance. Talent will not be a rare exception any more.

Soviet society has already moulded thousands of people who combine a high general educational and cultural level with deep professional and technical knowledge enriched by practice. These features, in addition to high consciousness and political activity, have given Soviet society a new type of working individual—the innovator of socialist production.

Thus, the point is not that division of labour will disappear in general as a law of the development of social production, but that its former socio-economic content and

forms, which give rise to conditions for preserving classes and interfering with the development of the individual, will be abolished. The division of labour among people in the shape of essential and rational specialisation combined with labour alternation remains the most important law of development of social production and a definite system for the production relations among people.

The division and alternation of labour under communism are factors that do not exclude each other—they are two aspects of a single process which includes organisation of social labour and all-round development of the individual.

The Harmonious Development of Intellectuals

The principal content of the process of moulding a new type of individual is the same for workers by hand and for workers by brain—it is the moulding and training of communist-conscious and highly educated men and women, fit both for physical and mental work, for purposeful activity in the various spheres of public and civil life, of science and culture. There are common ways, means and regularities and identical socio-economic, political and intellectual prerequisites for the moulding of a new type of individual for all people of our society, regardless of whether they are engaged in physical or mental work.

In order to obtain a correct idea of the process of the harmonious and all-round development of the individual, it is essential to see the specific features of this process with reference to physical workers and mental workers.

The specific features of the process of moulding a new type of man still engaged mainly (professionally) in mental work are due to:

(1) the nature of mental work which will always preserve its qualitatively specific features in spite of the radical changes of this nature;

(2) the complex composition of the intelligentsia as a definite social stratum;

(3) the features involved in the concrete forms of attaining an organic unity of mental and physical labour in the activity of men and women of mental work depending on its aspects, as well as on the physical, physiological, psychological and moral preparedness of these people for manual labour, on their inclinations, on the needs of society and economic expediency of a given level or extent of combining mental and physical work in the activities of every person or social group at a given period of communist construction;

(4) the concrete form in which the law of labour alternation operates and the specific features of the professional division of labour in the sphere of mental activity;

(5) the specific character of the concrete qualitative changes taking place in the

nature of mental labour and its connections with physical work;

(6) the concrete targets to be attained by one or another social group in the course of the moulding of all the features and aspects of the new type of individual, which follows from surviving distinctions between town and countryside, between workers by brain and workers by hand.

There are natural distinctions between physical and mental labour, due to their very nature and to the mode in which man invests his efforts.

The intelligentsia, as an intermediate social stratum between classes, forms in society as a result of the social division of labour into mental and physical work and the consolidation of these kinds of labour with certain social groups. Although there is a concrete historical content behind the term "intellectuals", this part of the population is basically distinguished by being professionally engaged in mental labour. The existence of intellectuals as a definite social group is objectively conditioned either by setting the people performing mental labour against those performing physical labour (as is the case with antagonistic formations), or by the marked distinctions between them (as is the case under socialism and in the period of the all-out construction of communism).

The socialist intelligentsia differ from bourgeois intellectuals not only in social essence, but also by the part they play in production, in socio-economic and intellect-

ual life. In the capitalist society the intellectuals perform the functions of governing the state and production, indoctrinating the population, taking care of education and health services, and developing culture. They do this intellectual and organisational work in the interests of the ruling classes in conditions when the masses of the people are kept from participating in it.

Socialist intellectuals perform the functions of governing the state and production, of educating the population and developing science and culture in the interests of the entire society. The marked distinctions between mental and physical work under socialism determine our intellectuals' role in the system of production relations, their social and professional functions.

The top intellectual functions in socialist society (the scientific, engineering and technical functions of labour, state government and economic management, education, scientific and artistic functions) are carried out by intellectuals to this day. But already some of these functions are performed by the direct producers of material wealth. And it is only under complete communism that the social and professional functions of the intellectuals will pass over completely to the whole society and then they will cease to exist as a special social stratum.

If all members of society are to perform simultaneously the functions of mental and physical labour, it is essential that their educational, cultural and technical

level be raised to that of specialists with higher education.

As we have already pointed out, the conception "intellectuals" has a concrete historical content, both for different socio-economic formations and within them, at various stages of their development.

If we analyse the composition of the intelligentsia as a special social stratum in various epochs and in different countries, we shall see that it is composed of more or less historically stable groups. Indeed, the category of persons professionally engaged in governing the state, regardless of the distinctions in their origin and of the given function in different epochs, still makes up an important element of this group, along with that part of it which is engaged in education, science and culture generally. Till lately, scientists accounted for a very small and unimportant part of the intelligentsia, whereas now this group is growing extremely fast. Both quantitative and qualitative developments and structural changes are taking place within this social stratum.

We may single out three distinctive groups within the socialist intelligentsia, depending on the concrete type of mental work they perform. In literature we often come across such designations of intellectual groups as engineering and technical, scientific, artistic as well as those engaged in education (teachers), medical services, (doctors and junior medical personnel), the

state machinery, public bodies, cultural establishments. We also hear of urban and rural intellectuals. Although such a classification is clearly relative, it reflects the existence of important distinctions between town and countryside.

The growth of the groups of Soviet intellectuals in the period of all-out communist construction is due to the requirements of socialist society, its productive forces and the new tasks which the practice of communist construction puts before workers by brain.

At present, we see in the USSR a qualitative structural change of the entire category of workers by brain, which is connected with the changes taking place in the production and non-production spheres and in their mutual relationship.

Statistics show the group of mental workers engaged in the sphere of material production to grow fastest of all. Due to the extension of scientific elements in production, there is an ever increasing demand for engineers and technicians in the socialist production system. The social consequences of the growth of the engineering and technical personnel under socialism are fully in conformity with the target of promoting all-round development of all the members of society.

The role of science in the development of the intellectual aspect of production is gaining scope not only—and even not so much—along the line of the growth of the number

of engineers, technicians and scientists, but rather due to other factors. This applies, first and foremost, to those connected with the rapid materialisation of scientific achievements in modern technology and production and with growth of the number of physical workers who pass from carrying out ordinary mental functions over to performing higher functions—engineering, technical and scientific ones. However, the distinctions between the scientific activities of the masses and the mental work of engineers, technicians and, the more so, of scientists still remain, both with reference to their nature and to their level.

The gradual transition to public self-government on the basis of all-round and full development of socialist democracy as a result of an immense rise in the educational and cultural level of the entire population will mean that the highest organisational functions of governing the society will pass over into the hands of all members of the society. Consequently, this aspect of mental work which, for the time being, is professionally performed by intellectuals will become public property. But to achieve this, it is essential that many tasks be translated into reality, especially the one which stipulates that all the members of society acquire the professional skills, experience and competence which are still characteristic mainly of intellectuals.

In the development of mental workers nowadays, we do not only observe numerical

changes in one or another intellectual group, but also some other features. Among these characteristic is the growing number of persons with secondary and higher education, this growth being of a different nature in separate groups. There is a marked increase in specialists holding diplomas, particularly among industrial intellectuals, although in 1956 the group of practical specialists, i.e. those without diplomas, accounted for nearly 60 per cent of all intellectuals.

Intellectual development of such a category of mental workers as engineers and technicians is marked by their gradual rising to the level of scientific workers, both as regards the nature of their work and their scientific, technical and cultural level. Industry is already advancing the target of raising engineering and technical activity to the level of scientific research. In the future, the work of engineers will acquire the highest forms of scientific work.

One often hears the puzzled question of whether the concept of labour productivity may be applied to mental labour in general or, at least, to some of its types. These questions arise from the theoretical principle that the capacity to physical labour must be developed in all members of the communist society. The classics of Marxism pointed out that under a reasonable social system every able-bodied grown-up must conform to the general law of nature, namely: he must work in order to eat, work not

only with his head, but with his hands as well, and that in the future society no individual can throw on the shoulders of others his share in productive labour, this natural condition of human existence.

Marx mentioned two possible approaches to determining the productivity of labour in a capitalist society. From the capitalist's point of view, the work of a scientist, writer and teacher is productive if it creates surplus value. From the point of view of society, it is the labour which is directed at manufacturing a product that is, according to Marx, productive.

The content of the term "labour productivity" changes in the course of historical development; its scope may now become broader, now narrower. Even in the sphere of material production, not all labour functions and kinds of labour may be considered as productive, for instance, accounting does not lead to the production of material wealth. Physical labour, too, cannot in all cases be identified with productive labour (as in the case of the work of a charwoman or yard-keeper).

On the other hand, the types of mental work done mainly (and professionally) by engineers, technicians, agronomists, zoologists and some scientific workers, forming part of the conception of aggregate production personnel, cannot be excluded from the term "productive labour". Some people maintain that these mental workers do not take part in the product output process directly. But it is a well-known fact that, as

production automation makes headway, an ever increasing number of people will be relieved of taking a direct part in operating machines and the level of production will be determined by the development of science and by the degree to which it is applied to technology. Under automated production, the ratio of persons directly servicing machine tools to the number of engineering and technical personnel is 1 to 10.

Analysing the connection of other groups of mental workers with the material production sphere and productive labour, we observe various forms of activity exchange and various degrees of their influence upon material production.

At the present stage of communist construction, development of the production sphere makes new, higher demands upon workers by brain.

The Party calls for a concrete and businesslike approach to development of the national economy, and this task requires that the relevant executives—mental, organisational workers—show high educational, technical and cultural standards and possess deep knowledge of the particulars of a given branch of economy. Engineers, agronomists and other specialists well versed in the relevant production branch are appointed to manage enterprises. The qualitative changes in agricultural work and its rapprochement with industrial labour make new demands on those who manage agricultural production. In 1953, only 18 per cent of collective-farm chairmen had a col-

lege or secondary education, whereas in 1959 this percentage rose to 50.4.

At present, managerial work is undergoing some qualitative changes which require of those who are engaged in such work profound knowledge, polytechnical training, and broad cultural outlook. This becomes particularly evident in connection with the repatterning of the centralised management and Party guidance of the national economy. The work of the relevant category of mental workers acquires a new content and must be turned into operative, creative and organisational activity in the sphere of raising labour productivity and moulding a new type of man.

The polytechnisation of the school introduces qualitative changes into the work of the teacher and requires of him a more profound knowledge of the features and tasks of modern production.

Each and every group of mental workers is confronted by its own, specific task in communist construction. For instance, men of letters and arts are faced with the problem of the all-round aesthetic and ethic education of people, of developing their intellectual level. This is an aspect of the intellectual activity of society which, in contradistinction to the activities of some categories of workers in technical and natural sciences for instance, is not connected with material production and which is not and will never be a direct productive force of society, i. e. productive labour. But that does not mean that this type of intellectual

activity ultimately does not serve the development of society's main productive force—man. Moreover, this does not mean that those who, for the time being, are professionally engaged in art and literature should not develop in the future their capacities both to mental and to creative physical labour.

The process of drawing all able-bodied members of society to productive, creative physical labour is quite a long one.

We may often hear that the process of the rapprochement of physical labour with mental labour is quite clear, but that it is not clear *how mental labour is to be brought close to physical labour*.

A number of socio-economic, political and intellectual prerequisites are essential to turn labour into the primary vital requirement of every person. Among the most important conditions for that there is the qualitative change in the nature of work both in the sphere of material production and in intellectual activity, based on the changes in the former division of labour, on the mechanisation and automation of production processes, of mental and logical operations, etc. The qualitative modification of labour, including mental labour, pursues the principal aim of imparting to it a creative nature.

The principal tendencies of the qualitative changes in the nature of mental labour are mainly determined:

a) by scientific and technical progress

(automation, cybernetics, etc.) which embraces all the spheres of human activity;

b) by the new conditions under which the law of alternation of labour in the sphere of mental activity operates;

c) by the qualitative changes brought about in the nature of physical labour due to one individual combining both physical and intellectual functions in his work;

d) by a certain growth of some groups of mental workers engaged, for the time being, primarily (professionally) in mental labour and by a general growth of the categories of workers by brain;

e) by the increasing extent to which various categories of mental workers take part in the sphere of material production directly.

Activity in a number of spheres of mental labour comes to resemble an operator's work, becomes a specific form of engineering labour, which relieves the workers engaged in this kind of labour of mechanical performance of such simple but tiring operations as accounting, control, planning, designing, etc., makes their work more creative, and sharply raises their productivity of labour.

In the work of engineers and technicians this is directly manifested when use is made of electronic computers, cybernetic and other devices. The use of devices that facilitate mental work in an ever increasing number of spheres of scientific activity—both in the field of natural and social sciences—requires a new system of training

personnel to handle these devices. Of course, we cannot demand that the automation of processes in mental labour develop as fast as in the field of physical labour, for the former involves a number of very special features. Besides, there are some types of mental work of a most complex and creative nature (in the sense that they require the highest degree of human intellectual capacities, as in discoveries, in solving complicated theoretical problems, etc.) which cannot be performed even by the "cleverest" of machines.

Speaking of overcoming the former division of labour with reference to mental activity, we imply, first and foremost, the necessity of organically combining mental and physical labour in the activity of all members of the socialist society and of developing in them the capacities both to physical and mental labour, to active participation in all spheres of social life.

In a developed communist society, all its members will perform the functions of intellectual labour. Further, within the field of mental labour proper, due to existence of different types of it, there are distinctions in the cultural and technical level of work expressed in the degree of mechanisation and automation and in the complexity of these types of labour. And, last but not least, there are professional and functional distinctions between the specific categories of mental workers, which are on the whole determined by the nature and content of the concrete jobs performed

within the specific types of mental activity. Thus, in scientific activity, for instance, we find distinctions between the work of a professor and assistant professor, between that of a senior research worker and a laboratory assistant, etc.

It is clear that neither the cultural and technical nor professional and functional distinctions can die out completely, because under communism, too, such factors as labour specialisation and division and proportional distinctions in combining mental and physical work in the activity of every individual engaged in the intellectual sphere will remain. But these distinctions will exist on a limited scale as all the members of society will become all-round and harmoniously developed individuals and, thus, these distinctions cannot lead to any social inequality. The elimination of the fettering division of labour in the sphere of mental work means that no person engaged in mental work will be one-sidedly developed and capable of one type of labour only, but will possess developed abilities for both intellectual and physical activity. All-round and harmonious development of the individual creates true opportunities for the free choice of profession and occupation to all the members of socialist society.

We consider the law of the alternation of labour, formulated by Marx, to apply to the sphere of mental labour too, but in a form that is specific to it.

The law of labour alternation in the

sphere of physical activity finds its concrete expression in the combination of physical and mental functions in the activity of every individual, in his combining several trades within the scope of a given activity. In the sphere of mental labour, this law also makes the objective demand that every worker should combine in his activity mental and physical functions and be able to perform several adjacent functions.

However, we have already mentioned that the solution of this problem will take considerable time and requires a specific approach with due consideration of a number of conditions and requirements. With reference to the younger generation, the combining of mental work with physical labour is implemented through linking the children's upbringing and schooling with productive labour. Once all school graduates have developed the capacity and need of both physical and mental labour, the alternation and combining of these two kinds of activity will become a natural thing for them. Life itself will prompt the concrete pattern of how this is to be attained and the means to consolidate and develop it. With reference to mental workers of medium and advanced age, the issue of combining mental and physical labour must find a specific solution with due consideration of their physiological capacity to physical work, the degree to which their professional abilities for a certain type of physical labour are developed, the distinctions in the categories of mental workers who

have different connections with material production and, last but not least, the economic efficiency and expediency for society to enlist intellectual workers into physical labour at a given stage of historical development.

It should also be borne in mind that a counter-process—the rise of intellectuals from the ranks of physical workers—is taking place, too. And, finally, it must be borne in mind that the high level of intellectual life in communist society, the growing differentiation of the various types of mental activity and the high level of Soviet people's intellectual requirements will probably demand that some individuals—possessing special talents and relevant inclinations—devote themselves entirely to the arts, sciences, etc. The need of top-level specialists will remain in communist society. Mental labour will become a general feature, while people who due to their natural gifts, abilities and experience are entrusted by society to perform some specific types of intellectual activity will in principle not differ from the other members of communist society.

Let us examine by way of an example the moulding of an all-round and harmoniously developed individual in the sphere of mental labour. The social and professional type of scientist has resulted both from the general conditions of the formation of one or another historical type of individual and from the specific laws and conditions of the development of science (deg-

ree of differentiation and cooperation, level of development, nature of links between science and society, etc.).

Analysing the division of labour in present-day science we observe two basic tendencies: deepening specialisation and growing cooperation. The tendency prevailing most in these two is that of the increasing integration of science, so there appears the demand in integral specialities. The needs of social development are putting problems before science that can be solved only by collective bodies of scientists. However, in the age of the turbulent development of science, specialisation is essential, too, for mastering knowledge on the level of the latest achievements of science: every system of scientific knowledge trains persons for activity within a comparatively narrow scope and embraces a relatively small range of knowledge about nature and society.

Some original though disputable statements have lately been made concerning the division of labour in modern science. In general, some new demands are now being made upon rearing of a new type of scientist. The growing role of science in socialist society and the appearance of new functions and tasks of science in the period of communist construction have had a marked effect on the process of the formation of a new type of scientist and of both his general and specific features and characteristics.

Indissoluble unity of scientific activity and communist construction practice is an

essential and initial condition for the development of a new type of scientist. Narrowness of mental interests and intellectual activity is overcome in various ways, such as through the active participation of all scientists in all spheres of public and state activity and their sharing the cultural wealth of society.

Here is how this could be done in practice. A desire and capacity to master the achievements of natural and technical sciences are moulded in scientists dealing with social sciences and, vice versa, natural scientists are encouraged to study the achievements in social sciences. Scientists in all fields of science will make a deep study of Marxist-Leninist theory to make it the core of their convictions. Scientists will be encouraged to make a deeper study of the achievements of sciences in spheres related to theirs. A profound understanding of the arts will be gradually cultivated in them.

A new man—combining cultural wealth, moral purity and physical perfection—is being moulded in the course of communist construction

Intellectual Wealth of the Individual

The issue of the intellectual wealth of the individual and the pattern and features that characterise the formation and development of intellectual wealth in the process of communist construction is undoubtedly of considerable theoretical and practical interest.

It is impossible to speak of the specific laws that govern the development of the intellectual wealth of the individual disregarding the general conditions and laws that govern the entire process of the all-round and harmonious development of the individual. To solve the problem correctly, it is important to see the relationship between intellectual development of the individual and that of society. Such are some of the methodological principles underlying the approach to the issue. Those who deal with it resort to a wide range of terms and conceptions: intellectual wealth, spiritual wealth, man's inner intellectual world, man's intellectual life, intellectual development of man, spiritual culture, intellectual level of the individual's spiritual life, spiritual values, spiritual features and

properties, man's inner and outward culture, etc. In our opinion, each of these terms characterises the individual and his development in one or another aspect.

The founders of Marxism-Leninism often used the term "intellectual wealth of the individual" which they understood, first and foremost, as the unfolding and development of all man's mental faculties and capacity for various kinds of social activity: in the production, socio-political, scientific, artistic and other spheres. The term also includes the reflection by, and the accumulation of, society's intellectual wealth and, first of all, its achievements in the field of public education, science, art, philosophy, etc. They understood the intellectual wealth of the individual to be not merely the mastering of the achievements of spiritual wealth expressed chiefly in literacy and education levels, but also the rich inner world of man, which manifests itself in a person's deeds and actions, in his outward culture.

Before we treat the relationship of "the intellectual wealth of the individual" to "the spiritual wealth of the individual", let us outline the content of several other relevant conceptions often used as synonyms.

Man's intellectual life is an exceptionally broad conception which includes the formation of all ideas, sentiments and concepts and their spreading and assimilation, and the creation of all spiritual values, in contradistinction from material life which

stands for the production of material values. That is why an individual's intellectual wealth presents the quintessence, as it were, of the development of the intellectual life of society and of the individual.

The term "intellectual forces" is used to designate man's capacities to intellectual activity in contradistinction to his physical faculties and abilities. The term "intellectual qualities and properties of the individual" indicates man's possession of many qualities and properties, main and secondary ones, "valuable" and less "valuable", stable and unstable which add up to characterise the individual's mental make-up. When characterising the degree to which an individual's intellectual wealth is developed, the extent to which the individual has "assimilated" spiritual values ought to be taken into consideration. One cannot speak of the individual's intellectual wealth without linking it with his inner and outward culture which are manifestations of man's intellectual world.

The intellectual development of the individual not only presupposes the moulding of the qualities and properties that actually characterise the intellectual wealth of the individual, which we dealt with above, but also applies to the formation of lofty moral qualities and moral purity of the individual.

Intellectual development of the individual necessarily implies the moulding of a new moral consciousness which must find its practical expression in the deeds, actions

and relations of people. The moulding of a scientific world outlook, communist ideology, high political and new aesthetic consciousness, extensive polytechnical and general humanitarian education and other elements that make up the intellectual wealth of the individual are closely interconnected and, if these close ties are not taken into account, one will be able to understand neither the process of the all-round and harmonious development of the individual nor the process of the formation of his intellectual wealth.

In the narrow sense of the word, the "intellectual wealth of the individual" is nothing but the unity of his scientific world outlook, ideology, extensive polytechnical education, high level of inner and outward culture, and advanced aesthetic views. The Party Programme, parallel with stating the basic features of the new individual, singles out moral purity as an independent feature. In our opinion, this serves to stress the particular importance of morals, of moral principles in the regulation of communist social relations and in the behaviour of people.

In the end, moral development of the individual is the manifestation of his intellectual development, while moral consciousness develops in close unity with other forms of social consciousness. In the broad sense of the word, moral values are a form, kind and manifestation of spiritual values in general, and their formation is the for-

mation of the individual's intellectual wealth in the broad sense.

In the works of the founders of Marxism we find indications on how to understand the intellectual wealth of the individual, both in the broad and in the narrow sense. They elaborated in principle the problems involving the basic features of an all-round and harmoniously developed individual, the essence of these features and qualities and their inter-relationship, and the principal ways and means of moulding a new man. Of course, they did not pursue the aim of giving a concrete exposition of all the features and characteristics of the individual's intellectual wealth, moral purity and physical perfection, for they had no concrete historical material for doing so, but they advanced the basic ideas and principles underlying such further elaboration.

As early as in his *Economic and Philosophic Manuscripts of 1844* Marx treated the problem of the historical inevitability of the appearance in the future communist society of a new integral individual. This society "produces man in this entire richness of his being—produces the rich man profoundly endowed with all senses—as its enduring reality"* , he wrote and stressed that for the all-round development of the individual it was essential to guarantee his mental and physical training and give him a polytechnical education which would ac-

*K. Marx, *Economic and Philosophical Manuscripts of 1844*, Moscow, 1959, p. 109.

quaint him with the basic principles of all production processes and train him to handle elementary tools. At the same time, Marx regarded the versatility of the individual and his qualities, depending on the many-sidedness of social life. Mental wealth, moral purity and physical perfection as qualities were examined by Marx and Engels with reference to the individual who must present simultaneously a new type of worker, consumer and public figure (citizen), and highly moral and cultured individual.

They considered development of this individual's capacity both for physical and for mental labour, development on this basis of his abilities to activity in other spheres of social life, development and enrichment of man's inner world through his assimilating the achievements of human culture, development of all senses, the rise of his intellectual level and high development of all mental faculties to be the basic content of the intellectual wealth of the individual.

Marx's well-known statement that "the real intellectual wealth of the individual depends entirely on the wealth of his real connections" * is the key to understanding the laws that govern all-round development of the individual, including his intellectual development.

Here he shows that, first of all, the individual's intellectual wealth depends on the

* K. Marx, F. Engels. *The German Ideology*, Moscow, 1964, p. 49.

development of economic life which determines all social relations and processes, and, secondly, points to the important role which social, political and intellectual life plays in moulding the individual's whole intellectual structure and its components.

The founders of Marxism indicated that it was in community only that man obtained all the means essential for his all-round intellectual, moral and physical development, that in community alone there could be "individual freedom", without which there could be no development of a new type of individual. Marx pointed out that there were not only the five senses, but also "the so-called mental senses—the practical senses (will, love, etc.)"*—the full and versatile development of which characterises the wealth of the human being.

Historical development of society and of the individual permits us to draw the conclusion that the content and scope of the conception "intellectual wealth of the individual" do not remain constant for all epochs. They undergo changes and differ in various formations both from the viewpoint of some or other elements and of the development and nature of their relationships.

The intellectual wealth of the individual must not be regarded as something lifeless and inert, simply as the result of the individual's having acquired a given scope

* K. Marx. *Economic and Philosophical Manuscripts of 1844*, Moscow, 1959, p. 108.

of knowledge and cultural and spiritual values.

In the first place, it is only in activity and, first and foremost, in participation in socially useful labour and in other activities that intellectual development of the individual can take place. Moreover, successful and effective development of his intellectual wealth depends, to a great extent, on the individual's activity, on the purposefulness of his activity, and on an understanding of the social value of his intellectual development. And, vice versa, the absence in the individual at the given moment of a desire for intellectual development presents a certain obstruction to this development.

Secondly, the individual's intellectual wealth develops under socialism in a continuous struggle between the new and the old, for overcoming the discrepancies and disproportions that arise, for harmonious development and conformity between content and form in intellectual wealth.

Thirdly, the intellectual wealth of the individual manifests itself in the interaction of the elements of the individual's intellectual structure. The scientific world outlook and moral substance form the ideological core of the individual's intellectual wealth, and it is on the degree to which they have "materialised" in man's consciousness and behaviour that the entire content of the individual's intellectual wealth depends. This means a gradual rise in everyday consciousness of people to a sci-

entifically materialistic level, the overcoming of survivals in consciousness and morals, including religious survivals, education of the entire population in the spirit of scientific communism, and the moulding of ideological principles in every person.

All the other elements of the individual's intellectual wealth form under a certain influence of a scientific world outlook and ideology which are themselves influenced and moulded, to a considerable measure, by the former. Moreover, the formation of each of the elements of the individual's intellectual wealth must, in the end, foster a scientific world outlook. The Party Programme points out that the whole public education system must not only guarantee extensive intellectual development and training of abilities for various activities, but must promote the moulding of an integral and harmonious materialistic world outlook and moral, aesthetic and physical development of the individual. Shortcomings and contradictions in development of some particular elements of the individual's intellectual wealth interfere with its overall development, while the settling of these contradictions does not always proceed quite painlessly.

Drawing on an analysis and generalisation of factual material we may outline some regularities and peculiarities of the growth of the individual's intellectual wealth in the period of all-out communist construction. In the end, these regularities are determined by the general laws that

govern the gradual transition from socialism to communism. In so far as development of the individual under socialism and during the transition to communism proceeds on the basis of common economic, social, political, ideological and cultural conditions and prerequisites, intellectual development, too, is governed by general laws.

But there is a difference due to the fact that, while in the period of socialist construction intellectual wealth developed on a foundation that had been inherited from foregoing epochs, in the period of communist construction the moulding and development of the individual's moral make-up proceeds on the socialist economic, political and moral foundation and on the basis of an already formed intellectual structure of the individual. That is why here the individual develops both towards further perfection and enrichment of some elements and towards gradual disappearance of a number of others, i. e. towards a change in the relationship of elements.

The active participation of every able-bodied member of society in social labour is a general and essential condition for a harmonious development of the individual, including his intellectual development. It is the Alpha and Omega of the entire education of a new man. We shall be able to consider a person to be intellectually rich in the full sense of the word if he is not only educated and cultured, but if an inner need to work voluntarily and according to his capacities is developed in him.

The individual's intellectual development in the period of all-out communist construction is distinguished for its fast tempo. The complete upbuilding of communism will mean the completion of the moulding of an all-round and harmoniously developed personality in all its aspects and with all its specific features.

The purposeful and conscious nature of the process of the formation of the individual's and society's intellectual wealth is due, first and foremost, to the fact that it is directed by the activity of the Party and the people's state. Drawing on the knowledge of the laws of social development and on the profound analysis of objective tendencies in development of intellectual life and social consciousness, the Party has mapped in its new Programme the main ways, means and methods for promoting development of this intellectual wealth. This makes the process purposeful and promotes its self-acceleration.

The process has acquired the new features of being monolithic and of showing a more or less simultaneous growth and development of all the elements of intellectual wealth both of society and of the individual. However, some elements may develop slower or faster than the entire structure. In intellectual development of some people we often come across certain contradictions between high political consciousness and negative features in their moral behaviour or low educational and cultural development and narrow intellectual outlook. We

come across some highly educated persons who show no concern whatsoever for other aspects of intellectual life and reveal a Philistine mentality in their everyday life.

In the evolution of the individual's intellectual wealth, its psychological structure and objective content gradually come in concord. For instance, discrepancies are eliminated between one's words and deeds, between the knowledge of rules and standards of behaviour and their implementation, between the acquisition of knowledge and spiritual values and their application to practical deeds and human relations.

There is a tendency towards harmonious intellectual development of society and the individual, though an individual is, of course, practically unable to assimilate all the intellectual wealth of society. The attainment of a harmonious unity between the interests of the individual and those of society will serve as a mighty source of the growth of its intellectual wealth.

The qualitative changes in the structure of the intellectual wealth of individuals in the various strata and categories of the population of the USSR are illustrated by investigations of how they spend their spare time. The investigations show that most of this time is spent to raise people's general and technical-educational, as well as cultural level, to develop high artistic taste, i. e. for all-round and harmonious development of the individual. Working people have started giving much time to active participation in public and political life, to

physical culture and sports, as well as to science and creative technical activities.

Development of the intellectual wealth of the individual in the period of all-out communist construction is characterised by the steady growth of the per capita quantity of spiritual values, due to the creation of a new material basis for development of the intellectual life of society. A fifth of the world's books and magazines are published in the USSR. There are over fifty times more libraries in the USSR than in the USA. Every third person in the Soviet Union is a reader at a public library. In pre-revolutionary Russia there was one library-book per every three or four inhabitants, whereas now there are seven to eight books per capita.

The network of scientific, scientific-and-technical and enlightenment societies, organisations of inventors, etc. is constantly growing.

The fostering of the freedom of the individual and of the rights of Soviet citizens is a most important factor in building up the intellectual wealth of the individual.

However, harmonious development, including intellectual development, of all the members of society does not mean that each and every of its members will contribute an equal share to the common cause of creating the intellectual wealth of society, although the capacity and need for both mental and physical work will be developed in all people and each and every one will contribute his share in accordance with

his abilities.

The high level of intellectual life in the communist society, the extensive differentiation of various aspects of mental activity (parallel with the tendency to cooperation) and the high level of intellectual demands of people in the communist society will probably require that some persons—particularly gifted and having corresponding inclinations—engage especially in science, the arts, etc. But, as the specific distinctions between mental and physical workers disappear, there will be an intensive growth of non-professional intellectuals, so that under complete communism the intelligentsia, as a specific social stratum will gradually disappear.

Harmonious and all-round development of the intellectual wealth of all people does not mean the levelling of talents, individual inclinations and intellectual needs, nor does it imply the moulding of “standard people”, as bourgeois ideologists claim it to be.

The communist society is the thriftiest of all societies, especially with regard to the individual and its wealth. That is why we are now faced with the task of making the most adequate use of society's and the individual's intellectual wealth, of employing in the most efficient way every person and his abilities where they are bound to be of greatest use both to society and to himself.

With further progress towards communism, the individual will in an ever increas-

ing measure accumulate both the concrete historical and the general wealth of mankind's intellectual culture, the high ideological content and humanism of the new society. Under socialism, the class and ideological aspect in the intellectual wealth of society and of the individual plays a predominating role, whereas with the completion of communist construction, with the elimination of classes and class distinctions and with the triumph of socialism on our planet, the class content of intellectual wealth will disappear to be replaced by a content that is common to all mankind which will result in some structural changes, too.

Another specific feature of the evolution of the individual's intellectual wealth is that it is attended by a process under which all the nationalities of the USSR attain a community of intellectual interests and requirements and acquire common features in their intellectual make-up. The treasurehouse of each nationality's culture is steadily enriched by the achievements of all the other nationalities of the USSR and of the world. In this connection, improvements in the instruction and study of foreign languages acquire immense importance for intellectual development of the individual.

Concluding the examination of the basic issues of development of the individual's intellectual wealth we must again stress the organic connection and interdependence of all aspects, qualities and features of an integral individual.

The Arts and All-Round Development of the Individual

Humanists throughout the ages dreamed of all-round and harmonious development of the individual. The ideal of perfect man—integral, harmonious, universally developed and standing on the highest level of the physical and intellectual culture of his time—was repeatedly advanced in the art of the past—in antiquity, Renaissance and in many other periods of humanity's progress. But the more the laws of antagonistic society, which maimed the human personality and killed all beauty, triumphed in life, the more Utopian did this ideal prove to be and, when the age of developed capitalism set in, all real grounds for this ideal disappeared altogether. It is only with the establishment of communism that this ideal can be made realisable again. Moreover, its realisation becomes a social necessity.

What content do we put into the conception of all-round development of the individual? Does it mean that each and every person will actually combine all the wealth of physical and intellectual culture evolved in the history of mankind's development.

that every person will be capable of accumulating in his brain all sciences and arts and be able to engage in any form of activity? The idea of an individual being able to combine all the wealth of forms of labour division and cultural values belonging to society and mankind on the whole is, of course, a pure Utopia. The point is not that every man and woman will become universally developed in the full sense of the word.

The issue of all-round development of the individual implies, first and foremost, free and unhampered development of all socially valuable qualities, faculties and gifts with which every person is endowed, the elimination of one-sided narrow professionalism which maims the personality, the accessibility in principle of all society's material and intellectual wealth to each and every person. The person of all-round development is many-sided, not in the sense that he knows and can do every possible thing, but in the sense that his functions are essential components of the all-sided activity of society, that he performs them fully aware of his attitude towards them, and that his activity is continued and supplemented by that of other people.

The conception of all-round development is opposed to that of one-sided, narrow-minded and limited development, regardless of its forms. All one-sidedness in man is abnormal, especially if it is brought to the extreme.

Take, for instance, the problem of the unity of physical and mental development.

It has always played an important part in the ideals of human beauty. But its attainment was extremely rare.

It is evident that physical development divorced from intellectual development reduces man to animal. Hard labour, as a rule, ruins man not only morally, but physically as well. And even when man overcomes its arduousness and becomes a physically developed athlete, but shows primitive mental outlook, poverty of ideas and animal senses, there is nothing of the beauty of an individual in him.

On the other hand, intellectual development divorced from physical development creates no real beauty either.

The ancient Latin motto, "Sound mind in a sound body," has come down to us through the ages. Art repeatedly turned to the ideal of man standing on the highest level of physical and intellectual culture of his time. In real life, however, such harmony was an exception rather than the rule, for physical and intellectual work in a class society are qualitatively opposed to each other and give rise to one-sided development of the people that are engaged in it.

Many outstanding thinkers of the past (in the epoch of Renaissance, the Utopian socialists, romanticists and others), who advanced the ideal of all-round development of the individual, considered that it could be attained by enlightenment methods: through propaganda and persuasion, through education and art. These thinkers were making a noble error of supposing

that it was sufficient to disclose the truth to people, and they would follow it immediately.

Marxism does not share this Utopian idea. All-round development of every individual can be brought about by a socialist revolution, by the upbuilding of socialism and communism, by the creation of an abundance of material wealth, and by the remoulding of human consciousness. New man is moulded in the very process of real social progress, and this is taking place already, when there are not yet the conditions for attaining the communist ideal, but when all the main prerequisites have been created.

Art plays an immense role in this process. Aesthetic education is an essential component of all-round development of the individual. A person of all-round development is not only one who has a broad general education and a scientific world outlook, who possesses an aptitude for labour and adheres to principles of communist ethics, who is distinguished for the unity of his physical and intellectual development and has overcome the one-sided influence of a narrow profession, but is the person who is aesthetically and artistically developed as well. Man's very nature is endowed with the capacity to artistic creative endeavour. Lenin once pointed out that capitalism stifled, suppressed and ruined a great mass of talents among workers and toiling peasants; that these talents perished in conditions of exploitation, poverty, and outrage upon human dignity.

Aesthetic education as a means for all-round development of the individual is a complex and versatile conception.

Aesthetic education implies, first of all, inculcation in people of the capacity to appreciate and enjoy works of art. This is a very important aspect of the matter, though only one of many.

Art in the USSR belongs to the people and, in this respect, is accessible to them. But complex works of art require certain habits, some training and a certain level of aesthetic development to be appreciated. A gap between the summits of artistic culture and the level of aesthetic development of the masses is a characteristic feature of an antagonistic class society. Under socialism this gap has been bridged in the main. But in order to make any, even the most complex works of art understandable, it is essential that the level of the mass audience's aesthetic culture be steadily raised. The popularisation of art plays a great role in this process, and this popularisation is one of the aims of aesthetic education. The more a person comes in contact with art, the better he appreciates it (all other conditions being equal) and the more delight he gets out of it.

The process of bringing art closer to the people has been developing since the first years of Soviet power along two lines: art was brought closer to the people, and the people closer to art.

Artistic development of man is a long

and difficult process requiring a great deal of work and mental effort. But it justifies these efforts a hundredfold, for it opens before man inexhaustible intellectual wealth and makes it his property.

This contradiction will disappear in the future when all people attain a high aesthetic development. But now, due to the historically shaped conditions not everything in art unfolds to any person (perception, appreciation and the ability to enjoy it are meant), although in principle it is accessible to every person. All the essential social conditions for it have been created, and the only thing now is that every person has the individual, subjective prerequisites for assimilating all the artistic riches available. These prerequisites lie in intellectual culture, education, aesthetic training, and artistic development.

It is not every person who can readily understand Goethe's *Faust*, the Ninth Symphony of Beethoven or Rembrandt's masterpieces. But aesthetic education creates the basic possibility for each and every person to understand them.

The complex elements in art require profound understanding and are inaccessible to superficial observers. Development of a deep understanding of art in the people and thus of a high artistic level in every individual is among the main targets of aesthetic education.

Further, aesthetic education also implies the cultivation of initial artistic skills in people, of their creative faculties in the

field of art. Lenin used to say that art must develop artists in people. Development of every person's creative faculties is of great importance for raising the general artistic culture of the people. Those who make a try at art themselves have an altogether different attitude and approach to it than the person that had never gone in for art. A person who is not professionally engaged in fine arts, but who draws or paints, will have perception differing from that of a person who had never held a brush in his hand. The former will show a more active, more interested and sharper attitude towards art. He will find more expression in the combinations of colours. Being versed in painting techniques, he will perceive the composition of a painting fuller and in greater detail. It may be said that the more a person can do in art himself, the deeper and fuller he appreciates art, all other conditions being equal.

Amateur art activities have acquired a truly immense scope in the USSR. Under communism, every person will be an artist to some extent or other. This does not mean that professionalism in art will disappear, that there will be no people for whom art is the essence of their life, requiring all their efforts and abilities.

Amateur art, apart from being a most important tool for artistic education of people, serves as the reserve and source of professional art. It is through amateur art activities that many people find their own

artistic self and become professional masters of art.

Consequently, under communism the marked distinction between professional and non-professional art will fade into the background. That does not mean, of course, that art will not survive as a special sphere of human activity, that there will be no distinctions among people as to the degree of their artistic gifts, that there will be no particularly talented individuals devoting themselves wholly to art, and that these highly gifted people and their art will cease playing a leading role in development of the arts in general.

Apart from developing the skill of understanding and creating works of art, aesthetic education also includes the cultivation of aesthetic taste. Taste—the ability of perceiving and appreciating aesthetic values—is directly connected with the individual's world outlook and personality. To cultivate taste means to exert a marked influence both on the personality and on the world outlook of the individual. It follows that the problem of taste is closely connected with that of all-round development of the individual.

Tastes may be diversified and one-sided, developed or undeveloped, fine or coarse, good or poor. As a rule, the higher a person's aesthetic standard, the better and finer his taste. But since taste is not a quantitative phenomenon, but a qualitative one, it does not always correspond to aesthetic level. A person may not be very well versed

in art, but possess good taste, preferring even in the simplest cases real beauty to substitutes for it, admire genuine artistic values but not outer attractiveness. And vice versa, a person may be a professional, but possess a trite, poor taste and be fond of cheap tinsel instead of true art.

Thus, it is the cultivation of good taste and development of the ability to understand and appreciate real beauty that is an important aim of aesthetic education.

Developing an understanding of art and artistic abilities and taste are important components of aesthetic education. But they are not the most important ones. The most important factor in aesthetic education is to foster through art the entire sum total of man's creative capacities and powers and to promote all-round development of his mentality and personality. It is art that exerts this effect on the individual, moulding and developing him in all respects and affecting his intellectual world on the whole. It develops his eye and ear, fosters and directs his emotions, excites his imagination, stimulates his brain work, cultivates moral principles, extends his mental outlook, consolidates his ideological views, and inspires him with ideals.

Art exerts an immense influence on man's thought. And the significance of art is directly proportional to its ideological wealth, to the part it plays in understanding life and moulding world outlook. However, art never takes the straight way

to the summits of thought. It rises towards them through the awakening and creative work of all the aspects of the human mind, through the response of all the chords of the soul. An idea in art is founded on the versatile manifestation of man's creative abilities and powers in art. It becomes artistically convincing when it is backed by strong and profound emotions, rich imagination, and a precise and observing eye.

Affecting man's emotions, art deepens and directs them. It prompts the correct emotional reactions to things, events and deeds. It helps to love that which deserves love and to hate all that humbles man and drags him backwards. It moulds his sympathies and antipathies. And all that is important to man not only for his artistic activity and for understanding art, but is essential, first and foremost, for life itself, for any of its spheres. In this sense, art not only fosters man's artistic abilities, but develops his general faculties as well.

A rich emotional life is an exceptionally valuable quality for the individual. The absence of emotional "wings" and incapacity for sincere passions are bound to handicap creative endeavour and to become a stumbling-block to understanding the new and to progress to the future—to the unknown.

Lenin used to say that there had never been any quests for truth without human emotions. We may add that neither had there been any fruitful work, inspired social activity and pithy private life without

human emotions. And this universal, always essential human capacity to emotional perception is developed and cultivated to a considerable extent by art, because it is an inherent property of the latter.

Stressing the importance of emotions in man's creative activity in general and speaking of emotional wealth as of a manifestation of the freedom and beauty of the individual, we must not set off emotions against thought, of course. Both one-sided rationalism and spontaneous emotionality are poor qualities. The latter, being divorced from reason, may carry away a person along the wrong path, to erroneous deeds. Nor is it helpful in artistic work, for it is incompatible with the true profundity of art. Art breeds clear harmony in man's intellectual world and sensible emotions, but not a chaos of emotions and unaccountable sensations. It teaches man to interpret his feelings and control them. It takes advantage of emotions to give a deeper comprehension of life and to cultivate an effective and creative approach to life.

Art exerts an equally great influence upon man's fantasy, upon the moulding of his imagination. Imagination is an inherent feature of art, too. Neither the creation of a genuine work of art nor any creative endeavour and new art are possible without fancy and imagination.

Being organically bound with imagination, art conveys it to the audience. This is of immense importance, indeed. First of

all, development of the audience's imagination is connected with the growth of their artistic culture and helps them to understand art. The wealth of artistic perception is directly proportional to development of imagination. Imagination is also the way to realising the ideological essence of a work of art, for it is imagination that participates in "translating" visual perception into feelings and thoughts.

Man needs a developed imagination in any field of creative endeavour and in life generally. A person without imagination is a very narrow-minded person. Imagination is of universal human value being a component of any creative activity and of a creative attitude to life, no matter in what it manifests itself. Lenin used to say that imagination was a quality of immense value. And this quality is developed by creative art. A work of art which does not evoke a variety of associations when perceived is artistically inferior.

Art acts upon man's mind, feelings and imagination because it always expresses and conveys thoughts, emotions and images. They are confined in its very content. But this content is inseparable from the sensual sphere, from the vivid perception of concrete phenomena of reality.

That is why art, as it turns to thoughts, emotions and imagination, develops the sphere of sensual perception at the same time. It combines, as it were, sensation, perception and notion with emotion and thought and thus makes thought visual,

emotion concrete, and contemplation intelligent and emotionally pithy.

That is why an aesthetically developed person is distinguished from one who is aesthetically undeveloped, by the former having much more subtle, "clever" and "observant" senses. His eye detects in things much more that is important and characteristic than does the eye of an aesthetically undeveloped person. A musician's ear perceives in the sounds of life and in the intonations of human speech many more shades and subtleties than does the "ordinary" ear of the uninitiated person.

The same applies to vision, the culture of which—its sharpness, keenness and power of observation—is a historically developing phenomenon depending, all other conditions being equal, on the level of the individual's general and aesthetic development. That is why painting plays such an important part among the arts in all-round development of the individual. Being an art of vision, painting develops the eye in the proper meaning of the word, i. e. makes it an observant and "intelligent" eye capable of noting all that is characteristic and important in life, capable of seeing in the "painted" image of life's phenomena (in shape, colour, spatial relationships, etc.) their true essence. Art develops both the man's brains, emotions, imagination and perception; it forms an eye that "feels the beauty of forms" (Marx). It teaches not only to look at the world, but to see the aesthetic significance and inner sense of

its phenomena. By developing the individual's sensual faculties it elevates them to the highest level of culture of his time. Man needs a sharp and keen eye, power of observation and feeling of shape, just as emotions, imagination and thought, not in art alone, but in any creative activity, in all spheres of life. So we see again that aesthetic education through art develops not only the artistic abilities proper, but the universal human faculties essential in all kinds of activity.

Art moulds the character, will and world outlook of the individual. Embracing man's entire intellectual world art patterns it on the whole according to the ideal which it conveys.

All-round development of the individual with the aid of art is a complex process. It would be wrong to represent it as just the training of man's various faculties and psychic qualities through art. All-round development is not only a "play" of the psychic powers of man. The aesthetic ideal of society is disclosed, established and assimilated by the individual in this training and "play". All-round development of the individual thus acquires an important content connected with the fact that the aesthetic ideal of society becomes the individual's own ideal and, thus, the cause of society becomes his personal cause, too. So, art not only promotes development of mental faculties per se; this development enriches the individual with the ideological and spiritual essence of life of the given epoch.

Thus, aesthetic education is called upon to develop through art the universal human faculties important not only for creative work, but for all spheres of activity, for life, for communist construction. Moreover, art develops in man not only some one human faculty, but the sum total of these faculties. It develops in every possible way the human personality, fosters the individual's creative powers, intensifies and stimulates his activity in life in the direction that is essential to development of society. That is why aesthetic education plays such an important part in attaining the targets set by the Party; that is why it is not a luxury but a necessity in the building of communism.

Morals of Man of Communist Society

Moral Qualities of the Individual

Moral convictions, feelings and habits manifested in the individual's behaviour and the organic need of acting in conformity with the principles of the moral code are the moral qualities of Soviet man. Following the principles of this code he asserts himself as a person of high morals, which is extremely important for all-round development of man. Marx pointed out that if a person worked only for himself he might, perhaps, become a famous scientist, great sage or excellent poet, but he would never be able to become a truly perfect and great man.

The moral code of the builder of communism differs from the moral codes of the past in that it regards as extremely important man's behaviour in his relations with the community, with society. Guided by such standards of behaviour, he constitutes a person of high morals.

What features characterise a person of high morals in communist society?

The harmony between interests of society and personal interests in one's behaviour is the most important feature of this

individual. This harmony determines all his designs and feelings, desires and aspirations.

In the USSR community spirit and co-ordination of public and personal interests are characteristic not only of some outstanding personalities, but, on the whole, of the broad masses of the people. This is the factor underlying the firm conviction that the new system gives rise to lofty moral qualities. If this factor were limited to some individual cases of heroism and valour, that would not be enough to prove the correctness of this assertion, for there were examples of heroism and selfless service to public interests in all historical times. The point is that here we are speaking not so much of the feats of valour of some particular individuals, but rather of the exploits of a whole people rallied into social, political and intellectual unity. Our people, overcoming numerous difficulties and privations, were first to pave the way to the triumph of a just system on earth, a way which all the peoples of the world will follow.

The human race will never forget the Soviet people's heroic exploit in World War II, which saved mankind from the menace of fascist enslavement and civilisation from destruction.

The Soviet people manifested true heroism when it brought over 40 million hectares of virgin and long-fallow lands under cultivation. Hundreds of thousands of Soviet patriots responded to the Com-

munist Party's call to go to the steppes of Kazakhstan and Siberia.

Service to the interests of society, the unity and co-ordination of one's own interests with those of the people, as the main moral principle of new man, manifest themselves in conscientious attitude towards labour. True, the moral content of attitudes towards labour will be fully revealed only with the advent of communist labour, i. e. when the latter turns into unpaid work for society. But even at the very dawn of socialism, when devastation and hunger reigned in our war-ravaged country, workers showed a deeply conscientious attitude to labour when they organised communist *subbotniks* (voluntary work on off-days without remuneration). The revolution in people's attitude to labour manifested itself initially in these *subbotniks*.

A creative approach to their work is another feature that characterises Soviet people's attitude to labour. It has found its expression, for instance, in the innovators' and inventors' movement in the USSR.

In the creative approach to labour, moral stimuli parallel with material incentive, are indisputably the motive force behind the questing and investigating nature of and enthusiasm for the very process of creative endeavour.

Concern for the common weal and harmony of personal and public interests in man's behaviour bring out such moral qualities as collectivism, humanism, sense of

community and personal responsibility for all that takes place in his community and society, as well as many other moral qualities. Let us examine some of them, so as to form a fuller idea of the person of high morals in the new society.

A person's attitude to public interests necessarily moulds the corresponding relations among people. Collectivism and humanism become the most important norms of behaviour and moral qualities of the builder of communism.

Collectivism manifests itself in mutual assistance, mutual respect and support on the part of the members of society. It stands for the sense of the individual's solidarity with the community and for the need of acting in conformity with the latter's interests. It is essentially expressed in the formula: "All for one, and one for all." This implies that this moral principle presupposes that every individual is concerned about the community, and the community is concerned about each and all of its members. It is expressed in a number of reciprocal requirements, duties and, first and foremost, in mutual responsibility. Where the individual does not care about his community and the community is indifferent to the individual there is no collectivism. These are two factors that are always interconnected and which promote each other. An individual who feels his community's concern and attention cannot help getting accustomed to it, acting in its interests, and cannot picture himself liv-

ing outside it. Thus, acting side by side with his comrades as a member of the community and dealing with problems that are his and, at the same time, the others', the individual experiences moral satisfaction. That is why collectivism, as a moral factor, fully coincides with the interest of the individual, becomes his integral feature and moral quality.

Stressing the idea that the principle of collectivism has established itself in Soviet society, it must be borne in mind, of course, that there are deeply rooted survivals of the past, including those of individualism, in the minds and behaviour of a certain part of the population. Individualism takes such forms as egotism, self-interest, conceit, self-importance, hooliganism, and many others. We may say that most of the survivals of the past in the field of morals are more or less connected with individualism.

Lenin warned that individualism could not be got rid of immediately, that it was essential to fight it untiringly, and to launch ever new and new crusades against it. The point is that individualism had been fostered in people's minds in the course of the centuries of the domination of private-property relations. It permeated their entire life and consciousness and consolidated itself in a whole system of traditions and customs.

The establishment of collectivism necessarily breeds mutual respect among peo-

ple, humanism. The rule "Man is man's friend, comrade and brother," becomes a norm of their behaviour.

Socialist humanism—a most important principle of the moral code of the builder of communism—expresses a profound respect for human dignity, faith in man and high demand on man, as well as the hatred for all forms of oppression and humiliation of man. Relations among people acquire a truly humane nature. Take, for instance, such aspect of humanism as profound faith in man. This elevates the individual and rouses in him a sense of self-respect, mutual respect and trust. Mutual trust and respect create a friendly atmosphere of life and work in every Soviet community.

Socialist humanism as a moral principle presupposes necessarily a high demand on the individual. A. S. Makarenko, the outstanding Soviet educator, pointed out that the measure of respect for the individual was at the same time a measure of the high standards to be exacted. "This linking of high demands on the individual and respect for him are not two isolated factors, but one and the same thing," he wrote. "And the demands which we make upon the individual express our respect for his powers and faculties, while this respect of ours makes at the same time a high demand upon the individual, too. It is a respect not for some outward thing, something that is beyond society, pleasant and attractive. It is a respect for the comrades who share our

common work, a respect for the active individual.” *

Socialist humanism among people asserts itself through struggle against an indifferent attitude towards man. Lenin considered indifference to be a grave moral crime against humanity. This evil has to be fought by the state, public opinion and all Soviet people constantly. And the more insistently and resolutely this struggle is waged, the quicker will humanism become a moral quality of every member of society.

Under socialism, moral qualities which had never been broadly cultivated in the past, are moulded. This applies, first and foremost, to the sense of personal responsibility for all that takes place in society. This new feature of the moral make-up of Soviet people has been very aptly expressed by Hero of Socialist Labour V. V. Yermilov, a fitter at the Krasny Proletari Plant in Moscow: “I am not just a worker, I am a Soviet worker. The satisfaction one gets out of honest, well-paid creative labour is not enough for me. I want more than that: to help the development of the finest of all societies, to live for people and for their benefit.”

It is this desire “to live for people and for their benefit” that is precisely the sentiment which is borne of the sense of community which inspires Soviet people to take

* A. S. Makarenko. *Works*, Moscow, 1958, Vol. 5, pp. 148-149, Russ. Ed.

an active part in the life of society, as well as of the man's high personal responsibility for the behaviour of his comrades, for the activities of his community, and for the destinies of his country.

Moreover, the individual in socialist society considers himself responsible for the future of the entire human race. Soviet people—brought up upon the ideas of proletarian internationalism, friendship of peoples and revolutionary humanism—are far from being indifferent to the destinies of mankind, when there still exists the danger of a new world war, and to the destinies of nations which are under the imperialist yoke.

Loyalty to the communist cause is a quality which cements the moral make-up of Soviet man. This quality stands, as it were, for all his most important moral qualities and gives an integral idea of the moral individual of the new society. This is borne out, for instance, by the behaviour of Soviet youth, by their sentiments and aspirations.

In 1961 the Public Opinion Institute of the *Komsomolskaya Pravda* newspaper circulated a questionnaire entitled, "What do you think of your generation?" Some 17,500 young boys and girls, living in all parts of the Soviet Union and representing all social groups and occupations, sent in their answers. They were people who held to different views on life and had different characters. That meant that the data obtained permitted objective judgment of

the interests, sentiments and ideals of Soviet youth.

Most of the answers showed that serving their people and their country was the main aspiration of the Soviet younger generation. Being inspired by a common ideal—communism—the young people follow numerous ways to make it come true. And they are sure of attaining it, sure of their future.

The inquiry, further, brought out the most vivid moral features inherent in our younger generation. Parallel with patriotism, these proved to be such moral qualities as will-power, steadfastness, courage, honesty and comradeship.

More than 50 per cent of all those who answered the questionnaire considered high ideological principles, loyalty to the communist cause, the striving to overcome difficulties for the sake of common interests, activity and enthusiasm to be the paramount features of Soviet youth.

Apart from these qualities which the young people consider to be the most important ones, they named such features as thirst for knowledge, honest attitude to labour, collectivism, striving for all that is new, peaceful disposition and internationalism. Such is the make-up of the Soviet land's younger generation.

The individual in communist society has the chance to pattern his future as he sees fit, for his actions are limited on the part of society only by the development levels attained in the economic, social and cultural spheres. This does not mean, of course,

that there will be no social norms with the transition to communism. Social norms are essential in any society regardless of the stage of its development. Under communism, too, they will serve to adjust social relations, but the range of compulsory rules will be altogether different from now. In the communist community, many of the prohibitive norms, which do exist today to oppose the survivals of the past in the minds and behaviour of people, will disappear. It is not only norms of criminal, civil and other branches of law that will vanish (law as a special system of social norms will die off), but the prohibitive norms of the moral code will disappear, too.

The moral code of the builder of communism contains essentially the norms that show a high sense of social duty, comradesly mutual assistance, etc., i. e. positive norms which impel good citizenship. At the same time, it includes prohibitive norms which compel people not to harm others. Thus, one of the principles of the moral code reads: "...an uncompromising attitude to injustice, parasitism, dishonesty, careerism and money grubbing."* When the survivals of the past are fully wiped out in the minds and behaviour of people, there will, of course, be no need for this kind of ethic norm. We may recall here how Engels examined the prohibitive command-

* *Programme of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union*, Foreign Languages Publishing House, M. 1961, p. 109.

ment, "Thou shalt not steal." He wrote that under communism, where the principle of distribution according to need is established and all causes for stealing have disappeared, the moralist who ventured to proclaim the commandment, "Thou shalt not steal," would become the laughing stock of the community.

The level of people's consciousness under communism will reach a height when there will be no need for society's regulation of human behaviour.

The positive norms of the moral code will further develop in the communist society; unified norms of communist mode of life will appear, marking further moral progress. It is to be assumed, however, that moral progress will develop chiefly not towards extending the range of obligatory rules, but towards the flourishing of the moral freedom of people. This implies that every individual will have the opportunity of patterning his future as he sees fit.

Among the views popular in modern bourgeois ideology there is the opinion which interprets moral freedom as freedom from duties towards society. Such an interpretation confuses people and prevents them from understanding that one cannot live in society and be free of moral obligations to it.

The triumph of the new social system will overcome these difficulties. Under socialism, social connections among individuals are not distorted by private-property relations. So, here, the freedom of one in-

dividual does not and cannot endanger the freedom of others. The individual develops not at the expense of others. but with their help, with the help of the community and the entire society. "In the real community the individuals obtain their freedom in and through their association,"* wrote Marx and Engels.

Under socialism man becomes free to act, in so far as he realises that his personal interests correspond to those of society. Society's demands upon his behaviour are not coercion from without upon him, but present his own accord and wishes. He follows the norms of communist morality of his own accord and desire, because of his own conviction and wish, by virtue of the demands of his conscience. And it is the individual who conforms his personal interests to those of society to a fuller extent that allows more freedom of behaviour.

Under communism, rights and obligations will merge into unified norms of human community, and moral freedom will continue to develop. It is quite clear that the moral qualities of the individual manifest themselves to the fullest extent with the advancement of moral freedom. And this permits description of the member of the new society as a highly-principled individual.

* K. Marx, F. Engels. *The German Ideology*. Moscow, 1964, p. 49.

Moulding of the Man of High Morals

In the period of all-out communist construction, society is faced with the practical task of educating all Soviet people in the spirit of the moral code of the builder of communism. This means, first of all, that its moral principles become profound convictions of people; that, secondly, their moral convictions grow into moral emotions; and, thirdly, that habits of proper behaviour form on the basis of these moral convictions and emotions.

It is important that moral standards turn into personal convictions, for the simple reason that if a person is not convinced of the correctness of one or another moral standard and it has not become his firm conviction, he will not follow it without coercion from outside.

The importance of the second aspect of the moulding of a highly-principled individual—the cultivation of senses—is quite clear, too. It is determined by the specific qualities of morality proper, as a form of social consciousness. Morality embraces both man's brains and senses, and its force is in the organic fusion of the knowledge and realisation of the principles of behaviour with the senses that are connected with the implementation of these principles.

As to the development of habits of proper behaviour, this merits special attention in so far as the formation of these habits serves as the most reliable guarantee of the moral conduct of the individual.

Lenin repeatedly stressed the need of cultivating moral standards. He was well aware not only of the negative significance of old habits, but stressed again and again how important it was to cultivate habits of communist behaviour. Lenin used to say that we understood communism as "...a system under which people get used to performing their public duties without there being a special machinery of compulsion..."* He pointed out that the conscious attitude to labour for the good of society must turn into a habit, and that the motto, "All for one, and one for all," as well as many other rules and standards of behaviour, must become habits, too. And, when the ethic standards of community are followed by habit, society will be able to pass over to communism. It is clear that, in the conditions of all-out communist construction, the social standards which express society's demands upon the individual become habit with people.

The practical solution of this problem comes up against numerous difficulties. In particular, there is the prejudice against moral habits which are alleged to exclude convictions and to lead to automatism, and, so far as we have to educate highly conscious and convinced people, no stress should be laid on the cultivation of habits. This kind of conception follows from the

* V. I. Lenin *Report on Subbotniks at the Moscow Conference of the RCP. Works*, Vol. 30, pp. 260-261, Russ. Ed.

failure to understand the nature of habits, especially habits involving complex psychological processes.

No doubt, habits do contain a certain element of automatism in the performance of actions. It was Hegel who once said that in this conception conscious activity merged with the opposite unconscious mechanical process in which the particular is less noticeable and only the general comes to the foreground. Thus, for instance, while we learn to write and read, every letter and symbol is quite a noticeable factor; but when through continued exercises we have well learned to write and read, we notice only the general whole and not the particular. But the concept of habit in no sense relates to automatism alone. Being formed due to continuous repetition and exercise, a habit suggests the purposeful activity of consciousness.

The more complex the habits, the greater the role of consciousness in their formation and in control. Soviet psychologists have made a rather detailed study of this role. Bringing out the specific features of moral habits, they have shown the latter not to be mechanical formations, mechanically acting automatisms, but extremely conscious actions. Habitual moral actions are connected with man's thought, with the realisation of the concrete situation, with planning, etc. They are quite flexible patterns of behaviour which, in contradistinction to elementary, say, hygienic habits, do

not involve strictly definite actions and operations. At the same time, moral habits do not burden the individual's mind with reasoning and hesitations as to whether or not the moral code should be adhered to in his behaviour. The individual's entire attention switches over to finding the best way of applying the code to concrete deeds.

Habits are an essential factor or aspect in the boosting of the individual's moral qualities, for moral convictions and senses grow into moral qualities as they are embodied in practical behaviour by habit, by the organic need of acting in a definite way. That is why there inevitably arises the question of habits when the problem of the moulding of the man of high morals arises.

Soviet reality itself serves as an objective foundation of communist education, including moral education. A person included into the system of socialist social relations is unavoidably imbued with socialist consciousness. It is on this objective basis that the successful purposeful activity towards moulding people's consciousness becomes possible.

Public opinion is a most important instrument of education. It exerts a greater influence upon an individual's behaviour than, say, administrative measures. The point is that with administrative measures the individual is the object of education and least of all a subject that is responsible for his behaviour to the community with which he is connected by the closest

of ties. Such measures do not produce the proper educational effect. Public opinion, on the contrary, expresses the demands of the community and so the wrath, contempt and censure, with which the community reacts to the unworthy behaviour of its member, has a strong effect on his consciousness and emotions. This is quite natural, indeed. Being by nature a social creature, man cannot help lending an ear to the opinions of his comrades.

Public opinion, apart from censuring, also influences human behaviour through approval. Striving to consolidate in man's consciousness the idea of the importance of actions which are desirable to society, the latter expresses its praise and approval of such actions. In this way public opinion pursues the aim of giving the individual or community moral satisfaction, strengthening in them confidence in their own powers, and fostering collective pride and honour.

By acting upon people's minds and emotions, public opinion serves as an important factor of moral education. The everyday life of Soviet society offers numerous examples of how people change their conduct under the effects of public opinion. We cannot categorically claim, of course, that the public censure of the misbehaviour of one or another individual will in all cases bring about a complete change in his consciousness; however, there is no doubt (and this is borne out by practice) that the prospects of accounting for his deeds to his fellow-workers make a

person seriously analyse his behaviour and promote the remoulding of his consciousness.

Public opinion and public organisations also play an important part in preventing violations of moral standards and socialist law. The survivals of the past in socialist society repose mostly in individual consciousness. Public opinion is capable of affecting individual consciousness and changing it in the required direction, for it is among the basic channels through which social consciousness becomes the property of the individual.

The public opinion formed in one or another community or society as regards moral standards accumulates, as a rule, in traditions and customs, and these form habits in the consciousness of its individual members. Traditions, customs and habits become the principal regulators of people's behaviour. Thus, public opinion fosters in individuals immunity against alien views and conceptions.

The effects of public opinion will be the greater the more the community's efforts combine with the individual's own efforts to improve morally, i. e. when education is combined with self-training.

An important role in self-training is played by positive examples. Following them, the individual strengthens his will to attaining an aim set and deliberately moulds his own behaviour.

The personality of Lenin as a highly moral individual distinguished for loyalty

to revolutionary duty, true humanism, selfless love of his people and mankind, truthfulness and honesty, simplicity and modesty has been recreated by those who had the privilege of living and working with him. Thanks to their recollections and, mainly, to the works of Lenin which have come down to us, he stands before us as a "truly perfect and great man". According to Paul Vaillant-Couturier, Lenin was the accomplished type of a new man; and we regard him as the prototype of the man of the future.

The importance of moral self-training is, first and foremost, in the fact that it fosters such a moral quality as a sense of moral responsibility. Moral responsibility is the individual's responsibility for his actions to the public opinion of his community. In our society, it comes to one's personal responsibility for the common cause of communist construction.

However, the individual is responsible not only to public opinion but to his own conscience as well. This stresses very definitely the point that moral responsibility is a quality inherent in the individual and characterises his moral make-up. Society's demands upon human behaviour, as expressed through public opinion, are perceived by the individual as his own demands. That means that the sense of responsibility to public opinion grows into a sense of responsibility to man's own conscience, which functions as an inner regulator of his activity.

Marx and Engels, foreseeing the establishment of a new society with new morality, wrote that the punishment for one or another misdemeanour would be fixed by man's own conscience. "Punishment would actually be no more than a sentence which the guilty would pass on himself... In other people he would, on the contrary, see his natural rescuers from the punishment to which he had sentenced himself, i. e. the relationship would be directly opposite to what it was now."*

In the course of transition to communism, training and self-training will implant the principles of the moral code in consciousness, and these will serve as the life standard for every individual.

* K. Marx, F. Engels. *The Holy Family. Works*, Vol. 2, p. 197, Russ. Ed.

Conclusion

The building of a communist society turns a new leaf in the history of relations between the individual and society. Here is how the CPSU Programme defines communism: "Communism is a classless social system with one form of public ownership of the means of production and full social equality of society; under it, the all-round development of people will be accompanied by the growth of the productive forces through continuous progress in science and technology; all the springs of cooperative wealth will flow more abundantly, and the great principle, "From each according to his ability, to each according to his needs," will be implemented. Communism is a highly organised society of free, socially conscious working people in which public self-government will be established, a society in which labour for the good of society will become the prime vital requirement of everyone, a necessity recognised by one and all, and the ability of each person will be

employed to the greatest benefit of the people." *

This is the characteristics of the established communist society and of the completely moulded communist individual. But such a society is the outcome of the development which starts with the triumph of a socialist revolution. It was this revolution that initiates the process of turning society into a single, integral community, of the consistent versatile enrichment of the individual's life and the growing harmony of public and personal interests.

The community, harmony of society's basic vital interests and those of each and all of its members expressly manifests itself at the present stage of our advance towards communism.

Hardly anybody will dispute that all-round development has always been in the interest of the individual. But in the times gone before, this interest never rested on a real foundation. At the preceding stages of its progress society, due to certain historical conditions, was not interested in versatile development of its members. Social progress demanded, on the contrary, that physical labour be separated from mental labour. The objective course of history led to originating the forms of labour division which had a particularly adverse effect on the destinies of the toi-

* *Programme of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union*. Foreign Languages P. H., Moscow, 1961, p. 59.

ler. But this very objective nature of historical progress makes it imperative that, on a certain stage of its course, the old forms of labour division be eliminated and an integral individual of all-round development be moulded. Thus for the first time in history the all-round and harmonious development of the individual proves to be in the interests of society as well.

The same harmony of interests applies to the formation of communist social relations, too. Speaking of the development of these relations, it is important to stress that the main and primary purpose is to build up a socially equal society.

Under socialism, though there still are some class and social-group distinctions, an individual's status in society does not depend any more on his class or group affiliation, in the sense that this affiliation does not give him any privileges and does not predetermine his career. The individual status here is determined not by his class origin, but by personal qualities and capacities which he has every opportunity to manifest under the socialist system. Moreover, as the distinctions between classes and social groups disappear, these personal factors will steadily gain significance.

What benefits will the individual derive when the material and technical base of communism is built? The creation of this base by introducing the latest achievements of science and technology, all-round process mechanisation and automation alters the conditions of labour and radically

changes the nature of man's material production.

Development of the community of public and personal interests is a dialectical process accompanied by contradictions to be steadily overcome. There are as well some objective factors that underlie these contradictions. The point is that the community of public and personal interests does not mean that these interests are identical.

Priority is given to society in this community of interests. But when productive forces are developed to full capacity and especially, when war is excluded from the life of society once and for all, then the basic causes that give rise to situations in which public interests demand certain personal sacrifices will disappear.

However, contradictions between society and the individual have some subjective grounds, too. They are due to the fact that some members of society still retain in their consciousness and behaviour such survivals of the past as disdain of socially useful labour, violation of moral standards of behaviour in society and private life, etc. To overcome these contradictions, it is essential to step up the ideological, political and moral education of people, so that the builders of communism develop to combine a high cultural and technical level and versatile labour skills and habits with high communist consciousness and moral perfection.

Thus, in active interaction with the so-

cial sphere, man himself changes and his world of spiritual values is renewed. The need for all-round development of the individual is expressed in this integral unity and interaction of objective and subjective factors in the process of communist construction.

HX 632 A1 W9 NO-854
WORLD COMMUNISM IN THE 20TH
CENTURY A COLLECTION OF
PAMPHLETS ACCOMPANIED BY A
39268382 HSS



000003985900

HX 632 A1 W9 no.854
World communism in the 20th
century.

0172047A MAIN

854

Read in the series:

**L. Leontyev, "Political Economy,
Questions and Answers."**

**G. Glezerman, "The Path Traversed
and the Path Ahead."**

**I. Berkhin, "Socialism Began Like
This."**

**O. Yakhov, "Philosophy of the New
World."**

**L. Grigorian, "The People in Power."
"The New Society."**

Novosti Press Agency Publishing House