

1965

1965



Ideals of New Society

Scanned / Transcribed by
The Socialist Truth in Cyprus – London Bureaux

<http://www.st-cyprus.co.uk/intro.htm>

<http://www.st-cyprus.co.uk/english/home/index.php>





Ideals of New Society

PEACE

LABOUR

FREEDOM

EQUALITY

FRATERNITY

HAPPINESS

Preface. "Communism accomplishes the historic mission of delivering all men from social inequality, from every form of oppression and exploitation, from the horrors of war, and proclaims Peace, Labour, Freedom, Equality, Fraternity and Happiness for all peoples of the world." These words are inscribed in the Programme adopted by the Communists of the Soviet Union.

The ideals of the new world are not the outcome of vague, abstract thinking; they emanate from real life and being the outgrowth of historical development have imbibed all the most precious spiritual values of the past centuries. And possibly many readers will discover that the ideals of communism correspond, in many respects, to their own dreams.

However, communist ideals differ fundamentally from all others. They are no longer the dream of individuals, now they have become the goal of millions and not of the privileged few. Another distinguishing feature of communist ideals is that they are real. In the old days joy and happiness in the dreamer's mind wandered from reality to fantasy, wonderland and utopia; today ways have been mapped out for the achievement of happiness for all.

This book, written by a group of journalists on the staff of APN (Novosti Press Agency) under the editorship of V. Komolov, will tell you what has been done in the Soviet Union to make these dreams come true.

PEACE

PEACE IS LIFE

DEAR TO ALL

WAR IS NOT ORDAINED BY FATE

WEAPONS CALLING FOR PEACE

PEACE DOES NOT COME SPONTANEOUSLY

Peace is Life. Peace means life, war spells death. A man comes into the world to live, and he wants to live and fights for life. Small wonder therefore, that the death sentence has always been the capital punishment. And war is virtually the death sentence for millions of people.

War is just as unnatural as is the right freely to kill or rob. This does not, of course, refer to the vain and thoughtless rulers who had sought or now seek glory in bloodshed and destruction: we are thinking of the working people who have created "the seven wonders", cities, industry, agriculture, art.

No lasting joy is possible without peace, for the realization that you yourself and the life of people near and dear to you are in danger is most depressing.

There were and still are philosophers who go on saying that aggression virtually lives in man and that it must periodically find an outlet in wars. But throughout the ages people have never been the instruments of war, they have always been its victims. Wars have been waged with the hands of mercenaries for plunder, massacre and subjugation. This "natural aggressiveness" did not seem in the least to suffer from the fact that the city dwellers and peasants did not wear armour and regarded the mercenaries with utter contempt. And if wars developed in scale and scope, involving millions of the working people, this was against their wishes.

The way to the realization of the great human ideals

is long and thorny. For their implementation a number of conditions are necessary, first and foremost.

Peace is one of these essential conditions.

No happiness is possible when war has broken out or is imminent. In time of war people are taken away from their customary occupations, from their jobs and parted with their families.

There can be no question of liberty in time of war, for man's will is then subordinated to the grim military requirements of the day.

Brotherhood to which people aspire consciously or by intuition is forsaken and in its stead comes planned, cold-blooded wholesale slaughter.

The only equality people enjoy in war is an equal possibility to lose all their possessions, and their lives too.

Peace is one of the most ancient human ideals. From time immemorial man has dreamed of peace in his legends, chronicals and prayers. The mother a thousand years ago, just as the mother today, trembled thinking of the fate of her children and home, which war threatened destruction. For the peasant the war meant trampled and burned crops, for the craftsman destroyed and ravaged workshops.

Peace more than any other ideal brings people together.

Dear to All. Not so very long ago Swiss scientist Jean-Jacques Babel has made some interesting calcula-

tions with the help of a computer. He translated the tragic results of human strife into the language of figures. His calculations covered the period of written history. It appears that throughout this period—roughly 5,500 years—about 3,500 million people, that is more than the present world population, perished on the battlefields. In fact, not a day passed without fight taking place in some part of the world. Peace was relative, and war was stable.

Eventually, people became possessed with a fatalist attitude towards war, and peace came to be regarded as an abstract ideal or as a wish to avert the impending war. War on the other hand was something real and menacing, an ever-present danger. Little wonder, therefore, that people stopped thinking of war as a disaster that could be wiped out once and for all, considering it an incontrovertible misfortune.

Nonetheless the means of destruction of life kept on improving more and more and people again and again posed the question of the need to exclude war among nations from the life of society.

The problem has become particularly acute today. People who with a shudder recall the cataclysms of the Second World War cannot even imagine that the explosion of one modern nuclear bomb, and not the most powerful either, would cause more havoc than all the blasts of the last war.

In the event of a world war today all peoples of the

world and not just one or another country would find themselves in deadly peril. The radius of action of a modern weapon is practically global.

A war unleashed today would track its victims everywhere—in the African jungle and in the snowy wastes of the Antarctic.

Everyone needs peace.

Of all the world ideals peace, as nothing else, requires common efforts. A person may achieve prosperity, he may even be happy and selfishly regard the problems of others, especially international problems. But his own well-being will not be lasting as people had learnt during the last world war. People who used to say: "My house is my fortress" saw with horror that their little short-lived fortress reduced to rubble under a shower of nazi bombs.

Peace can only be preserved by the common efforts of people and governments. Only recently the world was freed from the horrifying danger of nuclear radiation resulting from the testing of atomic and hydrogen weapons. This was due to the collective efforts of the peoples and governments who solved this all-important issue. Similar efforts helped to free space from the danger of converting it into an atomic arsenal. These are the first steps but how great is their significance! Above all they confirmed the vital truth that the "people must take the cause of peace into their own hands".

This they must do, for without peace the future of mankind is most dismal. Peace is the ideal of today.

War Is Not Ordained by Fate. For ages past people had dreamed about eternal peace but wars of bloodshed between nations still continued. Does this mean, as certain philosophers contend, that wars are unavoidable?

Communists disagree with this viewpoint. They have incorporated the task of excluding a world war into their Party Programme which is a realistic document. The Communists have not just proclaimed their ideals but have mapped out ways of achieving them. Peace is feasible, we say, because the world today is not what it used to be when the decisive say on the issue of war or peace belonged not to the forces that wanted peace but to the aggressive elements who sought wealth and greatness by seizing other people's lands through endless wars. The situation today is quite different.

Durable peace is possible above all for the reason that there is now a mighty community of socialist countries who are peace-loving by their social nature, for there are no classes or groups interested in wars in these countries.

All the material resources of the socialist states serve the cause of peace; the latest weapons developed by the Soviet Union can stop any aggressor from taking the fatal step.

In the past few years the warnings of the Soviet Government had more than once put a stop to a military conflict which had broken out.

There are also other serious factors which today stand for peace.

If the people act, they can compel the preachers of war to retire from the political arena, make governments alter their policy and change the climate of international relations as a whole. But for this they must act, act and act again. That is the main thing.

It is especially the workers, who, with their families, comprise more than half of the population in the developed capitalist countries that can do a lot in behalf of peace. The many millions of the working class, the class of creators to whom destruction is alien, are destined by history to thwart the atomaniacs and deliver mankind from the deadly peril that overhangs it.

The peasants, the second biggest section of the popular force, are also vitally interested in preventing a nuclear war. The time has come for the voice of the peasant masses to resound against war throughout the world.

Can the women, who give life to new generations, fail to show a special, I daresay unparalleled, activity in the struggle against the forces threatening to start a nuclear war? A war of that sort would turn the bright world of children into a world of orphans and cripples.

And the young people—does not the solution of the

crucial issue of our time depend on them to a large extent? To the young, war is frustration of all their hopes, it is ravished youth. Peace is breathtaking prospects of creation, realization of dreams, enhancement of mankind's wealth and exploration of the Universe.

Can the question of war or no war arise without taking into account the wishes of the working people who have set up powerful organizations becoming important in the respective countries? Can one discount the dozens of independent states in Asia and Africa, formed in the last ten or fifteen years, which are now trying to catch up with the industrial states? They, of course, are not thinking of war for it would tremendously retard their progress, destroy the fruits of all their painstaking efforts and virtually threaten the physical existence of the peoples of those states. Needless to say the young national states are also a mighty force fighting for peace.

Nor should we discount the tragic experience of the peoples in the last 50 years when two world wars shook our planet. Today most people know full well what war is: some as direct participants in the world wars, others through newspapers, radio, photographs and newsreels which give a good idea of the scope and character of the tragedy of war.

The Soviet people have had more than their share of grief and suffering in the last war. There is not a family which had not been engulfed in the black web of war. Soviet people sustained incalculable losses.

A few years ago the Soviet youth paper **Komsomolskaya Pravda** circulated a thousand questionnaires among people of different ages and professions. One of the queries was whether the person replying had had any part in the last war and the losses he had suffered. It appeared that one of every four of them had been at the front, every one of ten had lived through the nightmare of fascist occupation, 150 had been working in the rear, 28 had fought in partisan detachments and 17 were in sieged Leningrad. 453 of the people interrogated had been in their teens but the ravage of war did not spare them either. 720 lost their fathers, mothers, brothers or sisters.

Here are some of the replies received:

"I lost my leg. Two of my brothers were seriously injured, one perished." (Engineer, aged 58); "My father and sister were killed. Mother and I were severely wounded." (Factory worker, 22); "I was made deaf and blind." (Sewing machines mechanic, 49); "My son was killed. My house was destroyed and I was sent to a concentration camp." (Housewife, 87); "My father was killed." (Soviet Army soldier, 24); "The fascists tortured my family, shot my father." (Tractor driver, 51).

This is the result of the interrogation of only one thousand people, the mere handful of the many millions of Soviet people.

That explains the Soviet people's fervent striving for peace, their burning hatred of war.

Communists say that peace today is quite feasible,

for the overwhelming majority of the world's population not only want peace but are strong enough to prevent the unleashing of war by those who would like to try out the superpowerful new weapons on living beings. There was a time when a state built up a military potential and lost no time in utilizing it to promote its aggressive ends, to unleash war either on its own or in alliance with others, to attack its neighbours and sieze their lands. Today we can say that the forces advocating war, notwithstanding their adventurist tendencies, realize that they do not have any military superiority and are not the sole possessors of a special weapon.

The military potential of the Soviet Union and of the other socialist countries is powerful enough to prevent any speculation on the use of force. Even the politicians and the military who have lost all common sense and would like to resolve disputes and conflicts by cave-dwellers' methods can do nothing but shout and howl, without daring to let loose their war machine.

It is not a question of the notorious "balance of power" which is very unreliable. In the case of "balance of power" the parties merely wait for the time when the balance is reversed so that they can harness the war chariot. Communists do not advocate "balance of power", they stand for the general and complete abolition of the armed forces and armaments. They consider that the contemporary situation makes it possible to shannel historical development in the direction of peace and friendship.

Weapons Calling for Peace. There is one very important factor which necessitates, as never before, the elimination of world war. It is the character a modern war would acquire as compared with old ones. A world war today would inevitably become a thermonuclear conflict, that is a war of total destruction of life and material values. The First and the Second World Wars brought about incalculable disasters. But they would stand no comparison with the indescribable horrors of a new world war if it were to break out.

Prof. Linus Pauling of Columbia University, Nobel prize winner, wrote that in the first few hours of war thousands of heavy bombers, missiles and rockets would be directed against their targets and each plane or rocket would carry a hydrogen or superbomb 5, 10 or 20 million tons of TNT equivalent. And it should be borne in mind that a 20 million ton or a 20 megaton bomb is a thousand times more powerful than the bombs dropped on Hiroshima and Nagasaki. One such bomb would raze a city within a radius of 15 kilometres, he said. British scientists say that four bombs of only one megaton each, dropped on London, Birmingham, Lancashire and Yorkshire would kill at least 20 million people.

That is what thermonuclear war would be like in the opinion of competent people. Hence it is not only a question of this or that country being laid waste by war and that millions of people would perish. That has already happened in the First and the Second World Wars.

Now it is a question of the fate of civilization which in the event of war would be hurled back for many years to come.

Therefore, the new weapons, which make world war senseless, call for peace.

Peace Does Not Come Spontaneously. People visiting the Soviet Union see numerous posters and slogans glorifying peace. The USSR is the first country to declare war propaganda a crime punishable by law.

But Communists do not just proclaim peace and wait hands folded for it to come spontaneously. Eternal peace is only possible in the fight against the threat of war, against the aggressive forces encroaching on the tranquillity of the peoples.

Throughout its almost half-century history the Soviet Union has always worked tirelessly for peaceful coexistence with all states, irrespective of their political systems. The Soviet country has from its very inception considered that stable peace can be ensured precisely on the basis of peaceful coexistence, namely, mutual respect for sovereignty in the broadest sense of the word, development of trade, economic and cultural relations.

Nowadays relations between many states are based on peaceful coexistence. The relations of the newly free national states in Asia and Africa are founded on the

five principles of "Pancha Shila" which are now recognized the world over.

Forty seven years ago the fight for peaceful coexistence began in very difficult circumstances for the young Soviet Republic.

V. I. Lenin wrote: "We shall do our utmost to guard future peace, we shall not stop at big concessions and sacrifices to uphold peace."

The Western attitude towards the Soviet fight for peace at that time could be summed up in the words: scorn and sabotage.

When the Communists took the power into their hands they proclaimed peace in their very first decree. The hungry and freezing Russia, rent by bitter struggle against the counter-revolutionaries offered all countries involved in the frantic First World War to stop the senseless bloodshed. But in those days the sincere desire for peace was considered a token of weakness and the states launched an armed intervention against Russia which had quitted the war. It need hardly be said that Russia was poor and weak. But when people are dedicated to their ideals their strength increases tenfold. And the seeming miracle happened. The Russian counter-revolutionaries backed by 14 foreign partners. were routed.

Once again Soviet Russia appealed for peace. It offered peaceful coexistence to all states. And again its proposals were sabotaged by those who merely paid lip-service to peace. The proposal to establish diplomatic relations was

sabotaged as well as the proposal to conclude a treaty of friendship and non-aggression. Instead of developing trade, an economic blockade was undertaken. Christians oftentimes repeat that peace has always been their ideal but how little was this in evidence in the West European government quarters which tried to set and pit one another against the young Soviet Republic. It was the Communists who were the true champions of peace. When fascism hatched the Second World War the only way of preserving peace was collective security which could hold fascism in rein. The Soviet Union again called for peace and again as many times before the appeal fell on deaf ears. The Western governments waited for the fascist beast to attack the Soviet Union, reckoning that the military operations would be restricted to the USSR territory. They again assumed that Soviet appeal for peace and collective security was a sign of weakness. But their calculations misfired and boomeranged against them. Londoners heard the roar of nazi bombs flying overhead while the swastika fluttered over Eiffel Tower.

In 1941 fascism turned the spearhead of its aggression against the USSR. The Soviet Union upheld the ideals of peace by force of arms, and not for itself alone but for all people on earth. The Soviet flag was hoisted over the Reichstag. Then the talk about the weakness of the Soviet Union stopped and people began to speak of its strength.

Meanwhile, the Soviet Union continued its peaceful

policy. Nor did it stop its fight for peace after the Second World War. This can be traced in many big and small issues of world politics. Its essence has always been the same—to consolidate peaceful coexistence, weaken the tension that developed in recent years and prevent the outbreak of a new world war.

Here are the major issues which have to be resolved to preserve and strengthen world peace.

The Soviet Union considers it necessary to eliminate swiftly the leftovers of the Second World War and in the first place to settle the German problem. It is dangerous to leave the smouldering ashes of the war which ended almost twenty years ago, it appears obvious that former allies in the titanic struggle against fascism must find a common language in eliminating the remnants of that war.

The Soviet Union considers that the days of colonialism have passed and that it is a disgrace to leave intact remnants of the colonial system. There can be no doubt that the sparks of the colonial wars which imperialism is waging may kindle a new world conflagration.

Can our planet remain calm and tranquil while peoples and countries are being forcefully held in slavish dependence on the metropolitan countries? The peoples in those countries naturally rise against colonialism and are frequently forced by their oppressors to take up arms. The same happens when the imperialists refuse to

accept the fact that the one-time colonies have won independence and are now following their own way of development. Many attempts have been made to restore the old order, forcing the newly free states to uphold their right to independence by resort to arms. The Soviet Union has always attentively and sympathetically followed the development of these events. It could not stand aside of the just struggle of nations against colonialists who failed to understand that they were living in the midtwenties and not in the eighteenth or the nineteenth century. As is known the Soviet Union supported the struggle of the Egyptian, Algerian, Indonesian and Cuban peoples not only with its political and moral authority but also with supply of arms. If Asia and Africa are to be free of military conflicts, if peace is to reign supreme there the colonial system must be fully abolished.

The Soviet Union considers that in the present international situation, when there is the mighty socialist community and numerous young national states, there can be no place for recourse to force in settling international issues. Disputes and conflicts between countries must be solved by peaceful means, by negotiation on the basis of the principles of peaceful coexistence. Quite recently the Soviet Union proposed the conclusion of an international agreement on the settlement of all territorial disputes and border questions by peaceful means.

The Soviet Union considers that the best way of strengthening peace is mutual understanding and trust

between states. But can there be a greater barrier to such confidence than military preparations of one side against the other? The Soviet Government has come out with many proposals (or supported the proposals of other countries) aimed at easing international tension. These include the proposal on a non-aggression pact between NATO and the Warsaw Treaty countries, and the very important proposal of dismantling bases on foreign territory, etc.

Finally there is the crucial international issue—the issue of disarmament. The Soviet Union has time and again made concrete proposals on this question with due account to the wishes and interests of the Western powers. General and complete disarmament would free the world from the menace of war and destruction. An end of the arms race would release tremendous wealth that could be used to promote the economic development of the world and in the first place of the former colonial and dependent countries that have taken the way of independent development.

We have enumerated but some of the phases of the Soviet Union's present struggle for the realization of the age-old dream of mankind. A solution of any of these problems, full or partial, would mean one more step towards peace, one more step away from war.

The Soviet Union will continue to fight for peace until its efforts are crowned with success.

LABOUR

LABOUR IS THE MAIN THING

DRIVE OUT IDLENESS!

A DEVILISHLY SERIOUS MATTER

HONOUR AND GLORY

I WANT A SOLID GOLD DINNER SET

PRESENT-DAY COLUMBUSES

WHEN WORK IS A PLEASURE

FROM SIX P. M. TO MIDNIGHT

MAN AND THE MACHINE

SUPREME BEAUTY

Labour is the Main Thing. All that human beings need for their existence and happiness is created by their labour. "Man's work and care create all things for mortals," the Greek poet Archilochus wrote in the 7th century B. C. Man diverts rivers into new channels, irrigates the desert, builds towns, drives tunnels through mountains, and opens up air routes high above the clouds. It is thanks to labour that man became man; his intellect and his emotions develop in the process of work. Work always was and will be the corner-stone on which human society exists and advances. Yet to the majority of mankind work was for thousands of years an onerous duty that brought them neither joy nor well-being.

Charles Fourier, the French thinker, called the factory "mild hard labour". But even then it was not so easy to get a job, for thousands of jobless waited outside. Millions dreamed of "making good", getting rich to be able to stop working altogether, but only a handful succeeded—more often than not at the price of the blood and tears of the millions.

It was a vicious circle. Life and progress are impossible without labour, yet labour meant hardship and suffering. That was the way things were—and still are today—in the world of social inequality and exploitation. This crying contradiction is one of the ugliest aspects of that world. The cause? Robert Owen, the English thinker, pointed to it more than a hundred years ago. The main evil of capitalism, he asserted, was the private owner-

ship of the means of production. In other words, one person possessing great wealth, factories and land, while another having only his hands, and a family to feed. One being the master and the other his subordinate; one exploiting and the other being exploited.

A worker does not want to create new material values, as soon as he realizes that he works conscientiously, creating material values, but gets only a pittance for it, while the lion's share of the fruit of his labour goes to his master owner, as soon as he realizes that others lead a life of luxury and ease at his expense. He works just for the sake of a slice of bread, "from whistle to whistle". What is called "free" labour in the West is a form of "slave" labour performed by a vast majority to enrich minority which owns capital.

Drive Out Idleness! At the dawn of capitalism Thomas More urged to curb the vicious egoism of the rich and deprive them of the possibility of accumulating riches and appropriating profits. "Drive out idleness!" he said.

Since the victory of socialism in Russia the nature, content and aims of labour have undergone a fundamental change. The socialist revolution settled the most vital and crucial question—the question of property, in favour of the people. By doing this socialism has solved a great social problem, it has abolished the exploiting classes, eliminated the causes of the exploitation of man

by man, and made the people, the producers of all material values, the owners of these values as well, the masters of the land, the factories and the banks, the masters of production.

In the USSR, work is more than just a means of livelihood. It is the duty of every able-bodied citizen. In other words, the principle of work has been made universal, for the first time in history. Social groups that do not participate in the common work efforts disappeared from socialist society a long time ago. "He who does not work, neither shall he eat," proclaims the Soviet Constitution. It is required, moreover, that every citizen of socialist society shall work to his full capacity. The word "required" is quite relative here, for it is the citizen himself, who requires this first and foremost. After taking political power and setting up a new state system, the Soviet people introduced social ownership of all the country's riches, in other words, themselves became the owners of these riches. Therefore increasing the social wealth by his labour the citizen improves his own well-being. The motto of socialism is: "From each according to his ability, to each according to his labour". "From each" means that all citizens take part in the common creative activity, carrying out the principle of universal labour proclaimed in the Constitution. On the other hand, the citizen will not bring the maximum benefit to himself and to others, unless he works "according to his ability". When a person works half-heartedly he impover-

ishes both himself and society. We may recall in this context the wise words of Jean Jacques Rousseau that "every idle citizen is a thief". So, he is a thief if he lives at society's expense without contributing anything. He is a thief who robs himself as well as society. Every person has some natural gift, and it is only in the process of work that this is developed; otherwise it goes to waste. That is why the Soviet State, which gives legislative and material support to the right of every citizen to work, is so severe upon idlers. In fighting against idlers Soviet society is actually helping them to learn the happiness of creative labour and become full-fledged citizens.

The attitude that labour is a burden was born in the times when man toiled for the slaveowner, for the landlord, for the capitalist.

Universal labour is not only a great social achievement but also a great moral standard of the new society, a standard which the Soviet Union's tens of millions of workers, collective farmers and intellectuals follow in their daily lives. They put all their knowledge and ability, their soul into their work. They display an attitude of willingness and desire to work well; and responsibility for the common cause, in which man achieves his greatest joy in working for the benefit of the whole of society.

In the winter of 1963, when the temperature at the construction site of the Bratsk Hydroelectric Station in Siberia, one of the world's largest power plants, dropped

to fifty degrees below zero C, the builders were told not to report for work, without any cut in their pay, of course. But despite the bitter frost they all came to work as usual, and finished the project on schedule.

On a Saturday afternoon not so very long ago one of the conveyers at the Vladimir Ilyich Electrical Machinery Works in Moscow suddenly went out of order. A team of mechanics — ten ordinary Soviet workers — volunteered to stay on and repair the line. They sacrificed a whole evening of their leisure time, but they had the satisfaction of knowing that on Monday the Works would be able to resume operations as usual.

Planing-machine operator Kolesnikov of the Rostov Farm Machinery Plant invented a device which cut by 20 per cent the time needed to machine one of the parts. He then asked that the rates for that job be cut accordingly.

Many more similar examples of this new attitude towards work could be cited.

The working man in pre-revolutionary Russia constantly worried about his family and its future, for he was afraid of being sacked at any time, or of having his wages reduced. Naturally, he cared nothing about the interests of the factory where he was employed; he never thought of raising his productivity or setting an example of outstanding work.

Today the situation is different. Labour has acquired

a new, humanistic content. Once from a struggle for one's daily bread it has become a conscious effort to raise labour productivity, in order to bring about a better life not only for oneself and one's family, but for all the members of society.

Totally new social relations have arisen, relations of comradely cooperation and mutual assistance. When a Soviet citizen says "my factory" or "my collective farm" he means "the people's factory", or "the people's collective farm". And when he says "our factory" or "our collective farm" he knows that it is his factory, his collective farm. That is what underlies the spirit of collectivism, enthusiasm and creative approach so typical of work in the socialist society. That is what underlies the broad socialist emulation movement.

This movement has nothing in common with the cutthroat competition in some countries.

It is a patriotic work movement which millions of people join. Its main aim is to work more productively and to help one's fellow workers to do the same, so that everybody could produce more for society, and thus improve the lives of all the Soviet people.

The movement originated in the '30s when workers and work teams pledged to produce over and above their quotas and thus contribute to overfulfilment of the country's development plans.

Participants in the movement work in concord, constantly helping one another and pooling their know-how.

Their motto is: "Overtake with those in the lead and help those who are lagging behind in order to bring about a general advance."

This movement brings countless material and spiritual benefits to society as a whole and to each citizen individually, for no other sphere of human activity gives both society and the individual as much as labour does.

A Devilishly Serious Matter. The attitude of Soviet citizens to brain workers is one of respect and appreciation. Brain work involves tremendous effort. The work of the scientist, of the researcher, is persistent and at times heroic.

Nobel Prize winner Lev Landau, the distinguished Soviet physicist, is renowned the world over. He is a man of great erudition, one of the leading exponents of the Soviet school of physics. His years of scientific activity, including his years as head of an important research centre, have been years of indefatigable work, of quests and experiments involving tremendous mental exertion.

In 1963 Leningrad orientalist N. Nevsky published his "Tangut Philology", the culmination of ten years of work to decipher the alphabet of the Tanguts, a Central Asian people that disappeared many centuries ago. This has given orientalists the world over access to totally new data on the history and culture of medieval Asia.

Intellectual achievements result from an enormous

amount of intensive labour. The words of Karl Marx in reply to Fourier's contention that in the society of the future work would be like play are significant. "Work that is genuinely free," wrote Marx, "for instance, the work of a composer, is a devilishly serious matter, calling for the greatest effort."

That applies to all forms of creative work. Surely the work of a surgeon who fights for the life of his patient or of a scientist who designs a spaceship, calls for the greatest effort.

It is for this reason that brain workers are so respected by the people under socialism. Another important feature is that the Soviet intelligentsia is deeply rooted in the people and devotedly serves the people and the country by their knowledge, erudition and experience. The age-old antagonism between brain and brawn has become a thing of the past in the Soviet Union.

Honour and Glory In the USSR all forms of work are appreciated. Wealth and titles do not count in the socialist society. A man's position in society depends only on his work. Work for the people's welfare is the citizen's primary duty and the main measure of his worth. People who work with dedication are honoured, decorated by the government, and held up as an example to all.

For years some Western propagandists have been

circulating a myth about "forced labour" in the USSR. Real creative initiative, they claim, is possible only in conditions of private enterprise.

But these allegations burst like a soap-bubble on their first contact with Soviet reality.

If labour in the USSR is not free, but compulsory, then how is one to explain that millions of Soviet men and women daily and hourly accomplish magnificent deeds and feats. Where, then, does the Soviet Union have got its two and a half million inventors and rationalizers—workers, engineers, technicians, scientists and collective farmers who voluntarily, on their own initiative, improve technology and thus annually save the country thousands of millions of roubles a year? How could one explain the fact that no such mass movement of inventors is to be found in any country whose economy is based on private enterprise?

Furthermore, how could a 200,000,000 strong nation be "compelled" to transform backward Russia into a mighty socialist state? Most people in the world today realize what the only possible answer to that question can be.

The prominent American politician K. Randall has said he was certain the Americans had made a serious mistake about the motives behind the Soviet people's deeds. The Soviet people bore not the slightest resemblance to a nation oppressed by brute force and were confidently advancing to what they regard as a sure victory. The Soviet worker, he noted, performed his

duties with great enthusiasm; not because he was compelled to do so but because he was devoted to his cause; in present-day Russia work was a matter of honour.

I Want a Solid Gold Dinner Set. Some people imagine the future society of abundance as a paradise on earth where one will be able to get everything one wants without moving a finger. Doesn't the communist motto say "to each according to his needs"? If that's the case, then why work at all?

The same sort of caricature of the future society is drawn by the opponents of communism who claim that God made man unwilling to work, that human nature cannot be changed, and that as soon as man starts getting things "according to his needs" he will stop working altogether.

Both of the above pictures of the future society fail to take into account the first part of the communist motto, which is: "From each according to his ability".

Under communism, just as under socialism, the citizen will be required to work to the best of his ability, for labour was, is and will be the main factor making for progress.

Can a society of abundance be created unless a tremendous amount of work is put into it? And how can society advance if its members contribute nothing to it, neither their energy, their knowledge nor their labour?

What would the meaning of life be? Simply idleness?

No, it is work that will create the new society of universal abundance. "From each according to his ability." Only when all citizens without exception work for the benefit of society with zest and will, giving it their best, will it become possible to satisfy the needs of all in full and free of charge.

"To each according to his needs" is possible only if there is an abundance of everything, and abundance is created by persistent work.

There is still another aspect to the matter, namely, what will man's needs consist of?

At a lecture at the Polytechnical Museum in Moscow a foreign newspaperman put a "ticklish" question to the lecturer. "What will become of your abundance," he asked, "if under communism everyone wants to have a dinner set of solid gold, dozens of cars and houses, but doesn't want to work?"

Well, once there is an abundance of everything under communism, a citizen will be able to get ten cars, say, if he wishes. But would anyone ever have such a strange desire? Since under communism everything a person needs will be in abundant supply it would be senseless for anyone to want to take more of anything than he could actually use. Does anyone living in a modern apartment ever think of storing up water if the water supply is functioning normally?

On the other hand, the newspaperman who put that "tough" question refuses to understand that the transition to communism will bring with it a tremendous advance in attitudes. He ascribes to man an "eternal" passion for getting rich at the expense of others. He puts an egoist into the future society and then wonders how he will behave in it. But the point is that there will no longer be any egoists under communism.

We do not have fantastic whims in mind when we say "To each according to his needs". Human needs are not limitless; we do not mean "needs" that consist of a gold dinner set but the normal, rational needs of the citizen of a communist society, who will have an all-round development and a high level of civic awareness.

Present-Day Columbuses. The future is being built today. By producing more and better goods today we are laying the foundation for tomorrow's abundance. What does "producing more and better" mean? It means working at one's full capacity, with enthusiasm and with the greatest benefit to society. It means working where you are most needed instead of looking around for a soft, easy job.

The new attitude towards work began to arise quite recently. Today this communist attitude is becoming the standard. Men and women who work the communist way are not inventions of science-fiction writers. They are

our contemporaries; we know their names; they are a living part of Soviet reality.

More than 21,000,000 people are taking part in the communist labour movement that was born in one of Moscow's railway yards in November 1958. From the first shock workers of communist labour to teams (of which there are now more than 300,000), shops (more than 32,000) and whole enterprises of communist labour (1,715)—such are the landmarks in the history of this unusual movement that is outracing time.

The participants in the communist labour movement are people with a lofty sense of duty. Industry, discipline, devotion to the interests of society, and a spirit of collectivism are among their main traits. The common welfare is their primary concern. They do not, of course, spurn material incentives; wages are important to each of them. To produce more for the country, to do it better and, naturally, to get more for one's work—all that is a legitimate desire of a working man and woman. However, a passion for getting rich, money-grubbing is alien to a shock worker of communist labour.

The participants in the movement are called shock workers of communist labour because they do shock work, that is, they work better than others, with whim and zeal, because labour for them is not only a public duty, but a prime requirement, a joy. They realize that communist society—a society of abundance, of complete social equality and happiness for all—can be built only

on the basis of perfect technology and the highest labour productivity, and not singly but through the efforts of the entire people. That is what lies behind their striving for technical innovations and greater efficiency in production. Besides getting the utmost from their own machines and in their own teams they help other teams so that the entire shop and the entire factory may work in a communist way.

Moreover, they hold that the real builder of communism is one who is politically conscious, educated, cultured, highly skilled in his profession, constantly concerned with preserving and multiplying the public wealth, who takes an active part in the management of the factory and the government of the country.

A shock worker of communist labour sets an example to others by his work, his studies and the way of his life.

Hammersmith Timofei Oleinikov is a veteran worker of the Ural Heavy Engineering Works. He started there three decades ago as a youngster straight from the village and today is the leader of a communist labour team, a man whose outstanding work has won him countrywide renown. As he puts it, "work for the common good is what makes life fine".

Timofei Oleinikov and his team-mates realized some time ago that they would have to know more about machines and other technical matters if they were to succeed in raising the team's productivity and producing more goods, of an increasingly better quality. They en-

rolled in evening school, they attended courses and lectures arranged at the mill, and they studied books on the relevant subjects. The team first came into prominence when it initiated a new work method. Then this team sponsored countrywide emulation movement among the hammersmiths for the fulfilment of the Seven-Year Plan in five years.

A leader of the communist labour team, Timofei Oleinikov, is a worker but his knowledge can match any technician's. He takes an active part in public affairs, is an innovator and inventor, generously shares his experience with others, and has been chosen as a delegate to many congresses and conferences. He is one of 21,000,000 "scouts of the future", as the people call them.

It is their work, plus the work of all other Soviet men and women, that is laying the foundation of the future society of abundance.

When Work Is a Pleasure. Under communism, as under socialism, man's work will be free from exploitation.

These two societies differ, however, in their system of distribution. Under socialism, consumption depends on the quality and quantity of a person's work; the more valuable his work, the more he receives. Under communism, distribution will accord with people's needs. Work

will become the citizen's prime vital urge, an outlet for his free, creative energies.

To members of the communist society work will not be an enforced duty or a means of obtaining the goods they require. It will be motivated by their consciousness of the need to work for the common good; it will follow from their inexhaustible inner need to create.

Of course, work often brought people joy under capitalism, too, and earlier, as well, insofar as it contained elements of creativity. However, constant dependence on the powers-that-be tended to strangle and mutilate the creative element, turning work into a mechanical process that exhausted the body and the brain.

Very few people in the past, chiefly scientists and artists, were able to enjoy creative work. Karl Marx, the great teacher of the proletariat, continued working until his very last breath; he died at his desk, while working on the manuscript of "Das Kapital".

Our ideal is free work, creative work, work that organically combines physical and mental activity, work that is "technologically ennobled and socially significant", as Maxim Gorky put it. Such work will give the citizen the greatest of satisfaction. Each person will be able to develop his gifts to the full. This does not mean, of course, that everyone will be a Rafael under communism, but it does mean that every potential Rafael will indeed become one.

Physical work will under communism be transformed,

ceasing to be purely muscular effort. Not that a person will merely have to press a button and then everything will go smoothly by itself. No, the worker of the future will be a person who controls the operation of complicated machines. He will be a worker with deep and extensive knowledge.

Numerous examples of creativity in work are to be seen today. Under communism, all work will be creative.

From Six p.m. to Midnight. One hundred years ago, amazing lines came from the pen of a great thinker as he wrote about the future of mankind. "... And then the measure of wealth will no longer be working hours but leisure time."

Are Karl Marx's words paradoxical? We know that social wealth is created by labour and hence it is measured by working time. How can leisure time become a measure of wealth?

That was not a slip of the pen. Highly productive social labour will enable people to produce everything society needs with a minimum expenditure of time.

Increased leisure opens up boundless vistas for man's all-round development, giving him more time to acquire new knowledge, polish his intellect, and perfect his creative abilities. The supreme goal of the new society will be to promote the fullest and freest development

of the individual, to create the most favourable conditions for each member of society "to find himself".

Communist society's efforts in this direction will be repaid a hundredfold. Its harmoniously developed citizens will provide society with incalculably more material and spiritual values than were created in all previous eras put together.

The use of leisure will thus become a matter of paramount importance.

Much is being done in the Soviet Union today to reduce working hours and increase leisure time. By the end of 1960 all the country's factory, office and professional workers were switched over to a seven-hour day, while workers employed underground or in injurious trades have a six-hour day. The changeover did not involve any cut in wages; on the contrary, they were increased.

The 20-year programme of communist construction in the USSR provides for a further considerable reduction of the working day. The first decade (1961-1970) will see the introduction of a six-hour workday with one day off a week, or a 35-hour week with two days off. For those on underground jobs or in enterprises with harmful conditions there will be a five-hour day or a 30-hour week. The Soviet Union will thus have the world's shortest working day. Moreover, the simultaneous substantial rise in real wages will make it the best-paid working day in the world. In the second decade (1971-1980) a further rise

in labour productivity will make an even shorter working day possible.

More leisure time gives the Soviet people new opportunities for rapid cultural advancement, enabling them to improve their professional knowledge and engage in wholesome recreation.

Factory, office and professional workers use their extra leisure for entertainment, community affairs, scientific, technical and artistic hobbies, and sports. Those who are obtaining a secondary or higher education in their spare time—and there are millions of such people—get additional vacations for study. Time, as Marx said, is room for mental development. Both the individual and society benefit tremendously, for new skills and knowledge mean higher productivity, which leads to an increase in the national income and in the people's earnings.

In Thomas More's Utopia all the inhabitants were to work diligently for three hours in the morning and then for another three after a midday meal and have two hours of rest. Each would be able to spend the rest of the time as he wished—not in excesses or idleness, however, but in useful occupations. Most people would devote their leisure to the sciences.

Man and the Machine. We are witnessing remarkable changes in the nature of the Soviet workers' labour, changes brought about by rapid development of technology, notably comprehensive automation.

Automation opens up breath-taking prospects. In the West, however, it is a growing cause for anxiety.

Not so very long ago American and other Western newspapers heralded it as opening an "era of prosperity" and compared it to "a magic key to the creation of values". They called it a "Western miracle" that promised all kinds of benefits to both employers and workers. Today the very same newspapers play another tune. Some even go the length of calling automation an evil, a calamity. By reducing the demand for manpower it swells the ranks of the unemployed. The purchasing power of the people drops, and goods lie unsold in the warehouses. "Buyers are laid off" complain Western newspapers. This, in turn, leads to a cut in production; why produce new goods if the old ones are not yet sold? The result is a paradox: society as a whole grows richer, while the majority of its members grow poorer.

Two French economists expressed the contradiction in the following words: "Automation is fraught with social dangers for capitalism and rejection of automation is dangerous economically."

British and American economists have estimated that a substantial portion of the workers in the capitalist countries will be jobless 20 years from now if complete automation has been carried out. A bleak prospect indeed.

What is the view? Soviet economists estimate that the number of factory, office and professional workers

employed in the Soviet economy would increase by some 40 per cent that is, by at least 25,000,000, within 20 years. And that despite intense automation.

In the USSR it is not the man who seeks the job but the job that seeks the man. The results of technical progress are, therefore, different under different social and economic conditions. The main purpose of automation in this country is to make work easier and more productive for society. This is shown strikingly by the present stage of the full-scale construction of a communist society in the USSR. The state plans technological progress in such a way as to promote the development of the individual. If labour is to be the prime vital urge, if it is to bring satisfaction and joy, if it is to help develop man's physical and spiritual abilities, and raise his cultural and professional level, it should be facilitated, freed of strenuous exhausting operations, and made as healthful as possible. Furthermore, the workday has to be cut.

Such is the social trend of technological progress in the USSR.

Automation and all-round mechanization will serve as a material basis for the gradual transition from socialist to communist labour. In the communist society mechanization will reach its highest form, with production completely automated. Between 1961 and 1970 comprehensive mechanization will already extend in industry, agriculture, municipal economy and transport.

The subsequent decade will be years of complex au-

tomation, with increasing emphasis on fully automated shops and factories. Cybernetics, electronic computer and control systems will assume the "leading" role in production, building and transport, in scientific research, planning, accounting and management. This will already be the technology of communism.

Remote control, electronics and cybernetics are the technological mainstays of the future.

Under communism there will be no unskilled labour at all. Man will merely observe, control and regulate production. The labour of the worker will become a form of engineer's and technician's work.

The change is already in evidence. Many industrial and agricultural trades in which primitive techniques and manual labour were employed for centuries have gone out of existence. Yesterday's ditch-digger operates an excavator today. The stevedore sits at the controls of a crane.

The labour of the factory worker and collective farmer, in which up-to-date machines and technical skills are employed, often combines elements of manual and mental work. At times it is hard to tell a front-rank worker from an engineer, or a front-rank collective farmer from an agronomist.

"Before, we used our hands mostly; now we use our brains," workers in an automated shop at the First State Bearing Plant in Moscow say.

Elimination of the essential distinctions between men-

tal and physical labour is bound up with a tremendous expansion in education. There are now more than 20,000,000 brain workers in the USSR, or approximately one-fifth of the total number of people employed in the economy; 40 per cent of the industrial workers and 23 per cent of the collective farmers have a secondary or higher education.

As time goes on there will be more and more people in the Soviet Union with a specialized education, who have risen to the level of technicians and engineers. And before long everyone will be cultured and educated, will have risen to the level of the intellectuals. The intelligentsia will then cease to exist as a separate social stratum, and manual and mental labour will thus merge.

Supreme Beauty. The stone carvings that decorate many buildings in Yerevan, the capital of Soviet Armenia, bear testimony to the skill of stonemason Megrab Merzakhanian. He retired on pension a long time ago with honours, and is now enjoying a well-deserved rest. As he was walking past the quarry one day he took a fancy to a slab of granite. He set to work on it, and the slab eventually turned into a beautiful fountain in the shape of the trunk of a fruit tree. When Megrab finished it he called on his friends to help him and they erected it at a spring from which people took water.

That spring has been gushing since time immemorial, and it will keep on doing so after we have built a communist society. The saying that he who can drink from a spring will not drink from a jug will probably live on, too. People will come to the spring and admire the craftsman's work.

Megrab did not ask to be paid for making the fountain. The local folk have named it "Megrab's fountain". Could a person receive any higher reward for his work?

One cannot help recalling the words of Maxim Gorky, that outstanding humanist of our age:

"And before me there spreads a magnificent picture of the Earth, polished into a gigantic emerald by the labour of the free man.

"All human beings are rational, and each has a sense of personal responsibility for what he creates and for what is being created all around him."

Man's labour. He has created all there is on earth and all that is good and splendid, all that keeps life going and adorns it and he has created it often in tears and in bitter struggle. Just imagine what will happen on earth when labour freed from oppression and illuminated by peace, joyful labour that means happiness, talent, skill and inspiration is established on earth! It will then create values more wonderful than those mankind today can dream.

FREEDOM

THE MEANING OF FREEDOM

FREE LABOUR—FOUNDATION OF ALL

FREEDOM

TO STRIKE OR TO GOVERN:

ANOTHER CONDITION

The Meaning of Freedom. No word in the languages of man is more sacred or more proud than the word "freedom."

Countless lives have been sacrificed on the altar of freedom, yet it cannot, unfortunately, be said that freedom has triumphed universally and fully, that all men and nations enjoy its fruits in complete measure. Yet, there are still nations in the chains of colonialism, that 20th century slavery.

Hunger and poverty still stalk the lives of many people in different parts of the globe, including the economically advanced countries. Despite the new miracle drugs, epidemics still flare up in various parts of the world, killing or crippling thousands of people. Millions of people still live in slums or hovels.

Unemployment, the lack of educational and vocational training facilities for the youth, the ban on progressive political parties and the peace movement, the deprivation of large groups of the population of political rights because of their colour or their property status — can all this be considered compatible with freedom?

Yet all that takes place today in countries which call themselves the "free world" and the "bulwark" of modern civilization.

What, then, does freedom mean? What should it give each citizen and society as a whole? Where is the borderline between real and alleged freedom, between freedom for all and freedom for the privileged?

Freedom has been defined in any number of ways, many of them contradictory. We shall examine it here not from the academic or philosophical point of view but as the ordinary man sees it in real life. If a person does not feel he is free no amount of philosophy will convince him of the opposite.

It would be hard to find a word that is bandied about as much as the word "freedom." Jailors and executioners often speak about it; it is sometimes used to deceive entire nations. There is nothing surprising in that, for freedom is not food, clothes, or a television set, you cannot examine it on a shop counter or take it in your hand. Western propaganda's claims about Soviet backwardness in science and engineering were exposed to the world by the sputniks and manned space flights but freedom does not lend itself to such graphic perception.

Man was given eyes to see and a brain to think, however. By using them it is not so hard to tell the difference between truth and lie.

Let us assume, for instance, that a country's constitution solemnly proclaims the rights and freedoms of its citizens, calling them "inalienable" and "natural". The fact that a right is proclaimed, however, does not necessarily mean it can be exercised. To be exercised it has to be backed up by material facilities. As Anatole France, French writer, pointed out, the millionaire and the pauper are equally free to sleep under the arches of a Seine bridge but the former prefers his mansion while the

latter is deprived of a choice. To carry out his wishes and satisfy his needs a person obviously must have the corresponding material requisites. Society can give its members real freedom only if it can first guarantee their material well-being and economic independence. One cannot but agree with the French writer F. Giroud, who in an article in the weekly *Express* entitled "Eight Per Cent Liberty" said: "Liberty, Equality, Fraternity—all these words have a hollow ring for 92 per cent of the French people—workers and peasants, who from birth onwards are outside the border of material security."

If a person is not free from hunger and want, all other rights and freedoms mean little to him, no matter how beautiful they sound. The freedom to invest capital is not much of a consolation to the jobless worker who doesn't know where his next meal will come from.

What a person wants is not freedom in the abstract but, first and foremost, freedom from want and oppression, freedom from fear of the morrow, from worry about his children's future. All this constitutes the foundation of genuine economic and social freedom for the people at large.

Many people talk about freedom in purely abstract terms, as though it referred to birds in the sky instead of to human beings living under the definite conditions of a definite society. And what they say usually boils down to this: freedom is a man's right to do whatever he wants.

That may sound wonderful, but on second thought you will realize that very few people in the West live according to that principle. Those few are the men who own the factories, the land, the banks, the railways. They can really do whatever they want. But not the overwhelming majority of the people. Millions cannot even enjoy such a natural right as the right to work, let alone unlimited freedom. Just try asking one of America's 4,000,000 unemployed if he can do whatever he wants. His answer will most likely be unprintable.

But he has full freedom of speech and of thought, the supporter of Western freedoms will tell you. A convincing reply to that was given in a questionnaire which the French *Express* conducted a few years ago. The magazine put the following question to its readers: "Which is more important to you—freedom of thought or a rise in the living standard?" One of the readers voted for freedom of thought. He was Jean S., a prosperous commercial director. Jacques V., a factory worker, wrote: "I think a rise in the living standard is more important because that is something 90 per cent of the French people want." A woman reader said that freedom of thought was a good thing only if it helped to improve people's lives. She is right, of course. There is hardly any sense in "freedom of thought" if it cannot radically improve the living standard of the millions. The right of the hungry man to talk about a steak will not make him feel any less hungry. Yet that is the kind of freedom often held up as a model.

Free Labour—Foundation of All Freedoms.

For many centuries men thought that a situation in which some were masters and others slaves was eternal and unchangeable, pre-ordained by the gods and their emissaries here on earth. Dynasties came and went, and so did forms of rule; one government succeeded another—but the unjust organization of society, its division into masters and subordinates, remained.

The people's striving for freedom had to triumph, however: At last the hour of freedom struck.

The greatness of the October Socialist Revolution in Russia in 1917 lies in that it brought real freedom by rebuilding society on totally new principles.

The switch from private to social ownership led to radical changes in all spheres of life, in the very structure of society. That historic act was the decisive step in turning the ideal of freedom for all into a living reality. For the first time in history there arose a society consisting of free and equal working classes—workers and peasants—also of the working intelligentsia, linked to those two classes by close ties of kinship. The relations between the workers, the peasants and the intelligentsia are those of friendship and mutual co-operation free from all forms of exploitation and oppression, the relations of people jointly engaged in building a new society.

After thorough study of life in the Soviet Union Dr. Hewlett Johnson, the former Dean of Canterbury wrote that the socialist world had long ago created broad-

er opportunities for freedom and all-round development of the individual than had ever been achieved in the capitalist world.

He went on to point out that socialist society embarked on the road of freedom by ensuring the population food and clothing and the right to education for all classes and all nationalities, and continued the invaluable development of freedom by guaranteeing one and all the right to work.

The Soviet citizen not only creates the riches of his country but decides how to distribute them. The rise in each family's living standards and in incomes is in direct proportion to the growth of the national income. That is because under socialism the national income belongs to the whole people. The higher the national income the greater the people's prosperity. Three-quarters of the Soviet national income goes to satisfy the material and cultural needs of the citizens. Consequently, the socialist system reflects and protects the interests not of any group of individuals or privileged section of the society but the interests of the people as a whole.

Some Western sociologists represent the unorganised, chaotic nature of the capitalist economy as the highest manifestation of freedom in social life. "Free enterprise," however, has long since become a fiction. Not only because it calls for more money than a man can earn by his own labour, but because the monopolistic corporations which now dominate practically the entire capi-

talist economy prevent any freedom of private enterprise. Free competition long ago became an anachronism. The monopolies dominate the scene.

Scientific planned organization of the socialist economy provided broad scope for the development of the country's productive forces, progress in science and technology, a steady growth of the country's wealth, and a correspondingly steady rise in the living standard of the entire population. This free, unhampered economic development of society has yielded rich fruit. Within the brief period of forty-six years the USSR emerged from a backward agrarian country to become a great industrial power that has already outstripped the United States and other capitalist countries in many economic indices and technological achievements.

Under socialism all of society has become free in the deepest and fullest sense of the word. To put it another way, each member of society has become truly free, for freedom for all cannot but mean freedom for each. A genuinely civilized society can have no goals other than those of the individuals that go to make up that society. Only by serving each individual and helping him to achieve his aspirations does it justify its purpose. That is what a socialist society does. It has created real opportunities for each individual to develop his abilities unhindered and to satisfy his ever growing needs. These conditions include, above all, the guaranteed right to work and leisure, free education and medical care, a steady

shortening of the working hours, and large-scale construction of housing and cultural facilities.

There are miracles at every step; the earth and the air are filled with them; but the feeling that predominates over all others is that of admiration for the love of man that is manifested at every step and in every way, big and small, said Albert Kahn, the American author, noting what is probably the main feature of the new society.

One of the most important factors in the free development of the individual under socialism is the opportunity all citizens have to learn a trade or follow a profession in conformity with their interests and inclinations, according to the dictates of their hearts and minds. All who want to learn, to improve their qualifications and educational standards get material support and moral encouragement. Almost three million factory and office workers are taught new trades at industrial establishments annually, while more than six million improve their skills. Many adults as well as all young people engage in some form of study. No wonder 281 out of every 1,000 people in the Soviet Union have a full secondary or higher education. Constant self-improvement and advancement of the cultural level of the population is not only highly beneficial to society as a whole. It is also the most important means of heightening each individual's awareness and activity and of broadening his creative possibilities and range of interest.

Technological progress and rising labour productivity permit socialist society steadily to shorten working hours. Within the present decade people will get considerably more leisure for recreation, studies, sport, the arts and travelling. Reduction of working hours will be accompanied by a rise in standard of living. Thus technology and science, which under socialism have peaceful, constructive goals, become the most important factor contributing to emancipation of the individual, to his physical and intellectual development.

In a socialist society freedom from want means not only economic, material freedom but also spiritual freedom, for it frees the individual from oppressive fears and cares, and is a source of optimism and cheerfulness, traits which all impartial observers have found to be characteristic of the majority of Soviet people.

Free labour must, of course, be reinforced by freedom to use the benefits it creates. Here socialist society follows the truly just principle of "From each according to his ability, to each according to his work." In the USSR the work a man does is the main standard by which he is judged, and is the basis of material compensation and moral encouragement. The more and the better he works for society the more he receives of its material benefits and the greater the respect he enjoys. Neither great wealth nor position is inherited in the Soviet Union. Each person makes a place for himself in society through his free work in keeping with his knowledge, abilities, ener-

gy and experience.

"Work in the USSR is daily creation, and the creator is the ruler," said Helene Parmelen, French author who visited the Soviet Union and studied its way of life. "The factory worker, the chief engineer of a big power station, the office worker, the salesgirl in a grocery and the taxi driver are all rulers. Personal initiative is the powerful key to the development of the new society. That means the conditions of life here favour maximum development of the individual."

To Strike or to Govern. Soviet Communists have been accused of many sins. True, the list of sins is much shorter now than it was forty, twenty or even ten years ago. Not because Soviet Communists have come to their senses and bought themselves indulgence at a suitable price. Life itself and the Soviet Union's indisputable achievements in all spheres of life have dispersed, like smoke, the malicious slander of some and the indifferent ignorance of others. However, absurd accusations still crop up in the foreign press and in statements made by certain types of people.

"Communism is incompatible with personal freedom; it tramples it underfoot." This is a favourite theme of anti-Soviet propaganda today, used by sociologists, newsmen, ministers, diplomats, generals and other prominent figures in the West. At all times and under all circum-

stances they reiterate: "You may have a high rate of economic development but you have no freedom"; "You may have put a pennant on the moon but you are not free"; "You may have fifty-six million engaged in some form of study, but you lack freedom."

The Soviet system "has spread education and culture throughout the country" and the USSR "now leads the world in scientific progress" says Professor Emil Giraux of France in an article called "The Real Nature of the Soviet System," but goes on to assert there is no freedom of the spirit, no "freedom to express one's thoughts" in the USSR. "We feel both admiration and indignation" is how Professor Giraux sums up his attitude to the Soviet way of life.

For our part we cannot help noting that some people understand freedom in a rather singular way. It takes a rich imagination to accuse the Soviet Communists of "crushing" freedom and "infringing" on the rights of the individual, and yet consider the Salazar regime in Portugal to be free, and praise the policy of terror and repression in Angola. How can you call countries free where men are insulted, beaten and even killed for being black, where police batons and tear-gas bombs are used to disperse demonstrations of unemployed and needy war veterans, where progressive organizations are banned and Communist Parties are outlawed? That is what the "free world" looks like to the unprejudiced observer instead of as seen through the eyes of **Life** or **Look**.

Socialist society does not have either masters or slaves, either exploiters or exploited, either oppressors or oppressed. In the Soviet Union there can be no "freedom" to exploit the population or oppress other peoples, "freedom" to bribe the press or buy the votes of legislators, "freedom" to preach racialism, "freedom" to call for a nuclear war.

The fact that socialist society is free of such "freedoms" makes it the most genuinely democratic, the most humane, just and free society in the world. Those who shed "crocodile tears" over an alleged lack of individual freedom in the USSR ought to know that.

Government by the people is one of the oldest political ideas. It is an expression of an age-old striving for freedom, justice and equality, for providing each man, each citizen with the inalienable right to take part to run the country. For a long time the idea was merely a phrase. Constitutions were proclaimed, governments established, wars declared and armistices concluded in the name of the people, but the people continued to be subjects, the cat's paws in the hands of the professional politicians. Genuine government by the people is possible only when the people are masters of their destiny, when they exert a constant and decisive influence on state policy. That is the case under socialism, where besides owning the land, the factories, the mineral wealth and means of production, the working people are in full control of political power.

The socialist state could not exist without the active, constant and decisive participation of its citizens in government. The goals of the Soviet system are the goals of the people reflecting their basic interests, and can be achieved only with maximum participation of the population.

Lenin's idea of the widest, constant and decisive public participation in governing the socialist state has found practical embodiment in the Soviets of Working People's Deputies. Soviet citizens elect all bodies of state power, from the District Soviets to the Supreme Soviet, by free, equal and universal suffrage. Some 140 million people, almost the entire adult population, went to the polls in the last elections to the Supreme Soviet of the USSR.

Commenting on the fact that in the Soviet Union the candidates are as a rule fully supported by the electorate, some illwishers cite it as proof of the lack of free elections. But how could you force the population of a vast, multi-national country to vote against its will and against its own interests by universal, equal and secret ballot? Those claims are obviously absurd and false.

What makes elections in the USSR genuinely free is the fact that the candidates are nominated by the people themselves, from among their midst. This explains why the electorate are so politically active and unanimous in support of their candidates.

People in the USSR do not go on strike or stage polit-

ical demonstrations of protest. That is regarded in the West as a lack of political freedom. The very opposite is the case, however. Why do working people in the capitalist countries strike and stage demonstrations? Because that is their only form of participating in the economic and political life, the only way of protesting against exploitation. Nobody has seen the Duponts, Rockefellers or Morgans come out into the streets to demonstrate. Why should they walk back and forth in front of the Capitol carrying slogans when they can settle matters inside the Capitol? They are the masters there.

Can Soviet workers or peasants be dissatisfied with something? Of course. But they have no reason to protest in front of the Kremlin when they can settle everything much more effectively inside the Kremlin, where they are the complete and only masters. Of the 1,378 members of the Supreme Soviet, the Soviet Union's highest legislative body, 831 persons are either industrial workers or peasants. They govern the country, make the laws, decide organizational problems of industry and agriculture, and direct foreign policy. The number of industrial workers and peasants taking a direct part in governing the country increases with each year.

Of the 536 members of the US Congress 146 are businessmen and 314 are lawyers representing the interests of the big monopolies, but there is not a single worker. One can only agree with the remark made by

an American sociologist that in the United States "wealth is a stepping-stone to power, and vice versa".

Socialist democracy not only ensures the fullest representation of the people's interests in the governing bodies but it also ensures control over those bodies. All members of Soviets are obliged to report back to the electorate from time to time. If the electorate feel a member is not carrying out his duties satisfactorily they have the right to recall him at any time. This right is recorded in the Soviet Constitution.

Soviet members of parliament are not professional politicians. They take an active part in production, and in the country's cultural and political life, since they combine their parliamentary duties with their regular jobs. They are in close touch with the people and know the people's interests and needs.

It is a great misfortune when a man's body is in chains, but it is no less a disaster when his thoughts are fettered. No government in the world can prevent a man from thinking his own thoughts. But to have to keep them to himself is a great deprivation, because of man's social nature.

Like any other freedom, freedom of speech cannot be regarded outside of its relation to the social conditions under which it is put into practice. It is a means to an end. Communism clearly understands its great significance and vast power.

It is sometimes claimed in the West that the Soviet people have no opportunity freely to express their opinion because all media of information—newspapers, radio and TV belong to the state. The Soviet State is a state of the working people, and so it is to the working people that the press, radio and TV belong.

The main Soviet newspapers alone receive more than a million letters annually. Some are printed, while the matters brought up in the others are investigated. Criticism in the press is never left without an answer. The person to whom it is directed, whether a factory worker or a cabinet minister, must provide an explanation and a report on his action to correct the situation that was criticised.

The work of all organizations and institutions in a socialist society is permeated with a spirit of criticism and self-criticism, which are an inalienable part of the political and public life. That is freedom of thought, the right of every citizen to take an active part in settling affairs of state, both large and small. It is a freedom and a right which are regarded not as a private matter, but as one of social significance.

The people in the Soviet Union have the final and decisive word in deciding all important matters of state. Many questions of home and foreign policy are put before the public for discussion. In recent years the Soviet people have discussed the draft laws on the reorganization of industrial management, on pensions, on the

further development of public education, and on the national economic Seven-Year Plan, among others. The entire country discussed the draft of the new Communist Party's Programme. There were more than 500,000 discussion meetings attended by a total of over 70,000,000 people, of whom 4,600,000 came forward with concrete proposals. Newspapers, magazines and Party and governmental bodies received more than 300,000 letters from citizens.

Public discussion in the USSR is important not only as a manifestation of the popular will but also as a means of encouraging the population to be more active politically; it gives each citizen broad opportunities to take part in deciding state matters.

No sane person could object to such an understanding and realization of freedom of speech in socialist society.

In the West, the press is known as the "fifth Great Power." By whom is it ruled? Who has the decisive word?

The answers to those questions completely expose the claim that there is unlimited freedom of speech in the capitalist world. Of the 4,300,000 copies of newspapers circulated daily in Paris 3,800,000 are controlled by the Bussak, Ameri and Hachette trusts. Naturally, all that printed matter upholds the interests of the owners of the newspaper trusts and allied groups. Freedom to spread ideas, it turns out, is nine-tenths freedom to

spread the ideas that Bussak and other millionaires support. No one, of course, is prohibited from starting his own newspaper or setting up his own radio station. All he needs is the money to do it.

So it turns out that the solemnly proclaimed freedom of speech is nothing more than a formal right which the overwhelming majority of the members of society are unable to enjoy.

Another Condition. Bourgeois ideology can no longer refuse to admit that greater material and social opportunities stimulate the individual to develop his talents and provide him with favourable conditions for doing so. Yet for the majority of society such opportunities do not exist. In one of his books the American sociologist Sidney Hook says that if restrictions are put on social opportunities the vast mass of people will remain, despite all their differences, uniformly dull, while if social opportunities are extended each person will be stimulated to develop his talents and the possibility of creative work will be increased. In this respect, says Mr. Hook, every individual who does his work well and contributes to the common good is a hero. But it would be utopian, he says, to imagine that that was at all feasible. In a capitalist society, yes. In the Soviet Union, however, we see that it is not only quite feasible but is actually a condition for the development of socialism.

The first Sputniks and the first Soviet man in space took the world by surprise. People abroad racked their brains over the "secret" that had given the Soviet Union such astounding scientific and technological achievements. There is no secret to it, though: Socialism, the most progressive of all social systems, led to rapid progress in science and engineering primarily because it had lifted the culture and education of the entire population to an unprecedentedly high level and created the conditions for each individual to develop his mental capacities.

The right to education is probably one of the most important rights any country can give its citizens to ensure their freedom, for education has always been a guarantee of free thinking. It is significant that after he seized power General Franco hurriedly closed down most of the schools that had been established throughout the republic during the Spanish Civil War.

Socialism has produced the most progressive system of education in the world, ensuring the population universal, free schooling and universal literacy and culture. Not a single objective observer can deny that. Socialism, says Dyson Carter, Canadian author, has brought amazing cultural progress to 200 million people, giving scope to the creative abilities of the masses as no other civilization has. The cultural advance in the Soviet years are highlighted by the following figures. About 56,000,000 people in the USSR today attend schools at various levels (including those who study by correspondence) as against

10,600,000 in 1914. The Soviet Union's colleges and universities have an enrollment of more than 2,600,000, which is more than double the number in all the capitalist countries of Europe put together. The USSR now has more than 350,000 research workers.

Socialism has given the population at large easy access to libraries, museums, art studios, theatres, schools and scientific societies. Tens of thousands of elementary and secondary schools, more than 700 schools of higher learning, 400,000 libraries, 500 theatres and 4,000 scientific institutions, and thousands of scientific societies of all kinds are all eloquent evidence that the whole range of country's cultural resources have become fully accessible to the masses.

Creating social conditions under which each citizen can develop his talents and abilities is a noble but difficult task. The Soviet Union is coping with it successfully.

Many different ways and means are being used. Soviet boys and girls are encouraged to attend clubs at school and at the local Young Pioneer centres where they go in for various activities in which their abilities display themselves and develop. That was how Mikhail Botvinnik, for many years world chess champion, aircraft designer Sergei Ilyushin, Academician Victor Ambartsumyan, the famous ballerina Maya Plisetskaya and many other world-famous Soviet scientists, writers and stage artists first discovered their path to self-expression.

In the socialist society adults as well are encouraged

in every way to go on learning and develop their creative potentialities. Creativity and cultural advancement are promoted by the evening and correspondence schools and colleges, the scientific societies, and the work-improvement and invention groups that exist at practically every industrial establishment of any size. Inventors and innovators are to be found everywhere. Altogether, there are some three and a half million inventors in the country.

Amateur talent activities provide another avenue along which people can discover and develop creative ability. Millions of Soviet people go in for amateur activities in all kinds of groups, studios, troupes and the like. The Soviet Union now has about 600,000 such groups, with more than 9,000,000 members. They are a source from which the country draws gifted actors, musicians and painters.

Amateur folk art, with active and widespread participation in groups cultivating it, is a foundation for the successful development of Soviet culture.

The new stage in building a communist society is producing new forms of Soviet cultural development. Of late People's Theatres have been arising spontaneously in towns and villages in many parts of the country. The People's Universities of Culture, another instance of popular initiative, have also become widespread. These are free public lecture courses and seminars conducted by prominent scientists, artists and writers. The audito-

riums and studios are always crowded, testifying to the people's diverse interests and the broad opportunities each citizen has to enrich his mind and develop his artistic tastes as a harmoniously integrated personality.

The culture of the communist society will assimilate and develop the best that world culture has produced and will be the highest stage of human culture; it will embody all the diversity and wealth of the spiritual life of society. Its lofty idea-content and humanism will be manifested in a striving to free the individual from the fetters of obscurantism and ignorance. Classless in character and common to all men, it will promote the entire process of spiritual development. Under communism people will be harmoniously developed in every way, with broad cultural horizons. The individual will be able to go beyond the confines of a single trade or profession and become skilled in several. Extensive knowledge will help people to work more efficiently and have a better grasp of the meaning of social phenomena.

The further advancement of science, literature and art, with the growing participation of the people at large, will contribute significantly to the flowering of the human spirit.

Karl Marx said that people living under communism would preserve all the riches "of the development they have attained" but would regain the genuine "humaneness" they lost to a considerable degree in the course

of their development. In future people will not have to waste their time and effort in the struggle for existence or for freedom and peace on earth. They will be able to devote their efforts and abilities to creating the beautiful and the lofty. The man of the future will harmoniously combine great spiritual wealth with moral

purity and physical perfection. The cultural progress called into being by communism will surpass all other periods in mankind's history because it will represent the summit of the spiritual development of all members of society and a realization of mankind's oldest goals and loftiest ideals.

EQUALITY

DREAMS AND REALITY

THIS IS WHAT HAS BEEN ACCOMPLISHED

FULL RIGHTS FOR WOMEN

WIPING OUT OLD ANTAGONISMS

WE LOOK AHEAD

TOMORROW

Dreams and Reality. A character in a story by Jerome K. Jerome, the British author, falls asleep after a fine dinner during which the conversation turned on future equality, and dreams he is living in the 29th century.

It is a strange world he sees in his dreams.

All the streets are the same, with identical buildings. Everyone in the streets is dressed the same, in grey trousers and blouse. Everyone's hair is cut the same way and is dyed black, so that people look exactly alike. Everyone eats the same food and is given the same amount of water for washing. To prevent any inequality due to talent, there are no theatres.

This caricature of equality is no exception. Today, too, a communist society is sometimes represented as a vast barracks in which all individuality and all differences among people have been erased.

Universal equality is an ideal that has stirred the minds and hearts of millions for centuries, but such pictures of it have little appeal. On awakening Jerome's character recalls his nightmare with horror and is happy to be back in the old, familiar world.

From which the reader should conclude that he lives in the best of all possible worlds, with a way of life that abounds in individuality, from the millionaire to the slum-dweller.

Let us scan briefly the history of equality.

Take the slaves of the ancient world.

To his master a slave was a "thing with a voice". He could be bought and sold, or even killed with impunity.

It was here, in the slave-holding world, where for the first time human inequality was rife, that the tale of the Golden Age arose. In that Golden Age people were not selfish or evil; they were free, equal and happy all their lives.

There was a grain of truth in the tale: the slave system had not always existed. But the ancient dreamers of equality could not imagine their Golden Age as having been a time when primitive tribes waged a constant struggle against the elemental forces of nature for sheer survival.

Feudalism replaced slavery, and now it was the serf peasant, not the slave, that toiled for his master. He, too, could be bought and sold. The only improvement was that he could not be killed with impunity.

When the capitalist system was ushered in it looked as though the age-old fetters of inequality had been struck off. There were no longer slaves or serfs; the sale of human beings was outlawed; everyone was equal in the eyes of the law.

It is clear, however, that for a man to be the equal of others he must have the means of achieving that equality, that is, the means of attaining a decent existence.

Why is half of the population of the world over the age of 15 still illiterate? Why have 90 per cent of the

population of Africa never gone to school?

Why is an African in South Africa fined 300 pounds or imprisoned for three years if he sits down on a bench marked "For Whites Only"?

Why are women paid less for doing the same work as men?

The answer to all these questions reduces to the same. When the factories, land, banks and mines belong to a small social group the maximum benefits from them go to that small group and to those to whom they entrust the management of their property. The millions of working people get the crumbs. When there is danger of profits dropping, the owners close down factories, fire the workers, and destroy the "surpluses". They burn wheat, pour milk into rivers, and hold back fabrics and foot-wear in the warehouses. That is done to maintain high prices and prevent losses in profits.

Inequality of property gives rise to inequality in all other spheres—politics, law, culture, nationality, the family, and so on.

When you consider, for example, that tuition costs \$ 1,110 a year at Chicago University and \$ 1,450 at Columbia University, it is easy to see who gets a higher education and who goes without.

Or recall the outcome of the attempt made by Negro boys and girls in Little Rock to take advantage of their "right to education".

Under such a system universal equality, no matter

how much proclaimed, is clearly impossible. It becomes an empty phrase.

Equality is basically a simple idea. People differ from one another in ability, in individual needs and tastes, in the climatic conditions in which they live. But they should be equal in their social status, in political and civil rights, in the part they take in social labour, in material security, and in level of education and cultural and moral development.

Western propagandists assure people from childhood that they can become millionaires if they are lucky, or President if they use their heads and energy properly. Some still believe those fairy tales.

It is claimed that everyone is equal before the law in the so-called free world, that all have equal rights and an equal influence in society. Is that true? Compare the Mellons, Morgans and other Wall Street multimillionaires with the ordinary workers, or with the millions of unemployed and the impoverished farmers. One group has an income thousands of times greater than the other. Accordingly, its political weight in society, chance to run for legislative bodies or make itself heard in the press, over the radio and on TV is thousands of times greater. The relationship between a capitalist and a worker may be compared to that between a ton and an ounce. Equality before the law does not necessarily mean equality in actual fact.

An Italian writer has said that if people could feed

on words rather than food, if they could cloth themselves in words rather than in cotton and wool, and if they could live in houses made of words, rather than of brick the concept of equality would probably have no opponents. In practice, however, genuine equality calls for adequate material and social conditions.

Take the United States of America.

According to the admission of late President John Kennedy 17 million Americans go to bed hungry every night and poverty has not been outlived. It was a disgrace, he said, that in America, the richest country, 32 million people had a lamentably inadequate living standards, seven million Americans were dependent on charity, five million apartments in the towns did not have running water or modern plumbing, American towns were filled with breeding-grounds of juvenile delinquency, and too great a number of farmers lived in extreme poverty.

Then, consider the difference in economic and cultural development between a handful of capitalist countries and their dependencies in Asia, Africa and Latin America. Consider how great unemployment, agrarian overpopulation and poverty are in those countries.

The efforts to improve the position of the broad masses in the underdeveloped countries have thus far been tragically futile, says the *New York Times*. Almost 2,000 million of our fellow men, says the paper, starve, have no medical aid, they are clothed in rags, live in

filth, have no decent shelter, and, what is worse, cannot expect that their lives or those of their children will improve. The destitute and starving countries are making extremely slow progress, while in some parts of the world their position has been going from bad to worse in the past ten years. Says the big American capitalist Randol: The gulf between the well-to-do and the disinherited countries tends to widen rather than diminish.

Per capita annual income in some countries of Africa and Asia is now only about one-twentieth of the level in the United States, and in others almost one-fiftieth of that level.

History has shown that private enterprise cannot alleviate the social inequality of people and nations. Some theorists in the West try to prove that inequality is eternal, natural and just. Charles Bowyer, American sociologist, claims, for example, that the unequal degree of people's needs and differences in natural abilities constitute natural foundation for the existence of classes.

Real equality among people and among nations demands, first of all, economic equality. Socialism is the most important step to complete all-round equality.

In the Soviet Union and the other socialist countries the means of production are the collective property of the entire people and, consequently, benefit all. Maximum satisfaction of the material requirements of the people is an intrinsic law of the socialist economy. The aim in building communism is to create an abundance of mate-

rial and intellectual values for everyone. Hence growth in production and technological progress here are invariably accompanied by a rise in the living standards of the population. By 1965, when the current Seven-Year Plan of economic development is completed, the Soviet people's real incomes will have risen by about 40 per cent.

Everything that is done in the socialist countries to confirm social and economic equality is proclaimed an "agonizing experiment" by Western propaganda, which cannot accept the fact that the achievements in the Soviet Union and the other socialist countries are not just an experiment but significant progress in the history of mankind.

This Is What Has Been Accomplished.

What has socialism done to put an end to all forms of oppression and all manifestations of social inequality?

All Soviet citizens are equal in the most important thing—their relation to the means of production. Private ownership has been replaced by public ownership. No one in our country can oppress anyone else or be oppressed by anyone. That is the most important social revolution, the most effective way of achieving genuine equality.

Under socialism everyone has the same opportunity to obtain work, whether young or mature, man or woman, a member of the largest nationality in the country or the smallest. Equal pay for equal work and higher pay

for more qualified work is a law of our life.

More than 100 nationalities live in the Soviet Union. Most of them were brutally exploited before the socialist revolution of 1917. Many were reduced to the status of colonial peoples; with extremely backward economies they were undeveloped politically and culturally, almost totally illiterate, deprived of medical assistance. They were prey to hunger, disease and slow extinction.

One of the first legislative acts of the Soviet Government was the Declaration of the Rights of the Peoples of Russia, giving all peoples complete political freedom, and guaranteeing each the right to self-determination, including the right to secede and form an independent state.

The decreeing of equality, however, was only the first step in solving the problem of nationalities.

Giving political freedom to the oppressed peoples of the former Russian empire was far from all that had to be done, and not even the most important thing. It would still take years to change the way of life of peoples inhabiting areas which had neither factories nor railways, to eradicate the national discord that had been cultivated for centuries, and to educate people who not only lacked a written language but did not even know what writing was. The inequality which had existed for centuries among the peoples inhabiting this vast country made itself felt at every step.

To turn proclaimed rights into actual rights the Soviet

government promoted particularly rapid economic development in the territories where the formerly oppressed peoples lived.

Suffice it to say that while gross industrial output in the USSR as a whole was 45 times greater in 1960 than in 1913, in Kazakhstan, once one of Russia's most backward regions, it was 57 times greater.

The new economic foundation gave the 15 constituent republics an opportunity to develop science and culture at a more rapid rate.

Peoples which had formerly lacked all political rights acquired statehood. They formed Union and Autonomous Republics, and Autonomous Regions and National Areas.

The Constitution of the USSR gives each nation and nationality equal representation in the Soviet of Nationalities, one of the two chambers of the Supreme Soviet of the USSR, irrespective of the size of its territory or population. Each Union Republic is represented by 25 deputies. That applies equally to the Russian Federation, which accounts for 56 per cent of the country's population, and to the Estonian SSR, which accounts for 0.56 per cent of it. Each republic and autonomous region exercises state authority independently, with its own executive, planning and economic bodies, its own budget, press, radio and television service, schools and colleges. Actual equality of all nations and nationalities in the Soviet Union, and not merely declared equality, is one of the greatest achievements of our age.

Full Rights for Women. How many poems, serenades, paintings and statues have been created in honour of women! Yet how little was done all through the ages to give women equality. It is not easy to recall, without looking them up, the names of women who were great scientists, authors or public figures.

Women, the most oppressed and humiliated section of a nation, are more interested than anyone else in the establishment of communism, declared August Bebel, the German revolutionary.

What made women's position more difficult through the ages was that besides oppression as part of an oppressed class or oppressed nation they suffered family oppression, for their fate was implicit obedience to the will of men, whether fathers, husbands, brothers or guardians. Family oppression weighed as heavily on the "society woman" as on the ordinary farm labourer, but the life of the working woman was particularly hard and joyless. "Forever a mother, nurse, slave, pilgrim and toiler," wrote the Russian democratic poet Nekrassov of women.

The socialist revolution put an end once and for all to restriction of women's rights in all spheres of life.

At the French Exhibition in Moscow a few years ago copies of the magazine *Elle* were handed out to visitors. On the cover was a pretty girl, elegantly dressed, against the background of the Eiffel Tower. The introductory article stated with pride that nine women were members of the Chamber of Deputies of the French Parliament and

four had been elected to the Senate.

There are 366 women in the Supreme Soviet of the USSR. More than half a million women are members of local Soviets. Women are a major cultural force in the USSR. There are more than 600 women authors of books, more than 1,700 women who are artists, and over 2,000 women architects. Many religions (Christianity and Islam are examples) scorned women. Before the 1917 Revolution these religions influenced social mentality. Now the situation has changed. Women in the Soviet Union are especially respected by all members of society, and concern for them is a prominent feature of Soviet life.

Those who work get a long leave with full pay, before and after giving birth. Women receive a number of substantial benefits from the state connected with the care of their children.

Changes in the life of many thousands of women in Soviet Central Asia offer striking evidence of genuine equality. For centuries the women of Central Asia were crushed not only by social, legal and family oppression, but also by oppression as members of nationalities that did not enjoy equal rights.

Take the words of Tursunoi Akhunova, an Uzbek woman who operates a cotton-harvesting machine and who has thousands of women followers in Uzbekistan and other republics of Central Asia. Her fame has spread throughout the Soviet Union. She says: "You have to know a little of what life was like in the past for the

women of the East to understand how wonderful it is for them today. Think of what life must have been like for the Uzbek woman if after death, the Koran said, she had to be buried deeper in the earth than a man."

Y. Nasriddinova, a woman who is President of the Uzbek Republic, Chairman of the Uzbek Supreme Soviet, says:

"Our women are happy. The present-day position of women in Uzbek society is as different from what it was in the past as day is from night. Taking advantage of their right to work, they are making a rich contribution to Uzbek economic and cultural development. About 5,000 Uzbek women engineers and 10,500 technicians are employed in industry and construction. In agriculture there are more than 3,000 women agronomists, livestock experts, veterinary doctors and foresters. All of 26,000 women work in the health services. Thousands of Uzbek women are schoolteachers. Uzbekistan has 3,700 women researchers of whom 23 hold the degree of Doctor of Science and 640 the degree of Candidate of Science. Women make up 40 per cent of college-trained specialists.

"An entire era lies behind these figures. The days are not long past, when an Uzbek woman risked her life if she dared to lift her veil from her face. Today it sounds fantastic. But it was true.

"How can one not take pride, therefore, in the fact that Khadichah Sulemanova, Doctor of Law, has spoken

before lawyers in London, Tokyo, Vienna, Delhi, Cairo and Amsterdam. International gathering of historians have listened with interest to reports made by Sabakhat Arimdzhanova, Director of the Institute of Oriental Studies of the Academy of Sciences of the Uzbek SSR. Our Polish and Indonesian friends gave a warm welcome to Professor Munira Tursunkhodzayeva, Doctor of Medicine, when she visited them. The poems of the gifted Zulfia Israilova, a noted public figure, have been translated not only into the languages of the peoples of the USSR but also into many foreign languages. Professor Maksuda Hodzhinova, Doctor of Technical Sciences and Corresponding Member of the Academy of Sciences of the Uzbek SSR, has won renown far beyond the borders of Uzbekistan."

Uzbekistan is not an exception. Women's creative energies and abilities develop everywhere in the Soviet Union.

Wiping Out Old Antagonisms. Farm work is a healthful occupation with charms of its own. Down through the centuries, however, it was—and in many countries still is—so hard and exhausting that the tiller of the soil had hardly the time to lift his head to admire the surroundings or to take a deep breath of the invigorating air. Its ruthless lord, the city, sucks his very blood.

"The plain is dead; the city is eating its heart," wrote at the turn of the century the Belgian poet and dramatist Emile Verhaeren, whose favourite subject was the disintegration of the patriarchal village and the rise of the capitalist "octopus-city", which he saw as a symbol of horror, death and destruction.

Under socialism the situation has changed fundamentally. The city has become a friend of the village, helping it to surmount its backwardness, and in particular supplying it abundantly with machinery that lighten farm work, make it increasingly creative, and turn the farmer into a cultured and educated worker. The country dweller can easily switch to a job in the city, and the city worker can take up a job on the land without deteriorations in his skill. In this way the traditional distinctions between town and countryside are gradually being erased.

Skilled personnel are sent to the villages; hospitals, clinics, schools and other establishments are built there. Illiteracy is being completely wiped out in the countryside, just as in the towns. Under socialism the economic, and intellectual life of the village undergoes a radical change. As regards the level of technical equipment of labour, in standard of living and education the farm workers are rapidly catching up with urban population.

One of the most difficult heritages of the old world is the antithesis between manual and mental workers.

The slave-owner frankly regarded manual labour as an occupation that was beneath the dignity of a free

man. It was the despised lot of the slave.

In the opinion of the feudal lord his "blue blood" freed him from the need to work. Work was a burden that fell on the shoulders of the "commoner".

The capitalist of today hypocritically sings the praises of manual work—the manual work of others, that is, the work that makes him rich.

This antagonism, nurtured on centuries of inequality in property ownership, has developed into one of the most acute social and moral problems of the present age.

It might seem that nothing could be more absurd and unnatural than the artificial division of these two forms of human activity. When manual work is rational instead of being exhausting, it brings with it physical well-being and pleasure. In antiquity Plutarch commented thus on the effeminacy and idleness of the slave-owner: "The one who, desirous of preserving his strength, does not work is like the one who, desirous of developing his voice, keeps silent."

On the other hand, all intellectual activity, no matter how far removed it may seem at first glance from muscular work, is in the final analysis a derivative of the fundamental human activity, manual work. For labour created and developed the human brain, and made it capable of the boldest and profoundest abstractions. As Marx put it, body and mind are always connected by invisible threads.

Socialism solved that eternal problem, for the first

time in history. It did away with the contradiction between manual and mental activity.

In the Soviet Union a new intelligentsia, many millions strong, has arisen from the people and is ardently devoted to the people. The educational and cultural level of the whole population has risen significantly. The decisive factors in that process have been the Soviet system of education and the shortening of the workday. The door to secondary and higher education, both of which are provided by the state free of charge, has been opened wide to millions of working people. The cultural level of the working class and the peasantry has risen to such a degree that the gulf between the educated minority and the uneducated "masses" has ceased to exist.

Three-quarters of tsarist Russia's population did not know how to read or write. Although the years immediately following the revolution were years of severe economic disruption caused by the First World War, the foreign intervention and the Civil War, the Soviet Government carried out a programme for the universal abolition of illiteracy. After that, universal, compulsory, free elementary education was introduced. After the Second World War universal seven-year schooling came into force, and today the Soviet Union has universal eight-year schooling. Approximately half of the graduates of the eight-year school continue their education in the ten-year or eleven-year schools. More than 5,000,000 young people are attending specialized secondary schools, colleges and universities.

The USSR has the largest percentage of college-trained people, of the people with higher education than any other country. The college attendance in the USSR is higher than in all the European capitalist countries taken together. The Soviet Union annually trains three times as many engineers as the United States.

A genuine cultural revolution has taken place in the USSR. It has opened to the widest sections of population priceless cultural treasures and has forged a new intelligentsia, many millions strong, who have unlimited possibilities for educational and creative activity.

We Look Ahead. One of the things that make the socialist system so just and so humane is the fact that the rights proclaimed in the Constitution—the right of suffrage, the right to work, the right to rest and leisure, the right to education, the right to material security in old age and in case of loss of working capacity, the equality of women, the equality of nationalities, and so on—are guaranteed by the whole of the country's economic, political and cultural set-up. Pensions, grants to students, grants to mothers of large families, the allocations for building and maintaining schools, hospitals, libraries, recreation centres, and so on and so forth—are not all these absolute guarantees of the rights of the citizen?

We look ahead, however. We realize that "equal rights" is not yet the equality that constitutes our ideal.

Take, for instance, the socialist principle of the distri-

bution of benefits "to each according to his work", that is, equal remuneration for equal work. Does that principle ensure complete equality of distribution? It does not, for the **same** yardstick (work) is applied to **different** people. People differ from one another, as we know, in ability, in qualifications, in family position, in cultural level, etc. If you compare the work of a milling-machine operator with that of a bookbinder, for instance, you will easily see that the first calls for greater skill and effort, and, hence, should be better paid. Or take the work of a coal miner. The miner working in Vorkuta, inside the Arctic Circle, has a harder job than the miner in the southern coalfields of the Donbas. Therefore, the miner who lives and works in the harsher climate should be better paid. Or take the case of two engineers of equal ability, qualification and experience. Their contribution to society is the same, but if one is single and the other has a big family the principle of equal pay for equal work puts them in an unequal material position. The socialist state's policy is to bridge that gap, but so far it still exists.

Does that mean the principle of distribution according to work is not fair and rational?

It is the only rational and fair principle in the early stages of the new society. Socialism cannot and does not provide complete equality.

First, because a level of economic development assuring an abundance of all things has not yet been attained; the highest level of production possible today is not high

enough for a communist society. That being the case, material incentive remains one of the main factors in the development of socialist productive forces.

Second, work itself has not yet become a prime vital requirement of each citizen. "People have not become saints because the revolution began," said Lenin. And since all people do not work equally well as yet, since there are still a few idlers and parasites in our society, equal remuneration for all would not be fair.

All the material and spiritual prerequisites have to be created before it is possible to go over to complete equality in distribution, that is, distribution according to needs. The higher a building, the sturdier its foundation must be. In other words, the society of tomorrow calls for an immeasurably higher development of all material and spiritual resources than we have at present.

Does this mean that equality in the society of our ideals will be identical with the crude levelling in distribution of material and spiritual benefits which the character in Jerome K. Jerome's story saw in his nightmare? Of course not. Our ideal of equality, our goal—and the power of our ideals lies in their feasibility—is not that each person should get the same as the next one, but that each should get as much as he needs.

Nothing could be farther removed from the ideal of communism than blind levelling of requirements, tastes, minds, abilities and emotions in a grey world of faceless creatures as alike as drops of water.

Equality will not mean only equality in distribution. It will manifest itself, in the final analysis, in the flowering of all of man's creative forces, in equal opportunities for each person to display his capabilities to the full, in the rise of a radiant, many-hued world of individualities, talents and avocations. Distribution according to needs is the foundation on which the fullest, most all-embracing equality will come into being.

The Soviet Union has already started building the material foundation of a society of complete abundance in which distribution will be carried out according to needs. Very soon, within the coming decade, it will catch up with and surpass the United States, the richest country of the capitalist world, in total industrial output as well as in industrial and agricultural output per head of the population. In the next decade the Soviet people will attain abundance and will come close to practical realization of the principle of free distribution of material benefits according to needs. That is the time schedule set by the Programme of the CPSU.

It is a realistic schedule, as even Western economists admit. The Italian weekly *Espresso* comments that "if there is no war, the Soviet Union will not only reach but will exceed the goals outlined in the Programme."

Distribution according to needs will not be introduced all of a sudden. A distinguishing feature of our time is the increasingly vigorous and extensive growth of the buds of communist distribution that have appeared to-

gether with the victory of socialism in our country.

Many things are now distributed free of charge, according to needs, in the Soviet Union. It seems so natural to us that we often do not notice it.

Earnings have long ceased to be the only factor determining the citizen's living standards. There are numerous social benefits and services, such as free medical aid, social insurance, free accommodation at health and holiday resorts, free education, and so on and so forth. All that increases the real incomes of the people by approximately one-third.

Let us see how this works out in the case of an ordinary Soviet family. The monthly earnings of Baikov, a worker employed at the Novokuibyshev Oil Refinery, and the members of his family amount to an average of 229 roubles. But if we take into account the sums paid by the state to Baikov's wife during her maternity leave, the sums for maintaining the children in nurseries and kindergartens, for health and holiday resort accommodation free of charge or at a big discount, for free medical aid and free education, social insurance benefits and other benefits, we find that the Baikovs get additional 129 roubles monthly.

But even that is far from a complete list, for many of the services which the Soviet state provides its citizens are hard to calculate.

The prominent American public leader William Du Bois once said that in the Soviet Union he had seen that

wages were not simply money but also medical care, pensions, the system of vacations, and so on.

Apropos of that, we recall a curious incident that took place in a Moscow hotel not long ago. A first-aid ambulance was urgently summoned for one of the foreign tourists staying at the hotel. After examining the patient the doctor said she had to be operated on immediately, otherwise the outcome might be fatal. To the doctor's amazement the patient, recovering consciousness for a moment, refused to let herself be taken to hospital. Only when she learned she would not have to pay anything for the operation did she consent to undergo it. It turned out she had been afraid she would not have enough money for the operation, which would have cost nearly \$1,000 in her own country.

In many capitalist countries rent is one of the biggest items of a family's expenditure. In the Soviet Union rent is extremely low. In the decade from 1970 to 1980 rent-free housing, as well as free electricity, gas, water and heating will be introduced. Municipal transport facilities—trams, buses, underground, trolleybuses—will also become free.

There will no longer be any low-paid brackets of factory and office workers, retail prices will be steadily reduced, taxes abolished, and so on.

All that, taken together, will do away with the inequality in distribution inevitable under socialism, and will pave the way to communist equality.

Tomorrow. Although the antagonism between town and countryside has been practically done away with in the Soviet Union remnants of it still survive.

The town and the village still differ in appearance, in available technical production facilities, and in cultural facilities. Our goal is to eradicate these differences, and we are doing it in the following ways: by building up highly efficient collective farms and supplying them with modern machinery, by building urban-type communities with urban amenities, by further improving medical and cultural services for the rural population. Already today life on many collective farms differs little from city life. The collective farmers have public dining-rooms and shops where they can buy everything from bread and milk to tape recorders and the latest TV sets. Pensions, paid vacations, allowances and other benefits have been introduced on many collective farms. The village is following in the footsteps of the town in satisfying all the requirements of its inhabitants.

Another of our goals is to do away with the remnants of the antagonism between manual and mental labour. The factory worker possessing extensive technical knowledge is no longer a rarity today. Our system of free, universal education is geared to rapid process in grounding entire population in the fundamentals of modern knowledge. Furthermore, the state is doing everything to lighten the worker's labour. It is constantly supplying the factories, mines and mills with the up-to-date plant.

Returning to the problem of women's equality, we wish to emphasize that the main efforts in guaranteeing women genuine equality with men (the introduction of equal pay was easiest of all) are now to provide the conditions in which women can exercise their right to equal participation in social labour. Many women are still so busy with housework that they do not have the time or energy to step out beyond the narrow confines of the family, to combine motherhood with public activity, scientific or artistic endeavour with household management.

Although women have received equality, they cannot yet take advantage, on a par with men, of all the benefits which the Soviet social system and laws offer. Therefore, they have to be given conditions of everyday life that will enable them to combine household duties with extensive activity at the job and in public affairs.

We are approaching the time when women will have been completely freed from petty and burdensome chores. This will give them genuine equality with men and will make our society twice as rich.

To sum up, we have briefly reviewed here what the Soviet Union has already done and what it still has to do to attain true equality for all. Communism will reach that difficult and noble social aim. We base ourselves not on any idyllic daydreams but on a programme that is wholly feasible. Equality, man's ideal down through the ages, will be achieved not in a fairy-tale Golden Age but under the social system which we are building now.

FRATERNITY

THE LAWS OF THE JUNGLE...

...AND THE LAWS OF HUMANITY

IRRESPECTIVE OF LANGUAGE OR COLOUR

The Laws of the Jungle... In the legends, myths, sagas and runes composed thousands of years ago the peoples of East and West extolled sincere, humane relations among men, relations founded on mutual respect. As they gathered round their smoky hearths in the evenings, at the end of a long day's labour, our forebears, hunters or tillers of the soil, no doubt often shared with their children their dream of Fraternity. The dream was a bright ray of hope in bleak reality of those distant days. The years passed, they merged into centuries and millennia, and that dream remained as ephemeral as ever. The pretty tale of the fraternity among the ancient Athenians in the age of Pericles, which some Western politicians are still fond of spinning in their election speeches, can fool only those who want to be fooled.

The blood and tears of the thousands of slaves whom the Athenian freemen looked on as two-legged draught animals are clearly visible through the fabric of the tale.

When the wind of history dispelled the dark clouds of the Middle Ages, hope of an era of humane relations among men surged up once again, stronger than ever before.

The bourgeoisie, riding to power on the crest of the wave of people's revolutionary struggle against moribund feudalism, carried a banner with the proud device: "Liberty, Equality, Fraternity".

There are politicians who like to deck themselves out in the knee breeches and cocked hats worn by the men who framed the American Declaration of Independence and the French Declaration of the Rights of Man, and, with a persistence worthy of better application, remind contemporaries about those pages in history. But rich in glory though those pages are, their voice cannot drown out the wild howls of the enraged racialists or the swish of police batons against the bodies of innocent people; it cannot drown out the rattle of tommy-guns or the bomb explosions that have in some places become the most widespread method of determining the relations between ruled and ruler, it cannot drown out the thunder of battle. Bourgeois civilization is now in its decline.

It has to be admitted that the bourgeoisie has never honoured the moral IOU it gave to mankind when it came to power centuries ago. The era of Fraternity promised by bourgeoisie turned out to be an epoch of colonial and inter-state wars and social and national oppression of unprecedented scope and brutality.

Appraising Western civilization, the great humanist Romain Rolland wrote, some three decades ago: "Anyone who can renounce the self-seeking interests of the handful of privileged nations or, to be more exact, privileged classes within those nations and privileged castes within those classes, will sooner or later discover that the whole of civilization whose benefits he enjoys and in whose achievements he takes pride rests on the brutal, disgrace-

ful, disastrous exploitation of nine-tenths of the world's population."

Fraternity indeed!

The old society is rent by countless antagonisms. Historians have calculated that there have been more years of war than of peace in the last few centuries. That does not include the main war, waged continuously—an unproclaimed but nonetheless harsh and calamitous war, the war between wealth and poverty.

All the social progress in the West has been won by the people through stubborn, bitter struggle. Over the years the struggle has taken different forms, but its substance has remained the same. As the conservative "New York Times Magazine" remarked with a wistful sigh, it did not look, no matter what people said, as though the golden age in the relations between workers and capitalists had set in.

* * *

After the workers and peasants came to power in Russia in 1917 some people began to blame the Soviets for all the troubles, conflicts and upheavals of the times. If it were not for the intrigues of the Communists, they claimed, capital and labour, rich and poor, would be living in peace and concord. But this really doesn't sound like common sense! The saying, "It is easier for a camel

to pass through the eye of a needle than for a rich man to enter the Kingdom of Heaven" was current many centuries before the theory of communism arose. Class struggles of labour against capital shook the world long before the Soviet system came into being. It was not the communist movement that gave rise to social struggle but, on the contrary, the social struggle that gave life to communism. The October Revolution of 1917 is not to blame for the antagonisms that rend the old society. On the contrary, the socialist revolution took place because Russia was then the focal point of all the antagonisms of imperialism.

It is an inescapable fact that the capitalist system, like all other non-socialist social systems, has proved itself incapable of translating the shining ideals of Fraternity among men and nations into reality. Furthermore, many of its adherents question the very possibility of making those ideals come true on earth, while others simply reject them as senseless and pernicious illusions.

No wonder the old society was the breeding ground of the misanthropic theories of Schopenhauer, Nietzsche and Spengler, with their worship of violence that later became the cornerstone of fascism. Rejection of the very possibility of sincere and humane relations among people is also the substance of the views of Herbert Spencer. In his well-known "Social Statics" he proclaimed a violent struggle for existence to be an immutable law

of life, and called the death of the "unfit" in this struggle a boon for society. While admitting that many people were bound to be "stranded and impoverished" through the fault of the powerful, the English scholar claimed nothing could be done about it. No power on earth, no ingenious laws ever devised by statesmen, no world projects for the perfection of man, no communist panaceas and no reforms that were ever made or will be proposed in future could lessen their sufferings a single iota, he declared more than a century ago. One of his present-day followers, the American sociologist W. Lynn, has gone so far as to compare the "law of the survival of the fittest", which it is claimed operates in every society, with the law of gravitation.

Other "theoreticians" go still farther. They divide society into two parts: the bottom stratum, made up of the overwhelming majority of the population, and the top stratum, the élite, consisting of a chosen few. The bottom stratum, as the American author Magind says, should get a limited education and should obey the élite blindly.

The chosen ones, in the opinion of the racialists, are those whose skin is of the proper colour, whose eyes have the proper slant, and whose skull and nose have the right shape.

What talk can there be of fraternity in a society where the official credo of individualism—"Each man for him-

self", "Man is a wolf unto man", and "Bellum omnium contra omnes" ("A war of all against all")—is practically the foundation of the universe?

Pessimism of this kind should be taken for granted when one considers the history of the old society. Yet an intolerance of all kinds of injustice and a striving towards fraternity have never died among the ordinary people; they lived on despite all attempts by the ruling classes to suppress and slander them.

Many fine examples of unity and friendship among working folk, examples of true ties of brotherhood among the oppressed and exploited in their struggle for emancipation are to be found in the annals of the nations of the world. Coming from their lips, fraternity is not just a phrase but a truth, and human nobleness reflected in their faces, Karl Marx said of the proletarians in the middle of the last century.

The profound truth of those words was brought home to the world after the working people of Russia took the power into their own hands and built the first socialist society in the world.

... And the Laws of Humanity. Most readers will probably remember the 49-day battle waged against the elements several years ago by four Soviet servicemen, Ziganshin, Poplavsky, Kryuchkovsky and Fedotov, when

a storm carried their small barge far out into the Pacific Ocean. People who knew little or nothing about the Soviet outlook on life wondered why those four young men had not gone out of their mind, why they had not fought over their meagre supply of bread and water—in a word, why they had not cut each other's throats in a fierce struggle for survival. It is worth while remembering in this connection, that on the second day after the crew of the wrecked West German ship "Pamir" had been taken to the lifeboats, cases of suicide took place among them. Also, that pornographic films were shown from morning to night to keep up the spirits of the crew of a US Navy submarine on a long cruise under normal conditions.

In the Soviet Union, however, people took the behaviour of Ziganshin, Poplavsky, Kryuchkovsky and Fedotov for granted.

They found it just as natural as, say, the courageous act of Konstantin Yashuk, a reticent, elderly Siberian railwayman who saved a stranger's life at the cost of his own, when a train suddenly loomed up in front of them as they were crossing the tracks. Or the equally courageous act of young Tanya Bibina, a crane operator in Mordovia, who saved the lives of about two dozen children and women by shifting the boom of her crane away from them. The crane had gone out of order, and this cost Tanya her life. Or the desire of lumber-

jacks in the northern timber camp of Dubrovka to donate their blood to cure a woman, a stranger to them, who had fallen gravely ill.

Acts of that kind are common in Soviet life. They spring from the soil of the Soviet system and are nurtured by the communist world outlook.

Truly human relations among men are the ideal of the new world.

Loyalty to these noble ideals not only makes life brighter for people but also gives them greater strength. It is obvious, for instance, that if those four young Soviet servicemen had not acted like brothers in their hour of trial, if they had not retained, amidst the ocean storms, the moral purity and staunchness taught them by the communist ideology, they would surely never have set foot on terra firm again.

Soviet society's moral principles and the corresponding laws stem from the conviction of man's lofty calling on earth. Everything in the USSR is aimed at what Maxim Gorky called the awakening and affirmation of the human in man. Foreign observers, among them Professor David Mace, a British lawyer, have often noted that the morality in our country leaves them with "a sense of purity".

You will not see horror or sex films on the Soviet screen. The newspapers do not publicize criminals or crimes; nor do they pander to morbid curiosity by

writing about the filthy back-alleys of life. Our TV studios do not deafen their audiences with gunshots and the groans of people being tortured; they do not present young people violence and plunder as models of behaviour.

Soviet films, radio, TV, newspapers and magazines glorify true heroes, men and women of unusual moral strength and spiritual beauty. These are men and women of science and industry, conquerors of the atom and inventors of new work methods that multiply social wealth for the benefit of all. They are humane people, with pure hearts, the living embodiment of the principles of fraternity.

The women textile workers of the small town of Kupavna, not far from Moscow, are widely known in the Soviet Union. They do excellent work and lead full, interesting lives. All of them are continuing their studies by correspondence and take part in amateur talent activities of their factory club. They live and work the communist way, and the first point of their credo is: "All for one and one for all". Another point is: "If anyone is offended in your presence, you are to blame". The words of this short credo drawn up by ordinary Soviet working women as the law of their life are worth more than many a tome on morality.

Dr. Hewlett Johnson, former Dean of Canterbury, mentioned in his book "Christians and Communism" the need for a sincere recognition of the magnificent suc-

cesses of the Soviet world in establishing a Kingdom of Universal Brotherhood here on earth and in our day. Yes, the point is that not only does the Soviet Union support and popularize the eternal ideas of fraternity on a greater scale than the world has ever seen before, but—and this is even more important—it is the first country in history to put them into practice.

This did not come about spontaneously but was a result of the radical transformation of Soviet society along socialist lines.

Socialist humanism is not based merely on good will. It has a solid foundation in the social ownership of the means of production. That is the reason why it is natural and logical, and has nothing in common with philanthropy, which is as unreliable as it is humiliating.

A foreign observer once called the Soviet economy "a great family firm". It is an apt description, for there are no hired workers in the Soviet Union. Everyone—the worker, the peasant, the intellectual—feels he is a full-fledged owner, together with everyone else, of the means of production and the products of his labour.

The antagonisms between classes and between social strata have therefore disappeared. No one is permitted to enrich himself at the expense of others. But the road to the summits of science and culture, and also to executive positions, is open to all; education is accessible to

all, and a person's advancement in any sphere depends only on his ability. In a word, the breeding-ground of cutthroat competition for "a place in the sun" has been done away with, and people find it's in their own interest to co-operate in a friendly manner with their fellowmen.

In the Soviet Union there is a countrywide emulation movement for higher output and for further scientific and technical progress. Millions of men and women take part in this movement, which is the biggest in the country. Some gain more from it and others less, but no one loses.

Common labour in the interests of one and all is a basis for the harmonious combination of personal and collective interests, on the one hand, and for genuinely humane relations among men, on the other.

The new Mergider Canal in the Soviet Central Asian Republic of Tajikistan supplies water to some 10,000 hectares of arid land. The history books tell us the canal was planned, and work on it actually begun, 400 years ago. But centuries-old antagonism and hostility killed the project.

Socialism has given birth to new relations between people, to true comradeship. And as a result, the canal was built recently in four years.

The construction chief relates that people changed literally before his eyes, that he had never before

seen people so solicitous of one another, and that he had never seen such a creative, friendly, collective spirit.

Julia Vecherova, a weaver from Ivanovo whose outstanding work has won her renown throughout the country, says:

"In weaving, like in everything else, you have to help one another. Well, Nina Shantalova, who works by my side, and I decided to help each other and to work together in carrying out our production pledges. We asked the superintendent to synchronize the speed of our looms. Now we work much more efficiently than before. If there's a hitch on my side she helps me out, and if something goes wrong on hers I help her."

Truly, as Engels put it, "where there is no community of interests there can be no unity of goals, let alone unity of action".

In a letter to his son Maxim Gorky once said: "If all your life, always and everywhere, you left people only good things—flowers, thoughts, fine memories of you—your life would be easy and pleasant. Then you would feel that everybody needed you, and this feeling would make you rich in spirit; I want you to know that it is always more pleasant to give than to receive."

A. Krutykh, an elderly lathe operator in the northern town of Perm, never got any training as a teacher, yet dozens of workers consider themselves his pupils and

are grateful to him. All his life he has given to people unstintingly of his spare time and his energy, passing on his skills and know-how to others. V. Sidorenko, a foreman in Rostov, trained 20 workers and gave them a 110-hour lecture course, all free of charge. Many similar instances in other towns, big and small, could be cited.

The brotherhood among the citizens of the socialist society also finds striking expression in the unpaid community work for the benefit of all.

It was brotherly love that led a group of prominent physicians from the Rostov Medical College to receive patients at polyclinics without pay in their spare time.

Voluntary consultations have now been set up at big factories in Rostov. A polyclinic whose entire staff works on the voluntary principle, without pay, has been opened; this includes medical students who do duty as nurses and attendants.

Soviet intellectuals put a great deal of human warmth and energy into voluntary adult-education programmes. Take the small town of Shemoneikh in the heart of Central Asia, where free public lectures and classes in history, literature and art are now in their fourth year. They were started on the initiative of local schoolteachers and scholars, who devote their time to the project without pay.

Is anything like that possible in the world where egoism has been elevated to a guiding principle?

Irrespective of Language or Colour. There were many oppressed and backward peoples in pre-revolutionary Russia, and the country's rulers, following the "divide and rule" policy of ancient Rome, zealously cultivated national enmity and hatred. Russian capitalism has left a bad memory of Armenian-Turkish carnage, anti-Jewish pogroms and colonial oppression in Central Asia. To the younger generation of Soviet people, a generation that accounts for almost three-fourths of the population today, those dark pages of history seem as monstrous and unbelievable as the burnings at the stake of the Inquisition or the black plagues of the Middle Ages.

The Soviet Union is evidence of the correctness of the prediction made by Marx and Engels that the disappearance of class antagonisms within nations would be accompanied by the disappearance of hostility among nations. The former isolation, estrangement and hostility have been replaced by co-operation, magnanimous assistance and friendship.

The family of Shahmed Shemehmudov, a blacksmith in Tashkent, the capital of Uzbekistan, has become an example of what fraternity among the Soviet peoples means. This blacksmith has brought up fourteen orphans whom he adopted during the war. Among them there are Russians, Ukrainians, Uzbeks, Tatars, a Jew, a Moldavian and a Kazakh. They are all grown up now, and all of them have an education and a trade or profession. Some

of them now have families of their own. But to each of them the grey-bearded Uzbek is a beloved father and they regard themselves as brothers and sisters.

Or take Kupsha Kesimova, a middle-aged Kazakh woman who a few years ago became a member of the family of Moisei Chernyukevich, a farm carpenter in Byelorussia. Kupsha Kesimova lost her only son and her husband in the war. She became acquainted with the Chernyukeviches when they moved to Kazakhstan, where virgin lands were being reclaimed. For some time the relationship was merely that of good neighbours, but after a while the Chernyukeviches suggested that Kupsha Kesimova move to them and become a member of the family. Since then, say the neighbours, Kupsha looks ten years younger, her heart was warmed by the word "aana", the Kazakh for mother.

Humane relations of mutual respect are what are most in keeping with human nature and the essence of human society. Friedrich Engels, close friend and associate of Karl Marx, declared quite correctly that the interest, well-being and happiness of the individual are inseparably bound up with the well-being of everyone else.

Before fraternity could be established the ground had to be cleared of many tenacious weeds having age-old roots. The Soviet people have done this. The victory of socialism put an end forever to the power of money and

the power of rank; it abolished forever laws establishing national or class restrictions, and gave women equal rights.

Soviet public opinion is unanimous in its wrathful intolerance of anything that runs counter to the spirit of brotherhood, from avarice, arrogance and selfishness to boorishness and indifference.

Socialism has long since removed the objective obstacles to the brotherhood of men in our country, obstacles that were rooted in the private-ownership mentality. Some of these obstacles still make themselves felt in the callousness, bureaucracy and hostility to others that are encountered occasionally. It would be foolish to think that in a matter of only forty-six years millions of people could completely shake off the survivals of an exploiter morality, a standard of ethics which is the exact opposite of the way of life and the spirit of the new socialist society, the spirit of brotherhood. However, any injustice towards anyone, whoever he may be, is opposed by the entire weight of our society.

There is no instance in the history of social thought and world political doctrines of a party platform devoting so much attention to problems of morals and ethics as the Programme of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, the Communist Manifesto of modern times. The Programme envisages the disappearance of all survivals of bourgeois views, morals and manners, and describes the man of communist society "who will harmoniously

combine spiritual wealth, moral purity and a perfect physique".

Already today the overwhelming majority of people in the Soviet Union are noted for their deep respect for the dignity of others and their helpful, genuinely brotherly love of people, features that are an inseparable part of their spiritual make-up.

"Communism makes the elementary standards of morality and justice, which were distorted or shamelessly flouted under the rule of the exploiters, inviolable rules, for relations among individuals and among peoples," says the Programme of the CPSU.

Fraternal co-operation is the foundation on which relations among the socialist countries rest. By helping one another to mutual advantage and by coordinating their efforts to develop their economy, science and technology they are making rapid progress. The attitude of the USSR to the other socialist countries can be judged from the following fact: with the help of the Soviet Union more than 1,000 industrial enterprises have been built or are being built in the People's Democracies.

The Soviet Union is a sincere and true friend of peoples fighting for their independence and peoples recently emancipated from the imperialist yoke, and is giving them every support. This support is of an unusual character because it has no strings attached and because it pursues no selfish goals. It proceeds from sincere concern

for the prosperity and progress of other peoples. The Soviet Union will help over twenty young sovereign countries to build more than 480 industrial establishments and installations within the next few years. Loans to those countries on advantageous terms amount to nearly 3 million roubles.

How favourable the terms are can be seen from the fact, that at a time when West German firms demanded an annual interest of 12 per cent of their credit for the construction of an iron and steel works in India, the Soviet Union financed the construction of the Bhilai works at 2.5 per cent interest per annum.

The Soviet Union stretches out a hand of friendship to all peoples. The policy of peaceful coexistence between the socialist and capitalist countries that the Soviet Union so resolutely upholds is not considered a variety of the cold war by the Soviet people. According to Soviet views, peaceful coexistence, an objective necessity for the development of human society, presupposes the broadest possible economic and cultural co-operation on the basis of full equality and mutual advantage. Polarity of ideologies does not, after all, affect the properties of Soviet manganese or American machinery, or the Soviet ballet or the Old Vic company of Britain. All countries who maintain normal relations with one another can greatly benefit from it.

Socialism has for the first time in history introduced a new principle in international relations, the principle

of fraternal co-operation and equality among all countries, large or small.

We are confident that in the final analysis all peoples

will choose our road because it is the road to peace and fraternity, a road that is in keeping with the true calling of man.

HAPPINESS

UTOPIA MADE REAL

FOR SOME OR FOR ALL?

WORK—BUT NOT JUST ANY KIND

MONEY DOESN'T COUNT

BUILDERS OF THEIR OWN HAPPINESS

THE ISSUE OF ISSUES

Utopia Made Real. There are many different kinds and degrees of happiness—you recover from a severe illness... your wife gives birth to a son... you have good luck in a lottery...

And there is the supreme happiness that comes from knowing that what you are doing is of benefit to your fellow men. This happiness is experienced by people who can find application for their talents and abilities. It is happiness that inspires, that makes life worth living.

People have dreamed of that kind of happiness since time immemorial. Their dreams have often transcended bleak reality and carried them to distant, cloudless, fabulous lands.

Long, long ago a bold mariner discovered an island in the ocean, somewhere near the New World. Its inhabitants were like people everywhere else, but their way of life was very different. There were neither rich nor poor among them. They had an abundance of everything they needed. They combined work in the fields with work in laboratories, for they were sufficiently well-educated to take up any sphere of activity. They turned in the products of their labour to the communal stores, from which they drew, free of charge, whatever they needed. They did not know what money was, and gold—a metal that was the cause of wars and bloodshed where the mariner came from—was used here for making rattles.

There were times when the islanders did regard

gold as a precious metal. But we shall return to that later.

After the mariner returned home and told his story thousands flocked to see him, asking where the amazing island was situated. But, alas, he had lost the chart. There was nothing strange about that, for the mariner was a figment of Sir Thomas More's imagination, and the name this great English thinker gave the island, Utopia, was compounded from two Greek words meaning "nowhere". In his book about that island he depicted the dream of many generations about a country of universal happiness.

More than four centuries have passed since then, but a land of justice still holds a cherished place in the minds of millions of people on all continents.

Unlike Sir Thomas More's splendid tale, however, the dream will soon come true. The men and women of the Soviet Union are today making it come true. Instead of seeking a promised land far overseas they are building one at home, building it with their own hands.

Here we shall tell you what their understanding of happiness is.

For Some or for All? Britain, France and the other capitalist countries have come far along the road to abundance, say Western politicians. As for the United States, it has, they claim, already entered an era of prosperity and abundance.

The United States is, indeed a very rich country, and if its riches were distributed fairly it could quickly attain universal abundance. Yet in that "affluent society" more than 50,000,000 people are living on the edge of poverty, as the Americans themselves admit. There is a permanent army of millions of unemployed, while many of those who do have jobs, are afraid of losing them and descending to the ranks of the disinherited.

Furthermore, that situation is represented as being practically a virtue. "Here in the West," says Gianni Rodari, the Italian author, "the expression 'moral principles' is twisted to mean just the opposite. A manufacturer rolling in wealth, a man with villas at the seaside and in the mountains, who goes on pleasure cruises to the shores of Egypt on his private yacht, who gives his children everything from cars of their own to brilliant careers, does not feel that he is sinning against 'moral principles' in the least. I am acquainted with one such convinced Christian. The fact that two or three thousand workers toil from morning to night to assure him his sweet life does not trouble him in the least. He sleeps the sleep of the just, and never wakes up at night to ask himself, 'by what right am I enjoying the fruits of the labour of others?'"

Universal abundance is out of the question there, of course, for a high level of industry, science and engineering is far from enough. The main thing is who owns it all and, therefore, who benefits from it.

Factories and mills that are owned privately, by capitalists, do not bring the working people either abundance or happiness.

There is no abundance in the Soviet Union yet, either. Here, though, it is only a matter of time. The day when all Soviet citizens will lead a life of abundance is not far off. Yes, all of them, for socialism has done away with the causes of social and economic inequality. The previous chapters have dealt with that in detail.

Work—But Not Just Any Kind. Abundance is the main step towards genuine happiness, but it cannot produce happiness by itself. A warm place to sleep and plenty of food are probably enough to make an animal happy. Man has long since risen above the animal world, however. And he owes his rise primarily to the fact that he is able to engage in conscious labour.

Many millions of years have passed since then. The hands that once gripped a stone axe today confidently hold the controls of huge airliners. Man's brain, which once led him to realize that fire could be produced by rubbing two sticks together, is today fathoming the secrets of the invisible atomic nucleus and of infinite cosmic space. When a man does not work, his hands lose their strength and his mind grows weak. Only in work, only in meaningful labour, can he attain true happiness.

Many, however, do not link up happiness with work but, on the contrary, with a life of idleness. There is

nothing surprising about that. It is a natural reaction to hard, exhausting labour. This idea is clearly expressed by a metal worker named Joe, a character of a short story by the American author Harvey Swados. He curses his job, calling it a trap. Getting up every morning to go to a job you never would have taken if you had a choice means having no hope at all throughout your working life. Millions upon millions of working people in the West feel the way Joe does.

A study of the position of the workers at the huge Renault Auto Plant in Paris, by Daniel Mote, has been published in France. The author comes to the conclusion that "the worker serves as an ordinary production machine in society. Nothing more. And that is where his true misfortune lies". We might add that he serves as an appendage to a machine rather than as a machine, for not only does he work unwillingly but without the slightest creative interest. He is indifferent to the machine at which he stands and which is alien to him, since it brings profits to the owner. A British economist once aptly noted that when the worker arrives at the factory he leaves his brains in his locker together with his clothing. There is deep meaning in that bitter irony.

The position of the worker is greatly aggravated by automation although, common sense tells us, it should be the other way round. In a system founded on private ownership of the means of production this great achievement of man's genius, like so many others, only helps

the industrialist to squeeze out the maximum profits. He does this both by sacking workers on a large scale and by stepping up the exploitation of those who remain on the job. Here, for instance, is what Johann Bekker, a turner employed by the Dortmund-Horder Hutten Union concern, in West Germany, says about automation: "The results of automation here cause nothing but alarm; they make us even more uncertain of our morrow; they operate against the workers' interests. Our plant was one of the first in Federal Germany to introduce new techniques. For one thing, they have installed an automated rolling mill that can be tended by only one-third the number of workers needed before. What became of the redundant ones? Some, mostly elderly workers, were thrown out into the street. Others were shifted to auxiliary jobs where they earn much less... No, automation has not done us any good. Sooner the opposite. Everyone sees that automation is throwing many workers out of their jobs. The company is now automating the blast furnaces and the open hearths. That means we can look forward to more workers getting the sack. Everyone is afraid of losing his job and bends over backwards trying to do everything just right. If a man fails to do as much as he is supposed to he is at once told, 'We'll get someone else.' As a rule, the one who takes the place of a worker who is fired gets less pay. Earnings go down and the speed of the work goes up."

It turns out that labour, which made man, what he

is by developing his energy and brains, can, under certain conditions, hamstring his energy and dull his mind. It goes without saying that labour of that kind cannot bring him any happiness.

Only work that is interesting, that yields creative joy and satisfaction, can give happiness. People in all eras have experienced this happiness, but they have been few and far between. In our day the conditions have been created for bringing such happiness within the reach of all able-bodied members of society without exception.

Technical progress, automation chiefly, is what provides the possibility of doing that. Yes, the very same automation that brings woe and misfortune to the working people in the West.

Under socialism the worker takes part in production as master and owner. He is, therefore, vitally interested in higher efficiency and greater output. Here the machine is not an enemy but a friend and assistant.

The beneficial potentialities of automation are literally boundless in those circumstances. Work in an automated factory calls for less physical effort than work at an ordinary lathe or conveyer but requires much more knowledge and skill. It is no longer a matter of making part of a component by performing the same mechanical motions year in and year out, but of controlling the entire diversified process of manufacturing an article. Mechanical motions are not enough; here creative thinking and resourcefulness are essential.

The worker starts to think about the fine points of his job; he seeks, and finds ways of improving the machines. More than 10,000,000 workers in the Soviet Union are amateur inventors. However, this is not just the matter of how many amateur inventors there are or the savings their ideas yield, what really matters is that work takes on a totally new character, becoming truly creative.

Automation calls for more know-how, but at the same time it helps the worker to acquire it. By increasing productivity to a colossal degree, it makes it possible to shorten the working day and provide more time for study and improvement of qualifications.

The workday in the Soviet Union has now been cut to six or seven hours, depending on the type of job, and by the end of the current decade, as outlined in the Programme of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, it will be reduced to five or six hours. After that it will be made even shorter. It is interesting to note that Sir Thomas More considered six working hours a day the ideal in his Utopia, and did not venture beyond this limit.

People use a good deal of their additional leisure for study. Extensive opportunities for spare-time study are provided by the Soviet Union's 40 correspondence and evening colleges and 670 correspondence and evening departments at other institutions of higher learning. To make things more convenient for the students, branches of specialized secondary schools and colleges are set up at big factories. All this education is free of charge.

Now that we have presented a brief picture of the advantages technical progress brings under socialism, another question may arise, namely: what is the employment situation? New techniques undoubtedly require a smaller number of workers under socialism as well. The introduction of automation at the Dnieper Hydroelectric Station, for instance, reduced the staff from 280 persons to a mere six. Three workers now tend an automated production line at a Moscow motor works, whereas 180 used to be employed on that section.

The point is, however, that in the socialist planned economy automation does not lead to unemployment. Workers who are no longer needed at one place can easily find other employment, for hundreds of new factories, mines and mills are built in the Soviet Union every year as the country continues to expand its economy towards the goal of universal abundance.

Furthermore, since the worker has the opportunity to learn any new technical skills he is interested in, and is not tied to any one place, he can always find a job to suit him. Every year, more than 2,500,000 people in the Soviet Union learn new trades. The front-rank worker of today is an amateur inventor who often cannot be told apart from a diplomaed engineer. As a result many Soviet people now derive joy and satisfaction from their work.

Money Doesn't Count. Several years ago Valentina Gaganova, one of the most efficient weavers at the Vysh-

ni Volochok Textile Mill, transferred to a backward team of weavers in order to bring it up to the level of the most advanced and in this way help to raise overall productivity of labour at the mill. She knew her earnings would drop for a time, but that did not stop her. She was happy, she said, to know that she was doing her duty to society.

Tens of thousands of Soviet workers followed Valentina Gaganova's example, but Western newspapers and magazines still do not understand what it is all about. Fugerolas, a French sociologist, calls it fanaticism. He is seconded by Gunther Zehm, of Federal Germany, who claims, in an article in "Die Welt", that the Soviet citizen "is not supposed to have any personal happiness except the happiness that comes from collective efforts to attain a high level of production". In the society in which Gunther Zehm lives a cheque-book means the supreme happiness.

From that standpoint, how indeed could he understand the happiness experienced by Valentina Gaganova and the others like her who renounce part of their earnings to promote the higher interests of society as a whole.

They are puzzled by the unselfishness of Soviet people just as their forbears were puzzled a century ago by Karl Marx spending sleepless nights, often in an unheated room, writing "Das Kapital" when he could have had the secure life of a respectable bourgeois professor.

The consciousness that he was charting the road to a better life for the disinherited was the greatest happi-

ness to Karl Marx. Marx also experienced the happiness of a great love and family life. In their time, Marx and Engels were exceptions. Today the motivation behind their activity is becoming more and more a standard of behaviour for all citizens in the socialist society.

Every Soviet citizen has a personal life and individual interests, of course. When Valentina Gaganova, for instance, was asked several years ago what the biggest event in her life was she said it was the birth of her son. But the interests of Soviet people are not restricted to their personal life; they are much broader, taking in the life of society as a whole.

Jack London has painted a stirring picture of the Alaskan Gold Rush, when thousands of men rushed to the North in the grip of an overpowering desire to get rich. Each wanted to be the first to stake a claim, resorting to bribery, cunning, deception and, if that did not help, to brute force. The situation in the capitalist world today is basically the same.

The morality of the private property owner is not eternal, however. It will disappear together with the disappearance of capitalism and private ownership of the means of production. The Soviet people know that their wealth and happiness lie not in the acquisition of property but in collective labour.

More and more people in the West are coming to understand that the incentives in a socialist society have nothing in common with lust for profit seeking. Ford

once offered the top-notch Soviet worker Busygin a job in Detroit, confident that the sum he proposed would not be turned down. But it was turned down. Today Ford would not be so confident. Those who live according to private-property moral standards are gradually realizing that they are by no means eternal, that there is another, higher, morality.

The morality of collectivism and friendship are registering more and more victories as Soviet society advances towards communism. The image of the new man, who regards serving the people as his greatest happiness, is emerging more and more distinctly.

Builders of Their Own Happiness. In the socialist society the rich and varied activity of the people, who have thrown off the chains of social oppression, reshapes man's awareness. It produces a new pattern of thinking characterized by boundless faith in man's own strength and in human intelligence. Man frees himself from the centuries-old notion that he and his potentialities depend upon some outer forces—god, the power of money, status symbols, etc. In this sense the communist transformation of society creates conditions for a freedom of man that was inconceivable in all previous ages.

This general trend of our era is making headway in the minds of the people at large in the capitalist countries as well. Today people everywhere have begun to take an active part in making history, and in the course of

this process they are becoming aware of their strength. Less than half a century has passed since the outbreak of the First World War. It crashed down on the heads of millions of people like a bolt from the blue, like a vast natural calamity. Today scores and hundreds of millions of people in all countries, knowing from their own experience the social factors that lead to destructive wars, are not sitting back with folded hands waiting for another war but are waging an active struggle to prevent it. They have become active supporters of peace. That is a great change not only in the objective conditions of contemporary social life but also in people's psychology. At the bottom of these changes lies the great turn in human history that began with the socialist revolution of 1917 in Russia.

Western philosophers and sociologists cannot help sensing this vitalizing metamorphosis in human consciousness. They grudgingly admit that the people have become an active factor in contemporary history, they are casting aside the rotten shell of old concepts that enslaved their mentality. Most of them, however, deplore these changes; they see in them "the all-corrosive spirit of rationalism" and regret that man has lost his respect for mysticism. They call themselves preachers of "freedom of the spirit", which they claim they are upholding against what they call the encroachments by communism.

The genuine freedom of man and man's potentialities under socialism are expressed most strikingly of all in

the long-range planning of economic and cultural development. People the world over were amazed by the precision with which Soviet scientists and engineers calculated the flights of the moon probes and the orbital manned flights. Those were indeed impressive examples of human foresight and its practical application. The people of the Soviet Union are justifiably proud of them. It is clear, moreover, that the planning of the country's economic and cultural development, involving the movement of colossal material resources and manpower, is far more difficult. And the fact that the Soviet Union is carrying out its development programmes with a high degree of accuracy is an even more convincing illustration of the freedom and greatness of the human spirit. It is significant that a socialist country was the first to put a space vehicle into orbit. That was not just an accident but a logical result of the social ownership of the means of production and the planned economic, scientific and cultural development based on it.

Contrary to all common sense, however, Western philosophers regard planning as a factor that excludes freedom of the spirit. Man, they say, can pursue only separate, concrete goals; he is incapable of seeing the whole, and therefore planning is a myth. Take, for instance, the writings of Karl Jaspers, a prominent exponent of the fashionable bourgeois philosophy of "Existentialism", which deals with the problem of the freedom of man and the human spirit more than any other contemporary

Western philosophical trend.

"If man presumes to see the whole instead of pursuing concrete aims," says Jaspers, "he puts himself on a par with god."

That short sentence aptly conveys the barren substance of a philosophy which for some reason claims to be a philosophy of "freedom". Man can and should set himself only narrow, "concrete" aims and not try to understand and remake the "whole", the conditions of his life; man is incapable of foreseeing the future development of society, and of striving towards it; man has no right to go in for bold flights of the imagination, for if he does he equates himself with god. The main point of that philosophy is that it attempts to clip the wings of man's creative effort and hold him to the age-old belief that he is powerless to change the world.

No amount of sleight-of-hand verbiage, no matter how philosophical it may appear to be, can lead to genuine freedom of man, to freedom of the human spirit. Mankind has fought for freedom throughout its entire history of back-breaking labour, throughout centuries of struggle against political despotism, social slavery and oppression. It is by their labour and by remaking the social conditions in which they live that people lay the foundation of freedom. Communism, as a real basis and form of human freedom, is not somebody's invention but the objective result of all preceding social development, the logical outcome of the entire

contemporary struggle of the working people for a vigorous material and intellectual life. That is why communism is inseparably linked up with human freedom and happiness in all their manifestations and cannot be imagined apart from them.

The Issue of Issues. In his picture of idyllic happiness on the island of Utopia Sir Thomas More could not help touching on the highly important problem of war and peace. To convince the reader of the complete happiness of the inhabitants of Utopia he had to settle them in a land of everlasting peace and to deliver them from war, which was as great a calamity in those times as it is today. He solved this difficult problem in a most singular way. Gold, as was mentioned at the beginning, had no value for the islanders. They were very well aware, however, of its great temptation for people of other countries. And so when the islanders learned that some country planned to attack them they at once collected all their golden trinkets and gave them as tribute to their bellicose enemy, who left them in peace.

Sir Thomas More lived when the imperialists had not yet appeared on the scene, otherwise he would have known that no amount of gold could buy them off. The more they have, the more they want. Only one thing can restrain them from aggression—fear that a war might not only fail to enrich them but might deprive them of what they already have. Accustomed to settling all inter-

national problems by force, they can be halted only by force.

The imperialists realize that if they unleash powerful nuclear forces with aggressive aims in view they will subject themselves to immediate and total annihilation. Today, war cannot bring them either colonies or gold. It can bring them only death. That is undoubtedly what holds the aggressors back from an act of madness.

The Soviet Union has never intended, nor does it intend now, to attack any country, but as long as the Western Powers continue their sabre-rattling, as long as they refuse to stop the arms race in favour of general and complete disarmament, the Soviet Government will continue to equip its armed forces with the latest types of weapons. It regards this as its sacred duty to the Soviet people and as a guarantee that no hostile forces will be able to prevent them from building a communist society, a society of abundance and happiness.

While building happiness for his countrymen, the Soviet man is paving the way for the happiness of working people the world over. He is aware of his responsibility to the whole of working mankind.

Conclusion. Once upon a time, says an ancient legend, an Eastern ruler summoned his court chroniclers and ordered them to write a history of mankind. Many years passed, but the chroniclers had not yet completed their work. Sensing the approach of death, the ruler

demanded that the fruits of their labour be shown to him immediately. A huge caravan of camels loaded with countless bales of manuscripts was driven into the courtyard. It would have taken years to read them all. "Will I never know what I dreamed all my life of knowing?" the dying man cried in despair. "Isn't there anyone who can give me a brief history of man?"

The oldest and the wisest of the wise stepped forward. "Your Highness," he said, "I can put it into a few words. Man is born, he suffers, and he dies."

Throughout the centuries mankind dreamed, and often fought, to free itself from misfortune and suffering, from the chains of inequality and oppression.

It was only the victory of socialism that made it possible to solve these fundamental social problems engendered by relations of domination and subordination.

No social revolution can repeal the laws of nature, of course. Under communism, too, men will be born and will die. But for the first time in history the socialist revolution has created all the conditions under which people can be freed from poverty, hunger, war and social inequality in any forms and manifestations.

The communist society which the Soviet people are now building will solve those "accursed problems" for all time and will establish PEACE, LABOUR, FREEDOM, EQUALITY and FRATERNITY on earth. The loftiest and most humanitarian of all laws—universal human HAPPINESS—will become the law of life.