

INTERNATIONAL YEAR FOR HUMAN RIGHTS • 1968 •

*Reflections
on the
social
future
of
mankind*

REFLECTIONS
ON THE SOCIAL
FUTURE
OF MANKIND

NOVOSTI PRESS AGENCY PUBLISHING HOUSE

**THE FUTURE WHICH CONCERNS EVERY-
ONE TODAY**

*

The Present and the Future

People are made to think and they cannot help doing so. At all times they think about the future, their own and their children's. Some hope the future will be better than the present, others would like the present to last forever. Still others prefer the present only because the future holds nothing good for them. People look into the future, some with hope, some with despair. Yet there is nobody who can ignore it, for **the future is the part of the present which will exist tomorrow, which will come to replace the present.**

The future directly concerns everyone personally and all together. True, not everything arouses the same concern. The future of the arts and the power industry is no doubt important for humanity, yet it is not something that will trouble all the people. But the question of whether there is to be a global thermo-nuclear war concerns the very existence of the

human race. It is a vital issue for everyone living today—a question of life and death. Likewise the fate of tens of millions of people depends on the outcome of the struggle against racial and colonial oppression. For many the preservation of private ownership of the means of production constitutes an omnipresent danger of losing their jobs, the threat of hunger and poverty.

Describing the future of mankind many thinkers shake the imagination by pictures of flourishing science, technology and free intercourse with extra-terrestrial civilizations.

But there are quite a number of future-tellers, though, in whose imagination the upsurge of science brings about a scorched land, people running wild and inhuman, and civilization destroyed.

It is on the social future of humanity, on the way social life is organized that the direction and outcome of the present-day scientific and technological revolution depend. Will it lead to the efflorescence of humanity or to its decline?

The problems of mankind's social future force their way into the life of every individual, whether he likes it or not.

What will the future be like?

In the 19th century Jules Verne expressed numerous scientific and technical ideas and even foretold their realization. Our 20th century sees these ideas being put into practice.

Jules Verne was able to see fifty years ahead of his time and more, because he based his predictions on the then-new tendencies in science and engineering. The future always consists in making reality out of the possibilities of today.

Thus it is possible to find a scientifically authentic answer to questions relating to the social future of mankind which are today exercising the minds of immense numbers of people. One must study the history of mankind, analyze and objectively estimate the phenomena of social life of the last 50 years, whose triumph even imprisonment, executions, famine and wars failed to halt.

The Time We Live In

Ours is a time of complex and contradictory processes.

A turbulent scientific and technical revolution is under way; atomic power stations and fully automated plants and factories, synthetic materials and colour television, superfast planes and machines capable of solving the most complicated mathematical problems within seconds have become so much a part of life that people have ceased to wonder at technical miracles at all. Today one acre of land yields more than ten acres yielded at the beginning of the century. Contemporary automatic machines can do the work of a hundred and more people, easing labour and making it a source of pleasure. The space envoys from Earth that have already been to the Moon shatter all doubts about man's ability to explore new worlds and their mysteries.

Alongside this progress there is still famine on earth, there are children that are living skeletons and people who do backbreaking work to earn their daily bread, millions of them in different continents. There are still places where

the wooden plough and the hoe remain the chief implements of the land tiller. Meanwhile in some Western countries automation often deprives people of their jobs and forces them to join the army of unemployed. Young people join the same "army" on finishing school without even having tried the joys and hardships of work. As it was hundreds of years ago, mothers can only dream of happiness for their children, of a time when there will be no hunger and poverty.

Humanity is living in an epoch when there are means of warfare capable of wiping whole nations off the face of the earth. There are bombers and submarines ready at any moment to drop bombs and fire missiles, the terrible potentialities of which were demonstrated only in miniature in Hiroshima and Nagasaki in 1945.

Rivers of human blood flow in Asia, Africa and Latin America. Trampling on the Geneva Agreements and ignoring the elementary standards of relations between sovereign states, the United States is waging undeclared war in Southeast Asia. In South Vietnam it goes as far as using poison and in North Vietnam it savagely bombs peaceful towns and villages. Tens of millions of people have forgotten what peace is.

By unleashing wars and interfering in the internal affairs of other peoples, the imperialists seek to halt the progress of history. But progress is irreversible. Gigantic social transformations are being carried out on earth. The imperialist colonial system is living its last days. Only a few spots remain on the maps of Africa and other continents, painted in the traditional colours of Britain, Spain and Portugal. In 1919, colonial and semi-colonial territories comprised

more than three-fourths of the territory of the globe, whereas now they do not exceed one-sixteenth.

More and more colours are appearing on the political map of the world—the colours of freedom.

However, there is still a long way to go to a world without slavery. Something like 50 million people in the colonies are to this day deprived of elementary freedoms. The South-African authorities continue their apartheid policy with regard to the Africans—the native population—and are even intensifying it. In South Rhodesia the racialists have seized power in order to preserve the domination of the white minority. Meanwhile Britain, for whom it would be quite easy to suppress the mutiny, ignores the will of the African peoples and refuses to take adequate measures. In some Asian countries slave-trade has not been completely done away with and in the United States about 20 million former slaves are still fighting for genuine freedom and equality with the whites.

In places where imperialism is forced to retreat it tries to retain economic domination by employing various forms of neocolonialism.

The positions of imperialism are still strong. However, a new world, that of socialism, has emerged to exist alongside imperialism and become a decisive force in present-day development.

Fourteen states—about a third of humanity—have built or are building socialism. Though the majority of socialist countries were formerly underdeveloped economically, their rapid advance today provides grounds for stating that the

time is not far-off when they will outstrip the most advanced capitalist countries both in the volume of production and the standard of living.

By maintaining the high rate of economic development and placing the national income at the service of the people socialism guarantees a steady rise in the standard of living and ever fuller satisfaction of the material and spiritual needs of **all the working people**.

The imperialist myth of eternal capitalism cannot withstand the test of time and reality. How can one speak of the eternity of capitalism when the world of socialism has emerged, become strong and is successfully developing despite the powerful resistance on the part of the imperialist states, despite blockade, intervention and wars?

It is remarkable that many young national states are abandoning the capitalist way of development and some of them (UAR, Mali, Burma and others) have consciously chosen the path of socialism.

In the capitalist countries themselves a powerful communist movement is gaining momentum. In the world today there are 89 Communist Parties, with a membership of almost 50 million.

Communist Parties have been banned in Spain, Portugal, Greece, Federal Germany, Venezuela, Peru, the South-African Republic and some other countries. Communists are discharged from their jobs, thrown into prison, tortured and executed. Anti-communist terror has swept over Indonesia. The Communist Party has been banned there and the reactionaries have savage-

ly killed tens of thousands of Communists without trial. And what of that? In tsarist Russia, too, reprisals were launched against Communists. They were also thrown into prison, exiled and persecuted. The Party of Bolsheviks worked underground right until 1917. This, however, did not prevent it from leading the October Socialist Revolution and becoming the country's ruling party. Today the world communist movement is steadily growing stronger. Twenty eight Communist Parties have come into being during the last 25 years. Since 1960 the number of Communists in the world has increased by 14 million. Many Communist Parties have become the leading political force in their countries.

Today no one can ignore the communist movement; it has become a force of tremendous political impact.

Socialism ushers in the communist era. For socialism is the early stage of communism, the first step along the path of its materialization.

The force and influence of socialism is the most remarkable feature of the time we live in.

What does the future hold in store? Will scientific and technical progress bring about the elimination of all misfortune, or will the great forces of destruction wipe out all life in the world? Will the nations be able to win and retain their freedom, or does inequality and oppression await them? To whom does the future belong? To communism or capitalism?

History shows that the future invariably belongs to what is new, to what embodies progress. The old resists desperately. It can inflict wounds on what is new, it can raise obstacles along the path of progress. But these wounds

will heal and the obstacles will be destroyed, for the triumph of the new is inevitable.

Freedom and communism is what is new and progressive in the world today. The peoples of the USSR are engaged in the construction of communism and they are scoring successes. The 23rd Congress of the Soviet Communist Party held at the end of March and the beginning of April 1966, summed up the first results of communist construction and mapped out a programme for the further advance to communism. The peoples of the socialist countries have also proclaimed communism the objective of their development.

COMMUNISM AND MYTHS

For thousands of years people tried to imagine a social system under which all would be free and equal with nothing to cloud their happiness. At first such ideas were just—

Dreams

In their dreams people recalled the long-gone past, a time of social equality, a time without private ownership, or exploitation. Despite the fact that the dawn of the human race was grim many thought the ancient past a "Golden Age." And it was glorified in different countries.

The "Golden Age"... Hesiod, the ancient Greek poet, pictured it as a time when people lived without work or worry, when land yielded rich fruit all by itself. Even when people had to work it was a joyful process in which they competed peacefully. Freedom, friendship and mutual aid were the moral code of that time. If only that age could be returned, the poet dreamed.

But how could it be returned? All attempts

to break the yoke of oppression ended in defeat for the oppressed. The future held out no good prospects. It seemed that only in their dreams could people revive the "Golden Age."

Thus tales of an earthly paradise, lost by people for some reason, were composed. The biblical New Testament, the holy book of Christians, contains passages, naive of course, which ring with nostalgia for primitive communism. There is hope but no strength. The *Apocalypse*, an ancient work of Christian literature, predicts the coming of a divine savior, Jesus Christ. He is the one, it says, who will lead people out of darkness and establish a thousand-year reign of equality and justice on earth.

But as time went on, religion transplanted the kingdom of justice to heaven and paradise became believers' posthumous award. Meanwhile the Church proclaimed inequality on earth, oppression and exploitation to be the divine order of life. Gradually heavenly paradise lost its semblance even of primitive communism. Life in the world beyond was made similar to the life of the rich, that of idleness and luxury.

But people kept thinking of equality, justice and material well-being here, on this earth. They were not afraid of work. They remembered that the forebears of the human race were not idle: Adam delved and Eve span.

For more than a thousand years movements sprang up to defend the old Christian idea of a kingdom of justice and equality on earth. The leaders in those movements, anathematized by the Church as heretics, taught that private ownership was sinful, and advocated equal rights to land and property. At the beginning of the

16th century Thomas Munzer, leader of the Peasants' War in Germany, proclaimed the injustice of private ownership and worked out a scheme for establishing a social system under which there would be no class distinctions, private ownership or hostile government.

True, the kingdom of justice and equality—the dream of people of those bygone times—resembled communism only vaguely, for the poorly developed economy could not ensure well-being for all; under those conditions equality would have been equality of the poor. And even if attained (attempts of this kind were made in various small religious communities) equality turned out to be only ephemeral.

What happened to the people's dream? At first it was the "Golden Age," which lay wholly in the past, then earthly paradise—wholly in an indefinite future. People came to realize ever more clearly that the kingdom of justice and equality would not be established on earth **all by itself**.

How could they attain it? Out of the dreams came the—

Utopias

Actually, at first it was not utopias, but the *Utopia—A Fruteful and Pleasant Worke of the best State of a Publique Weale and of the Neue Yle Called Utopia*. Such was the title of the famous book written in 1516 by Sir Thomas More, English statesman and great humanist.

At that time the development of woollen manufactures in England had resulted in the pea-

sants being ousted from their lands, which were fenced off for pastures. Forcibly turned into beggars, they roamed the country in search of the means of subsistence despite savage punishment threatening them.

Thomas More indignantly condemned the society of his time. He wrote: "...your sheep, which are naturally mild, and easily kept in order, may be said now to devour men and un-people not only villages, but towns."

He arraigned the society where vagabonds were sent to the gallows when their only fault was that no one would set them to work, "though they never so willingly proffer themselves thereto," the society in which the lives of a few idlers were passed in splendour and luxury, while the lot of people who worked was worse than that of cattle.

Where was the source of this misfortune and evil?—Thomas More asked. **In private ownership.** According to More a nation could not be happy "so long as there is property, for when every man draws to himself all that he can compass, by one title or another, it must needs follow that, how plentiful soever a nation may be, yet a few dividing the wealth of it among themselves the rest must fall into indigence."

But the picture to be observed on the fantastic island of Utopia is entirely different. Absence of private ownership is the main distinction of Utopian society. Life in Utopia is founded on universal manual labour, from which only scientists and people temporarily engaged in fulfilling social functions are exempted. There is an abundance of products, distributed accor-

ding to needs, and universal equality reigns supreme.

Unlike medieval idealists who associated the just organization of society with just distribution alone, Thomas More thought that it was the rational organization of production that should be the requisite of social equality. He based his supposition on the fact that only the organization of production on a nation-wide scale would make it possible to implement the principle of consumption to meet the needs of all the people.

Here are some features of such organization as More pictured it. Production is based on handicrafts. As for farming, the urban population take it up in turn, each person working for a spell of two years. Each family is engaged in a certain trade as an economic unit. The working day lasts six hours. All the products are conveyed to public warehouses, entered into books and distributed by the state in such a way as to meet everyone's needs. Well-being is not ensured by production alone but also by the natural measure of people's requirements. The Utopians are not ascetics but their needs are reasonable, they do not go in for luxury and extravagance.

As More showed it, the welfare of that wonderful state rested on the legislative activities of King Utopus the Good. More gave rise to hope: "Wait, more Utopuses will turn up!" But he did not and actually could not indicate a realistic way of transforming the society of his time.

The traveller, Ralph Hythlodaye who told More's story about Utopia, described the life of the Utopians so vividly that many contemporaries came to believe that there really existed such

an island. But let us recall the meaning of the Greek word *outopos* (utopia)—“not place,” nowhere. There is no such place and, we must add, there cannot be anything like it if one is to count on Utopus the Good. There are also other circumstances, making the existence of Utopia impossible, but they will be dealt with later.

People soon realized there was no island of Utopia on earth. But the name was not forgotten. It assumed the meaning of a beautiful but vain dream. More's *Utopia* was followed by numerous other utopias.

In 1602, the imprisoned Italian philosopher Tommaso Campanella wrote his communist utopia *Civitas Solis* (The City of the Sun) which was published in 1623. There, too, the narrator was a traveller, who had visited a wonderful city during a round-the-world voyage. It was situated on the imaginary island of Taprobanu in the Indian Ocean.

What did the Genoan traveller tell?

The society of Solarians (citizens of Sun City) have no private property. People do not serve things but things are made to serve the people. Respect for labour is instilled in Solarians from early childhood. It is not just their duty but an organic necessity. There is no gap between manual and brain work. Any work is an honour. The harder the work the greater the honour. At the same time extensive application of various technical inventions makes work easier (Campanella mentions sail-driven, self-moving carts, and says that people are even able to fly). The workday lasts four hours. Women are engaged in easy occupations; they are equal to men and enjoy general respect. The abundance

of products suffices for all requirements. A special system of education and upbringing ensures the rearing of a harmoniously developed individual. Relations are based on mutual love and friendship. The Solarians are friendly and truthful.

There actually is no such city, Campanella admits. But if people follow the urge for intercourse, the desire to unite with other people inherent in them, they will finally attain that harmony.

It is to human nature, outside time and history, to human reason and to man's supposed absolute moral principles that all the later authors of socialist and communist utopias appealed—Gerrard Winstanley of England in the 17th century, Jean Meslier, Gabriel Mably and Morelly, the author of the famous *Code de la nature*, in the 18th century, and the great socialist-utopians Charles Fourier, Henri de Saint-Simon and Robert Owen in the 19th century.

In the spring of 1649, during the English bourgeois revolution, a small community settled on common land and started jointly to till it in the country of Surrey near London. The group was called the “Diggers.” Their leader, the theoretician Winstanley, described a republican society ensuring genuine freedom to all citizens in his *Law of Freedom, in a Platform or True Magistracy Restored* (1652) appealing to the Bible as expressing the demands of human nature. In that society there is no private ownership, no trade. All the products manufactured are sent to public warehouses from where each family receives what it needs.

The authors of communist theories in pre-

revolutionary France of the 18th century appealed directly to human nature and reason. Guided by the "natural light of reason" Meslier, the author of *Le Testament*, created an image of an ideal social system where public ownership and universal labour enabled the people to attain genuine freedom and equality. What distinguished Meslier's theory was that he did not suppose education alone to be enough to realize the communist ideal. He believed it was necessary to eliminate private ownership and exploitation in a revolutionary way.

According to Mably, the "Order of Nature" requires the elimination of private ownership, the chief source of all evil. Common property and equality, competition among people in the name of lofty goals, concentration of power in the hands of the people—such are the social relations that are in harmony with man's nature, and as such they wholly belong to the past. As for the future Mably is pessimistic: it is impossible, he claims, to establish communist relations in a society spoiled by private ownership.

Just as Mably, Morelly idealized the primitive state of the human race and considered its distant past a "Golden Age," a time of "natural order." But unlike Mably, Morelly was optimistic about the future. He maintained that legislation would help humanity restore the ways of man's "code of nature." The main thing was to eliminate "property and private interest." Morelly's future communist society was remarkable for its institution of social ownership. He believed it was only the welfare of the whole of society that could ensure conditions for the personal happiness of each individual. Labour was

the right and duty of every citizen; each was guaranteed the right to rest and recreation, distribution was organized on the basis of people's needs; favourable conditions were created for the development of science.

The most complete theories of utopian socialism were developed in the first three decades of the 19th century. The 1789-94 French bourgeois revolution and the industrial boom in England which replaced manufactures by machine production, had not brought any radical improvements for the working people. On the contrary pauperization even increased among broad sections of the population. The ruined peasants poured into the cities where nothing but ruthless exploitation at plants and factories, or even worse, unemployment and poverty, awaited them. The promises of the bourgeois revolution—universal freedom, equality and fraternity—remained nothing but beautiful words as far as the people were concerned.

The capitalist order was sharply criticized by Saint-Simon, Fourier and Owen. Saint-Simon was the first to notice that the French revolution did not consist in struggle against the gentry alone, but also in the fight between the poor and the rich. This struggle had a sad outcome for the have-nots. Charles Fourier, brilliant critic of capitalism, condemned the vices of a "system of civilization" under which poverty was born out of abundance, where seven-eighths of the population had been robbed by the remaining one-eighth, where parasitism flourished and contradictions between personal and public interests were flagrant. He wrote that in this civilized society every individual was in a state of

intentional war with the masses: the doctor wished there were more sick people, the architect dreamed of a fire which would burn down a quarter of his town, the glazier was happy about the hail that had broken all the windows, and the court wanted more crimes. . .

The people's moral make-up was ugly. Egoism was the predominant trait; woman was an article of commerce, and as a rule, there was no love in marriage. Following Saint-Simon, Fourier proclaimed that society's freedom should be measured by the degree of the liberation of women.

Fourier, Saint-Simon and Owen revealed the principal vices of capitalist production: the anarchy reigning in it and "surplus crises" as Fourier referred to crises in the economy. Describing the irrationality of bourgeois society Owen wrote that under capitalism the introduction of machinery in production had only depreciated the labour of the workers without having made it easier. Now two and a half thousand workers produced as much as sixty thousand did fifty years before, but the difference was appropriated in the form of profit by the owners of plants and factories. As for the workers, the wealth they produced brought them only deprivation and suffering.

At the beginning of the 19th century utopian socialism was three hundred years old. And all that time socialists had proceeded to moralize while criticizing the existing relations and drawing up projects of an ideal society. They proclaimed the old as counter to morals and the new as stemming from them. Sometimes they supplemented moral by aesthetic condemnation

and supported the need of an ideal society from aesthetic positions. Both moral and aesthetic requirements were considered to derive from human nature.

The great utopians of the 19th century hoped that their schemes for society's socialist transformation could be implemented solely through propaganda of ideas, with material aid from those who had money. They were sure these ideas were reasonable and in accord with human nature. People, they felt, could not but respond to them. Fourier and Saint-Simon even had a special place reserved for capitalists and bankers in their ideal society, where they were relieved from compulsory labour and retained their right to private ownership.

One must be extremely naive to pin hopes on bourgeois philanthropy, to rely on Napoleon as did Saint-Simon or to appeal to Queen Victoria and Emperor Nicholas I of Russia, as did Owen. Owen, himself a capitalist, was ready to sacrifice and he did sacrifice his capital to the great ideal. Capitalists, he believed, were also human and it was again "human nature" that he supposed was to play an important part. That was the cherished hope.

Soon after Saint-Simon's death his pupils wrote that now it was necessary to make the last change: the moralist's task was to lay the foundation. Later the legislator's turn would come to decree it.

What were the results? Socialist theories were still castles in the air and the utopias remained a brilliant but unattainable ideal. They were really brilliant theories, containing as they did many ideas which were later realized,

though in a different environment and by different means.

Saint-Simon supposed that the most important criterion of social progress were the possibilities a social system offered for man to satisfy his requirements and win a position due to his own abilities and not by virtue of his class origin. He believed that these possibilities could materialize only in an **industrialized society**. This society was to be distinguished by universal labour, centralized management of the economy and the replacement of government over people by government over things (thus politics was to be dissolved in the economy). Although in his industrial society Saint-Simon preserved both private ownership, capital and profits, as well as the difference between manual and brain work, he believed this society capable of ensuring abundance, happiness and justice for all its citizens.

But it is absolutely impossible to replace "government over people" by "government over things" if private ownership is to be preserved. This is a point that strikingly reveals the contradiction between the magnificence of the ideal and its utopianism, total lack of realism and the impossibility of its implementation by the suggested means.

We see the same gap in Fourier's theory: the great ideas anticipating the future and the utter impossibility to realize them on the basis of his scheme. Fourier's ideal **societarian society** is a society where the principles of "harmony" are implemented: each individual seeks to accord his happiness with the happiness of the world around him. Total participation in pro-

ductive labour ensures the elimination of differences between labour and capital and, moreover, it gives rise to competition in labour and the desire to make labour diverse, as well as to the irresistible urge to create which Fourier describes as "enthusiasm." The societarian society creates all the necessary conditions to meet these aspirations. It ensures, among other things, man's right to work. The development of the economy on the basis of scientific and technical progress will wipe out all material wants. There is no difference between town and countryside, and the woman is relieved of household burdens, and hence holds an equal position in society. Children are brought up on a social-labour basis and lofty morals are proclaimed the guiding principle in people's behaviour.

Fourier drew up a detailed project of a societarian society. It was to be a world society in which different socialist communities—*phalanges*—would attain complete unity on the basis of free agreement with each other. The *phalanges* would constitute production-and-consumption associations, with a comparatively small membership (up to 2,000). Life in such a community was to be concentrated in a huge building—the phalanstery—housing workshops, dormitories, mess-rooms, schools, etc. Seeking to make labour diverse, people would change their occupations as they desired. Labour would become a source of enjoyment, a fact on which Fourier set his hopes when he stated that all people, even the rich, would work.

Owen's theory was somewhat different. His "Rational Social System" was first of all a system without private ownership, and hence with-

out classes. Such was the basis on which the wonderful power of machines would ensure abundance. Every member of a small labour community—the cell of the new society—would receive whatever he needs. The difference between manual labour and brain work would completely disappear along with differences between industrial and farm labour, between town and countryside.

The magnificence of Owen's ideas is striking. At the same time Owen considered the system of distribution to be the only source of all misfortune in contemporary society. He hoped that by replacing money by a direct exchange of goods it would become possible to overcome this misfortune. Like all the other utopian socialists Owen did not believe in the creative forces of the people and the working class, and counted on the capitalists, to whom, he supposed, the system he devised would also be beneficial.

It is not our intention to describe all the socialist and communist theories. There were other great names in other countries. Some utopian writers as, for instance, Meslier associated the realization of the socialist ideal with the revolution of the popular masses. Among them was N. G. Chernyshevsky, the outstanding Russian thinker of the 19th century. But all those theories were essentially wrong on a number of crucial points.

As a rule their authors supposed that an ideal society could soon become a "place which is." For instance Fourier believed that if an experimental *phalange* were to be set up in 1823, it could start running the next year and by 1828 the transformation of society would be com-

pleted. Ten years was the maximum time Owen reckoned necessary to build a society on a communist foundation. There were people—the thinkers themselves and their advocates—who actually set about creating such a society.

Experiments

In September 1932, the centenary of a "socialist" agricultural and industrial colony was celebrated in the outskirts of Paris. The colony was set up by Dr. Baudet-Dullarilin in his estate of Conde-sur-Vesgre when Fourier was still alive. At the same time there still existed the *phamilister* built between 1859 and 1865 by Gauden on the basis of a small iron works in Guise.

Was the colony a success? Alas, the "socialist colony" in Conde-sur-Vesgre had long since turned into something like a cooperative holiday home and the inhabitants of the *phamilister*, which had been set up to transform production, distribution, consumption and cultural activities on a socialist basis, had invariably acted as enemies of the working class in all the class battles.

Did the cause of defeat lie in departure from Fourier's ideas? It is known that Fourier had not completely approved of the principles under which the colony in Conde-sur-Vesgre was organized and Gauden's *phamilister* followed Fourier's plan only in part.

But let us consider Owen's experiment. In 1824, he set up a socialist colony, called "New Harmony," in Indiana, the United States. Over

800 people (this was in accordance with Owen's best variant of a socialist community—from 800 to 1,200 people) arrived there from different countries of America and Europe. Even scientists were among them (Owen believed this to be extremely important): William Maclure, founder of American geology, Thomas Say, founder of American zoology, the Dutch geologist Troost, the French botanist Charles Lesueur et al.

The colony had a 30,000-acre plot of land situated along the navigable Wabash River, tributary of the Ohio. At the time the land was bought it had cultivated fields, orchards, vineyards and even workshops and a settlement with conveniences.

"New Harmony" was organized under Owen's plan. On May 1, 1825, constitution of the preliminary community, that Owen himself had drawn up, was adopted. The community's life was based on commonly owned means of production and on distribution according to labour. Transition to a communist association was announced the community's objective. The transition period was set at three years. But at the beginning of 1826 Owen decided that development was ahead of the planned targets, and that everything was ready for the realization of the communist ideal. On February 5, constitution of the community of perfect equality was adopted. The new element was that apart from social ownership each citizen was to have the right to receive food, clothes and dwelling, as well as upbringing irrespective of the amount of work done. All punishments and awards were to be abolished. The legislative power was to belong

to the General Meeting; the executive power, to the Elected Council, which was to report to the Meeting every week.

Soon, however, discord set in. The constitution had not been adopted unanimously. First two communities broke away from "New Harmony" and in March 1827, another two. There was no unanimity in "New Harmony" itself. In 1828 Owen had to admit failure. And only three years before, in Washington, Owen had spoken of "New Harmony" as the beginning of a new era and expressed confidence that its experience would convince the best minds and all governments.

The history of "Icarian" communism was fully as sad.

In 1840, in Paris, Etienne Cabet published his "philosophical and social novel" *Voyage to Icaria*. The mythical Icarus flying from the Crete Labyrinth on the wings his father Daedalus had made for him, helped Cabet to create an image of a free society organized on a communist basis.

Cabet should have given thought to Icarus' death. No one could be free when slavery reigned supreme. He should have considered the unfortunate experience of "New Harmony," whose story he had heard from Owen himself. But perhaps Owen had given Cabet grounds for hope, when the latter went specially to London to meet him?

At any event, in May 1847, Cabet published an appeal *Off to Icaria!*—an invitation to settle in a "new paradise," where property would be held in common and distribution would be governed by needs. On February 3, 1848, the

Rome sailed from Havre to America, carrying on board "the first vanguard" of 69 Icarians. As Cabet's magazine *Populaire* wrote, "the greatest venture in human history" began. Cabet believed that "swarms of new bees would fly from Icaria all over the world to transform it."

There is no sense in relating Icaria's story in detail. Suffice it to say that it was a chain of failures. The "second vanguard" which left for America on June 3, numbered only 19 people instead of the supposed 1,000 to 1,500. Finally the new community managed to assemble 487 people who were headed by Cabet. Out of this number 200 people left the Icarian society even before the first attempts to create a "new paradise" were made. The number of Icarians changed all the time, now growing bigger, now smaller, and the communist ideals stayed as far from realization as ever. Continuous discord resulted in the expulsion of Cabet himself from the Icarian society not long before his death.

Small Icarian societies sprang up now and then in different places: "Young Icaria," "New Icarian Commune," "Icaria Speranza"... (*speranza* in English is "hope"). The latter ended up in using hired labour and the "communist order" virtually became capitalist order.

Other experiments were made too. A Saint-Simonian community was organized at Brook Farm in America; there were Fourierist societies, like that of Dr. Juon's in France which was called "rural children's home for social experimenting" and which existed 22 years, Owenite communities (Orbistone community in Scotland, Rolahine in Cork, Ireland, and the so-called exchange-markets that Owen organi-

zed in London and Birmingham).

Complete failure was the end of all these experiments, which only proved the bankruptcy of "utopian" socialism.

Why Utopian Society Was Doomed

In 1726, the Italian philosopher Giambattista Vico proclaimed that "human genius is God in Man," thus denying the conception of history according to which it was completely forethought by a divine being.

After Vico the bourgeois enlighteners of the 18th century called all social institutions to "trial by reason." They found them irrational and demanded that the old feudal relations be replaced by capitalist relations. It would seem that the results of bourgeois revolutions, which did no good to the people, and the numerous utopias of the 16-18th centuries which remained "places that were not," should have cured the socialists of the 19th century of any illusions with regard to human morals and reason as factors destined to transform the world. But the time had not yet produced a real force capable of carrying out the socialist transformation of society. The thinkers still cherished hopes of only the "eternal" categories—human reason and human nature.

Unfortunately, there is no such thing as "human nature" existing outside history, no abstract requirements of human reason, no above-class, absolute morality.

There were two inseparable features revealing the utopianism of socialist and communist

theories of the past: moralization and hopes pinned on morality, reason and human nature alone, and the total inability to see in the people and the working class above all the only real force capable of transforming society on a communist basis, and destined to do so by history.

True, the utopians' sympathies were with the common people, the working class. But they regarded them only as the **object** of exploitation and not as the **subject** of history.

A number of socialist writers (from Campanella on) justly associated communism with technical progress and a high production level. Some even tried to substantiate "demands of human reason" by ideas of objective historic development (Saint-Simon, Fourier) and believed that socialism could be attained only at a definite stage of history. But just as the bourgeois enlighteners of the 18th century, utopian socialists based their conclusion regarding logical historic development on the same "human reason." But what made reason develop? What made reason direct history into certain channels?

Vico was among the first to mention that history developed under laws of its own. But unable himself to perceive the laws moving reason, Vico arrived at the conclusion that reason developed by the irreversible laws laid down by Providence. In other words, there existed some "ideal history" chartered by the great plan of God. For that reason Vico considered "Rational Civil Theology of Divine Providence" to be a "new science."

Reflecting on the causes and ways of the

development of reason, some utopians, e.g., Fourier, arrived at the same conclusion.

In this way the realization of socialist and communist ideals was turned over to divine Providence. It was logical, therefore, to count on the union of all the social forces, all people no matter whether rich or poor. If considered from this standpoint, the class struggle would only hamper the union of society on the basis of communist transformation. For that reason as soon as the proletariat launched their independent class struggle, followers of the great utopians came out against it.

The plans of the great utopians ran contrary to the real content of history. The lofty ideas had not been supported by the masses and the experiments failed.

Reason is capable of accomplishing much, provided that the ideas it exercises truthfully reflect the objective necessities of life.

It was necessary to combine the theory of communism with science and to combine science with the working-class movement.

COMMUNISM AND SCIENCE

*

**How do Rivers Know that They Should Flow
into the Ocean?**

But they do not know. They just flow. The Volga into the Caspian, the Nile into the Mediterranean, the Lena into the Arctic Ocean and the Amazon into the Atlantic. They just flow and cannot help it.

Why? Simply because all things and phenomena in nature have their own properties—mechanical, physical, chemical and biological, their own relations and laws. They exist independently of human conscience and will, no matter whether people like it or not. Of course one can declare his complete indifference to them, as did the Greek Pirus or the Roman Sextus Empiricus. But that will not change anything. The laws, properties and relations will still exist just as they have always existed. People cannot ignore the laws of nature; moreover, they should act in full accord with them. Only then will they be able to achieve their ends sooner and with greater certainty.

Let us recall a remarkable tale of the Ancient Greeks. Apollo, being enraged at Achilles, the great hero of the Trojan War, directed Paris' arrow so that it struck Achilles' heel—the only vulnerable spot on his body. Achilles died.

The Greeks believed in fate and destiny. Yet in many of their myths and tales the idea crops up that not only mortal beings but even gods themselves sometimes had to consider external factors. Transplanted into the sphere of imagination, objective connections and properties often assumed the image of an "Achilles' heel."

It is essential to cognize the objective laws in order to harness them and make them serve man.

That is what science takes up.

Ideas, hypotheses and theories remain in science only if they accord with the laws of nature. Copernicus's book which outlined the heliocentric conception of the world some four hundred years ago was banned by the Vatican. Professors of astronomy had to pledge they would not reveal Copernicus's heresy to their students. The book was not read, not retold and was even burned. Nonetheless who doubts the correctness of Copernicus's theory today?

If an idea or theory is false and contradicts the laws of nature, even the most powerful defence and support cannot save it from defeat. It is extremely tempting to create a perpetual motion machine. Even today there are people who have not yet given up the idea. Moreover, some are even sure that they actually have invented it. But not a single patent office in any country will bother to consider the projects of

perpetual motion machines: they cannot be built because they oppose the laws of nature.

Could it be that society too is governed by objective laws? Perhaps there is also an ocean into which "it is flowing," regardless of anybody's will, but simply because such is the objective course of its development?

From More to Owen, all utopian socialists of the past looked for and studied that "ocean"—the future society of justice and equality. But research into the depths of that ocean often proved inaccurate, not objective and insufficiently "equipped." The researchers did not and really could not see the objective road to communism.

"Objective" means something that exists regardless of people's will, reason or desire. To develop to the level of science the theory of communism had to be supported by the laws of history. This support was furnished in the '40s of the last century when the outstanding philosophers and revolutionaries Karl Marx and Friedrich Engels discovered these laws.

K. Marx, F. Engels, V. Lenin and their followers studied the objective laws of social development and raised the theory of communism from utopia to science.

From Utopia to Science

We have mentioned a few attempts to interpret history as an objective process, made as far back as the 18th century. They were all doomed because they drew on the idea that it was the development and perfection of human

reason, and hence, of the ideas of good and evil that was the crucial point in all historical changes. But there was no answer to questions as to the basis of the development of reason and morals or the reason they were different at different ages.

Marx raised those questions and answered them. The role of reason and morals is certainly very important in man's life and in the development of society. The worst architect is different from the best bee in that before erecting a house he draws it on paper. But in his drawings the architect has to consider circumstances of external reality, otherwise his project will never go further than the paper stage. He has to consider the soundness of the foundation or something that can replace it, the properties of the building materials and the local relief.

In society too, ideas, moral principles and theories will promote the building or reconstruction of the social structure only provided they are in harmony with the objective possibilities and laws of its existence and development. Consideration of the objective conditions of social life signifies the beginning of a **materialistic understanding of history**.

This may sound simple. Actually the materialistic understanding of history states the simple truth that first of all people must have something to eat, drink and clothe themselves in, that is, must meet the material needs of life. The foundation of life consists in the **economic relations** which regulate production and distribution of material blessings. These relations also determine the existence or absence of classes in society. Economic relations are actually

the factor that shapes all the state and law relations, as well as all the philosophical, religious, moral and other views of every historical epoch. It is not the consciousness of men that determines their being, but their social being that determines their consciousness. For instance, in our age slavery, the turning of man into an article of property fully possessed by the slaveowner is considered by the overwhelming majority of mankind, even by people of the upper classes, to be contrary to human nature, and propaganda of slavery is regarded as immoral. Under the slave-owning system, however, the "normality" of slavery roused no doubts even among progressive people: slave-holding was the norm of life.

Economic relations themselves depend on the nature and level of development of the means with which people influence nature, transform it and thus create the material conditions of their life, that is, on the productive forces of society. For instance, had people of the Stone Age tried to make a slave out of a prisoner, while having nothing but stone tools to win their meagre means of subsistence (and this too on condition that all members of society worked), that slave would not have lived more than five days. For slavery to become society's basic form of relationship, society had to provide at least a minimum of surplus consumer goods above the physical minimum, otherwise the slave would have died of hunger. Social relations, no matter of what type, always depend on the state of production.

Social development consists in the interaction of the aspects making it up. The spiritual

aspect is a no less important element in the historical process than the material. But their interaction is based on economic development. Herein lies the final explanation of the causes of all social changes and political turnovers. The realization of the irrationality and injustice of the existing social relations only comes as a result of such changes in production which no longer accord with the social system measured by the old economic "yardstick."

The materialistic understanding of history made it possible to distinguish the major periods in the development of society, objectively replacing each other in a definite sequence. Those periods are called **socio-economic formations**. There are five of them: the primitive-communal system, the slave-owning system, feudalism, capitalism and communism.

The replacement of a socio-economic system by a new one is due to the fact that each succeeding formation provides more favourable possibilities for the development of production and that it is capable of securing a higher labour productivity and making society wealthier. Capitalism, for example, replaced feudalism in conformity with the laws of objective reality, for the development of commodity relations under feudalism gave rise to cooperation and manufactures. There emerged a need for free labourers while the land, all its natural wealth and the land-tillers themselves were the property of the feudal lords.

It was essential to destroy the feudal ownership of land and eliminate serfdom in order to step up the production of raw materials. Backed

by the popular masses, the bourgeoisie abolished serfdom, which resulted in the development of free enterprise and the system of hired labour. They succeeded because at that time their goals conformed with objective reality and the objective tendency of historical development.

It should be pointed out that it is not just any new formation which replaces an old one, but the formation whose emergence has been determined by the level of development and the character of productive forces. Conditions for the next stage of social development emerge within the framework of the previous formation.

Understanding of the development of socio-economic formations made it possible to reveal the uniformity of the historical process. True, the history of any people is to a great extent unique. This becomes obvious if, for instance, one analyzes the capitalist formation in different countries. But peculiar as they are, the concrete conditions in these countries represent nothing but **capitalism** and the economic relations—the forms of ownership of the means of production, distribution and class relations—are characteristic precisely of capitalism. In any capitalist country—the United States of America, the Federal Republic of Germany, Britain, Spain, Japan or the South-African Republic—the means of production belong to capitalists, distribution depends above all on the amount of invested capital, and the proletariat's struggle against the bourgeoisie never ceases.

Since the economic conditions determining the objective possibilities of development are

similar in all capitalist countries, the immediate future of any capitalist country considered in terms of these conditions is in principle also similar.

It goes without saying that the concrete history of a people depends on numerous factors, such as geographical conditions, racial and national relations, the extent of religious influence, various historical impacts and even the personal traits of those leading the different public movements. Therefore there can be no absolute similarity in the historical development of different peoples.

However, no matter how peculiar the development of a nation in its details and tendencies, the trend of historical development is similar for all humanity.

It is in the development of production, in the objective replacement of one mode of production by another, that the innermost essence of the historical process lies.

Marx's law of surplus value revealed the mechanism of capitalist exploitation: in the process of capitalist production the owner of the means of production, the capitalist, appropriates a share of the worker's labour without having to pay for it. The law of surplus value was a key to understanding the way the bourgeoisie takes to quench his steadily growing thirst for profit. This way is increasing the portion of surplus, unpaid labour.

It is impossible to do away with exploitation under capitalism. Capitalism gives rise to a constant drive for bigger profits, constant because ever-greater profits have become the condition

enabling the capitalist to withstand competition. Besides, capitalism inevitably expands the "territorial boundaries" of exploitation. The tendency to enslave other, weaker nations, that is, the striving for world domination is inherent in it.

This is why projects for realizing socialist ideals in conditions of the preservation of private ownership of the means of production are unrealistic.

In the course of their class struggle the proletariat and all the toiling masses united with them realize with ever greater clarity the contradiction between their class interests and the social relations prevailing. As a result they direct their efforts to eliminating exploitation and oppression of man by man.

The materialistic understanding of history and the exposed essence of capitalist production helped communism become a science.

The **historical** character of scientific communism is the first distinction between it and all previous socialist theories. The turning of utopia into a science started with proof of the indisputable fact that society's transition to communism is a logical process and that the possibility and necessity of such a transition develops within the preceding formation. Actually the establishment of communism is economic in character. A communist society draws on the conditions created by capitalism.

The economic inevitability of the replacement of capitalism by communism lies first of all in the fact that capitalist production is of a pronounced **social character**. Practically any product of labour, even if manufactured by one

worker, is under capitalism a product of cooperative labour—the product is manufactured from a raw material produced by other workers or peasants, with a machine, built by others, and with electricity produced by still others. The various industries are connected with one another by unbreakable, visible and invisible ties.

The normal functioning and development of social production utilizing all the productive forces and void of crises and stagnation is ruled out under capitalism by **private** appropriation of the results of labour by the owners of the means of production. Only the replacement of private ownership by social ownership can ensure the primary requisites for the normal development of production.

It is noteworthy that the establishment of social ownership completes the concentration and centralization of capital, a process fermenting within capitalist production as a logical result of its development, and first of all of the law of capitalist competition. The replacement of private ownership of the means of production by social ownership signifies a qualitative change in the development of society, opening before it broad historical perspectives.

Scientific communism gained victory where utopias came to a dead end. They only criticized capitalist relations, but were unable to comprehend them or to find realistic ways of creating a society of justice. The doctrine of scientific communism did away with moralization as regards the social order. It proved the inevitability of capitalism for a certain historical

period, hence the inevitability of its replacement by a more progressive socio-economic system.

Capitalism laid the basis for communism, since by developing production it created the material requisites for freedom and equality. Classes must be eliminated so that equality of all before the law becomes genuine equality and not a mere formality. This requires a high level of production and an abundance of material and spiritual wealth, enabling distribution according to needs. **Were it not for the turbulent technical progress under capitalism, communism could never be achieved.**

The historical character of the theory of scientific communism lies also in the fact that it proved the necessity of destroying relations between people prevailing under capitalism. The elimination of private ownership of the means of production and oppression of the working people by the exploiting classes is the factor that will bring about the "Golden Age" which even Saint-Simon justly called a thing of the future and not of the past, as legend held.

The transition from capitalism to communism is as **necessary and logical** as was the replacement of feudalism by capitalism. The capitalist order clashes with the productive forces it itself engenders, forces which can no longer be fitted into the narrow framework of private-ownership distribution.

Yet it would be wrong to suppose the modern capitalism has exhausted its production potential. After the Second World War a considerable growth of production has been ob-

served in many capitalist countries, accompanied by the modernization of the tools and technological processes of production as well as of the means and methods of labour. This is to be explained by a number of circumstances: intense competition between capitalist monopolies in the world market, their struggle for economic and political influence over the newly emergent countries that have taken the road of independent economic development, and the continuous arms race.

However, all these are only temporary factors. The economic progress made by the young nations in Asia, Africa and Latin America will sharply limit the possibilities of capitalism in the world market. As the socialist community develops it will steadily increase its aid to the young sovereign states, and this will create still greater difficulties for the imperialist states.

To sum up. When labour productivity was low and yielded a miserly surplus of the means of subsistence, the economy could be developed only if there existed exploitation of man by man. Under capitalism economic development reaches a stage when, firstly, the working people are able to participate in political affairs besides working at plants and factories, and secondly, capitalist production which is not intended to satisfy the constantly growing requirements of society, of all the people, inevitably limits the productive forces it itself engenders. Thirdly, the conflict developing under capitalism between the social character of production and private appropriation can only be resolved with the transition to a higher social order.

Why Nobody Sets Up a Party to Promote the Onset of a Lunar Eclipse

Rudolf Stammler, 19-century German philosopher and jurist, used this question as an argument against Marxism. In his book *Economy and Law from the Standpoint of the Materialistic Understanding of History* Stammler puzzles over the fact that while Marxists believe the transition to communism inevitable they still consider it necessary to speed up this transition. He says that this is as strange, say, as organizing a party to speed up a lunar eclipse, something which is astronomically inevitable.

Since then this has been a favourite argument. Even today critics of the theory of scientific communism use it in attempts to prove the logical "inconsistency" of this theory. The proposition that history is determined materialistically (i.e. that history develops in accordance with objective laws) is incompatible, they claim, with belief in the revolution. For if communism is actually to win, the critics say, it will be established without any revolution or struggle, without any effort on the part of the people—just as a lunar eclipse sets in, just as day comes after night and summer follows spring.

It goes without saying that this argument is intended to disprove the necessity of society's transition to communism. And the meaning behind it is this: Marxists themselves do not believe in the objective necessity of communism which is the reason for their associating it with class struggle, and revolution, i. e. with

human activity. Following this train of thought it is quite easy to draw the conclusion that Marxists are utopians, that, like More and Campanella's voyagers, they are engaged in wishful thinking. Finally, to deprive Marxism even of perspective, any attempt to create a science of the future is announced utopian.

Actually the proponents of anti-communism are in too great a hurry!

Two hundred years ago the British philosopher and chemist, Joseph Priestley, wrote that the inevitability of certain events does not at all exclude the possibility of man's part in them. That, mind you, was written absolutely regardless of the idea of communism and long before a real possibility of implementing it appeared. Human activities constitute an essential link in the chain of causes and consequences and for that reason the outcome of events largely depends on people themselves.

Naturally, such processes and phenomena as the position and movement of the Moon, lunar eclipses, the alternation of night and day and the seasons of the year, do not depend on people and it would be ridiculous to set up parties to promote them.

Yet it is also true that while cognizing natural processes, people very often influence them, intensifying the good and limiting the harmful influence as much as possible.

Now social phenomena are something quite different. There can be no society without people and people are beings possessed with conscience and ability to act. Though human conscience and the nature of people's activities are a result of their social being, people themself-

ves constitute an essential element in the process of realization of the laws of history. Actually, people develop ideas and actions because there can be no historical process without them. **The laws of history are at the same time laws of people's social activity.**

Perhaps the desire to make people look like puppets driven by some mysterious fatal forces or individuals is to be explained by the fear of those activities.

Numerous examples prove that the masses are the main motive force of history. Naturally, this concept does not at all exclude the part of individuals, and not great personalities alone, but of every individual. Yet it is only when the efforts of individuals merge into one torrent that a socially significant effect is produced. And the possibility of this merging is determined by objective laws of the historical process.

Ever since classes came into being class struggle has been the most important form of popular activity. Although the tangibility of communism stems from the preceding development of capitalist society, it can be realized only by developing the class struggle of the proletariat against the bourgeoisie, of the masses against the monopolies.

The establishment of the historical role of the proletariat as the builder of a communist society is the second major discovery of scientific communism. According to this theory the liberation of the working class can be effected only by the working class itself.

While liberating itself the proletariat also liberates the whole of society. For it means liberation from exploitation, hence from private

ownership of the means of production, and this results in the elimination of the social conditions that enslave man. That is why in order to bring about the triumph of a new social system all those oppressed, exploited and ruined by the bourgeoisie and landowners—peasants, craftsmen, office employees—must unite with the working class in firm and lasting alliance.

It is on the strength of this alliance and on the extent to which it involves the masses, that the triumph of a more progressive society depends.

In order to rouse the masses to the struggle against capitalism, in order to unite the working class, all the toiling and oppressed people, and to organize their actions and make them more purposeful the proletariat sets up its political party—the advanced, best organized and most conscious section of the working class.

Communism: As It Is and Will Be in Future

The Marxist theory of communism is a scientific characterization of the communist society and its development. The outline of the future society drawn up by the founders of scientific communism is based on study of the objective processes of the present time, which bring to life the requisites for the transition to communism.

But this is utopia!—claim the present-day opponents of scientific communism. The future cannot be the subject of science.

May we ask why? Does one see anything

utopian in astronomy? And it is a fact that it studies the future when it foretells the position of the planets and stars in the sky for decades and even centuries ahead. The possibility of such prediction, the correctness of which has been brilliantly proved in practice stems from knowledge of the objective laws of the movement of stars and planets.

The theory of scientific communism describes the communist future on the basis of the laws of social development. Naturally, the theory cannot foresee all the details but only depicts the general picture and general features of that future and here it is astoundingly accurate. Suffice it to analyze the experience of socialist construction in fourteen countries.

The great utopians were amazingly correct in many of their predictions, but they were wrong about one essential detail—the transition to communism could not be as rapid and smooth as they pictured it.

Alas, communism is not born ready-made. Not time alone but the collective effort of millions of people is needed to ensure the full triumph of communism.

The major principle of communism is: from each according to his ability, to each according to his needs. But distribution meeting all needs is possible only if there is abundance of material wealth. Meanwhile the level of production achieved under capitalism only creates the **possibility** of the transition to communism. Capitalism cannot go further, for its aim—to extract profit from private capital—restricts the development of the economy. It becomes possible to achieve a level of production creating the ma-

terial requisites for distribution according to needs only in the course of communist development, which subordinates production to satisfying the constantly growing requirements of the working people.

Distribution according to needs also supposes a change in people's consciousness, their psychology. Under communism all people obtain the possibility of satisfying their requirements regardless of the quantity and quality of their labour. Labour is destined to become the prime vital necessity, expressing man's natural desire to work as best as he can to the good of the whole of society.

Even under socialism an important part is played by the moral stimuli of labour and the conviction that successes scored by the whole of society ensure a better life for every individual.

On this basis a communist attitude to labour is formed and the essential requisites appear for the victory of the major principle of communism—from each according to his ability to each according to his needs.

In this way, communism comes into being on **its own basis, that of socialism.**

The theory of scientific communism substantiated and experience proved the inevitability of **two phases in the development of a communist society**—socialism and communism.

Being two phases of one formation, socialism and communism have some common features. They are: social ownership of the means of production; elimination of the exploiting classes (hence of all forms of class, national and racial oppression, for it is the exploiting classes

that constitute the source of oppression in any form); relations of comradesly cooperation, emulation and mutual assistance in the process of production; equal interest of all the working people in the development of production; subordination of production to satisfaction of the constantly growing material and cultural requirements of all the members of society—a condition attained as a result of the development and improvement of production on the basis of technical progress; conscious development of new social relations by people themselves, which stems from their perception of the laws of social development; predominance of communist, Marxist-Leninist ideology.

Communism transforms the features it has in common with socialism to a considerable extent. Under communism an abundance of material wealth will be created on the basis of scientific and technical progress and ever-growing labour productivity. Consequently, conditions will develop for the further improvement of social relations.

Communism is a society with a single form of ownership of the means of production, that of all the people, a form which replaces state ownership and group or cooperative ownership prevailing under socialism in countries with large sections of peasants, craftsmen, etc.

Communism is also a society where there are no classes or social groups differing from one another.

Communism is a society in which the essential differences between town and countryside will disappear on the basis of public ownership, and as a result of agriculture be-

coming a form of industrial labour. Of no less importance in this respect will also be the cultural development of society.

Communism is a society in which physical labour will be reduced to the functions of control and adjustment of production, where the basic differences between people of manual and mental labour will disappear as a result of technical progress and the development of education and culture.

Communism is a society in which labour will cease to be an obligation and become a prime, vital necessity.

Under communism products will cease to be commodities, hence commercial relations will wither away. The measure to which a product satisfies people's requirements will be the only criterion of its value. Communism will implement the principle: "From each according to his ability, to each according to his needs."

Communism is a society of freedom and equality, in which man will be able to develop fully and harmoniously, to change his occupation freely, to engage in production, science and the arts.

As communism triumphs the world over the state will wither away to be replaced by communist self-government of the people; "government over things" will completely oust "government over people."

Communist consciousness and public opinion will become the basic regulators of people's behaviour.

Since the purpose of production under communism will be the satisfaction of the constantly growing requirements of man, and since when

satisfied, these requirements will give rise to other requirements, communism will create conditions for a boundless development of production and the communist society itself as a whole. Moreover, as production develops and labour productivity rises, the amount of time needed to produce material wealth will decrease, thus providing conditions for a genuinely free development of all man's creative forces. Consequently society's wealth under communism will not be estimated by the amount of necessary working time, but by the length of leisure—space for the development of the mind, as Thomas More thought.

Communism is a society for the people, not for the elite but for **all**. The free development of every individual is the requisite for the free development of all.

In short, communism will be a society without classes, a society of abundance for all, a society ruled by a new morality, collectivism, a society ensuring the boundless initiative of every individual.

Such is the general description of communism, for to predict the details would amount to fantasy.

CHAPTER IV (ON THE PRESENT)

COMMUNISM AND HISTORY

History has proved that every scientific theory emerges and finds its way into society only when society is in dire need of such a theory. The doctrine of scientific communism is no exception in this respect: it emerged as the answer to the questions put by the working-class movement.

In the 19th century capitalism was still very strong. Of course it had long since passed its early stage that had inspired artists and poets with admiration for man, whom they had exalted and glorified. It was no longer the capitalism whose ideologists had been sincere proponents of Freedom, Equality and Fraternity. As it matured, its former ideals faded into the past; and only the golden calf remained to be glorified and worshiped.

The first clouds began to gather at the onset of the 19th century when the working-class movement made its first independent steps. And even though these clouds were often dark and heavy, the capitalists and their ideologists saw no reason for worry; the future seemed promising.

Then came the 20th century. A new age that was to put an end to economic crises; production surged upward, each day brought new technical victories; the living standard in the developed capitalist countries attained a comparatively high level.

But all this did not bring the bourgeoisie the security it had longed for.

Acute class struggle, the collapse of the colonial system and the struggle of the peoples for independent political and economic development—all these factors are undermining the very basis of imperialism.

And imperialism is striking back. It is fighting tooth and nail to bar the way to political freedom for the colonies and semi-colonies. And when it fails there, thrown back by the tidal waves of the national-liberation revolutions, it seeks to petrify its economic power in the newly emergent states by devising various forms of neo-colonialist rule. Imperialism schemes to split the working-class movement, it knocks together military blocs to dictate its will from a "position of strength." It resorts to direct aggression.

Along the Road to Communism

The first steps along the way to a new society were far from easy. Russia, the country that was to pave the way into the future, had a very low economic potential. Besides, the years of the First World War and the Civil War that was waged against foreign aggressors and the internal enemies of the Soviet Republic had bro-

ught the country to a state of economic collapse. Some industries, such as the iron-founding industry had to be reconstructed from the 18th-century level. The population was for the greater part illiterate or semi-literate. The remaining bourgeoisie fought against all social reorganizations.

Soviet Russia, encircled by the hostile capitalist world, could not count upon foreign economic aid. Moreover, it was constantly threatened with aggression.

In this atmosphere the country was forced to allocate a substantial part of its meagre post-war resources for defence purposes in prejudice of its economy and the people's welfare.

Finally, there was no previous experience of building an entirely new society.

Yet there was a goal that inspired, there was knowledge of the laws that opened the way to this goal, and there was unprecedented energy to reach this goal. What there was not was acquired along the way, what remained to be learned was learned from life.

Modern enterprises, modern technique emerged on the ruins of the former Russian empire.

There was a sharp rise in the living standard which today is six times that of the pre-revolutionary period.

The Soviet Union can boast of 100 per cent literacy, surpassing every capitalist country in the level of education.

The numerous peoples and nationalities of the Soviet Union have achieved tremendous progress in their economic, political and cultural development. They have become a truly fraternal union.

But the chief result of all these developments was the transformation of social relations, the building of **socialism**. Social ownership of the means of production prevailed in every town and village; exploitation of man by man was totally done away with; the principle "from each according to his abilities, to each according to his work" was consistently put into practice.

All this was achieved in the 10-15 years following the Civil War.

Of course, there had been great sacrifices and immense difficulties. But there were great results too, there was a new life, there were new people!

At the beginning of 1941 the Soviet people were already in a position to set about elaborating a plan for the building of communism. But the war came, and the people had a more immediate task to accomplish—that of routing the fascist aggressors.

As a result of the victory in the war a world socialist system has been formed. Many of the People's Democracies have brought radical changes in social relations and are completing the building of socialism. The path they have trod was not a mechanical repetition of that taken by the Soviet people. In the general advance of the new society each people has its own trail to blaze with due regard for its historic, national and other features; nevertheless the basic line of this development and its common laws are naturally uniform for all socialist countries. And the experience of the Soviet Union stands them in good stead. Socialist countries often coordinate their efforts and render each other friend-

ly aid in building a new society. The fruits of their joint efforts speak for themselves.

Having developed their economies at a rapid pace, the socialist countries now account for nearly two-fifths of the world industrial output, although in the past many of them ranked far behind the industrially developed capitalist countries.

Socialism cannot give one a complete picture of a communist society, for the latter is characterized by an incomparably higher level of development; it is a society whose distinctions from socialism in many respects and in due time will be truly tremendous.

The building of communism envisages the solution of a triple problem: the creation of the material and technical basis of communism, the formation of communist social relations and the education of the new person. All this has to be solved simultaneously. For example, the character of the material and technical basis of communism not only determines the possibility of achieving an abundance of material wealth, but also that of shortening working hours—something that is a prime prerequisite for people's all-round development, this being closely tied up with the time a person has at his disposal after work. Hence the productive forces of communism are not merely those of socialism developed to a higher level; their new qualitative features must ensure a gigantic upsurge of labour productivity and bring about a substantial change in its character, including first of all the complete eradication of heavy, inefficient physical labour and the maximum narrowing of the gap between agricultural and industrial labour.

On the other hand, the material and technical basis of communism makes new, incomparably higher demands of the labourer as regards both his professional and cultural background.

The Directives on the Five-Year Plan for the Economic Development of the USSR during 1966-70 adopted by the 23rd CPSU Congress envisage a number of measures aimed at eliminating the distinction between town and country: to achieve rapid technical progress in agriculture, to raise the cultural level of the rural population, to narrow the gap in the living standards of the rural and urban population. The people's general and technical educational level will be considerably raised, the essential distinctions between mental and physical labour will be wiped out. General secondary education for young people will be introduced in the main; the number of people with a higher or special secondary education will increase by 65 per cent as compared with the previous five-year period; the publication of books, newspapers and magazines and the construction of new theatres, clubs and cinemas will be considerably expanded. The further development of TV services will play a significant part in eliminating the gap in the cultural levels of the rural and urban population.

However, it is the creation of the material and technical basis of communism that constitutes the basis of his triple problem.

The extensive application of scientific discoveries in production, further electrification and all-round mechanization, the increasing utilization of chemical technology, the development of comprehensive automation, and technical and production aesthetics will greatly increase output

and evoke substantial changes in the character of production. The growth of labour productivity will reduce working hours, create favourable conditions for each person's all-round harmonious development and bring closer the day when distribution according to man's needs will be made possible.

Spelled Manchester—Pronounced Liverpool

A curious change has come over bourgeois ideology during the last ten years. It has discarded a number of concepts as regards historical development that were advanced by its predecessors.

Back in the 18th century Turgot and Condorcet introduced the idea of social progress, which implied the replacing of one social order by another, namely feudalism by capitalism. But already in the 19th century progress was regarded by bourgeois ideologists as the perfection of private-ownership relations. "Progress is the development of order," proclaimed Auguste Comte in the first half of the 19th century, where "order" implied private ownership of the means of production and all the inherent attributes.

Now, in the 20th century, they proclaim "progress" a delusive term (report of US sociologist G. Schneider at the 13th Congress of Philosophers in Mexico in 1963) which should be replaced by "social changes" (US sociologist W. Ogburn). The concept of "development" is rejected likewise.

The concept of "social changes" has been

turned into a ballyhoo. Its propositions are as follows:

1. "People's Capitalism." Certain strata of the working people become stock-holders of different companies, hence "sharing" in the companies' profits. Thus, say the apologists of "people's capitalism," there are no class differences between the workers and the multi-millionaires. They are simultaneously the bosses and the workers of the enterprise, for they both receive profits. The fact that the incomes of millions of workers suffice them a hand-to-mouth existence, while those of some hundred monopolists and their-high-paid lackeys bring them millions upon millions of dollars is disregarded—this, they claim, is merely a quantitative difference and not a matter of principle.

2. "Stratification." This proposition issues from the "thesis" of "people's capitalism". Profits and wages are claimed to have become simultaneous and common sources of income. Consequently, classes and class struggle have sunk into oblivion, while those social "strata" that have taken the place of classes are proclaimed to be of no significance in speaking of the character of the social system.

3. "The civilizing mission of capitalism". The inventors of this "proposition" claim that capitalism has given the colonial peoples access to civilization, after which it gave them their freedom.

4. This proposition has several high-sounding titles: "welfare state," "society of equal opportunities" and others, all of which serve the same purpose: to prove that "economic growth" ensures a "revolution in distribution," i.e. con-

stant and accelerated movement towards a high level of consumption and social prosperity. Advocates of this "theory" resort to examples of the following kind: the wife of multi-millionaire Dupont drinks the same kind of milk as the workers of, say, the Chicago slaughter houses, and the amount of milk she consumes does not exceed what the said workers can afford; multi-millionaire Rockefeller suns himself in the same kind of beach chair as the workers of his enterprises; both the President and the average American enjoy the same TV show featuring Hollywood stars. . .

Developing these propositions the ideologists of capitalism come out with far-reaching theoretical and political conclusions: capitalism in the Marxist sense no longer exists in the USA, which serves as an example of a country where success is the result of private ownership, initiative and competition.

All this sums up to a bucolic idyll of the "transformation of capitalism," which is brought up to counterbalance the ideas of communism and the practice of socialist construction.

To do away with all doubts as regards the "idyllic" character and tendencies of the "social changes" in capitalism, the modern imperialist ideologists throw in another concept—that of a "single industrial society." Besides giving a "clear-cut" picture of "social changes" under capitalism the latter is used to prove that collision with man's nature and human interests has brought communism to failure, that communism itself is undergoing "social changes" that "are bringing it back" to the fold of private interest and private ownership of the means of produc-

tion, which consequently is leading to the emergence of a new society that includes the features of both capitalism (its essence) and communism (certain outward attributes).

“Will capitalism and communism spontaneously converge?”—is the question posed by the theoreticians of the “single industrial society”. The invariable answer: in the final end, yes; planning, well-being, proclaimed by communism will be implemented on the basis of transition to the initial stage of “people’s capitalism.” The latter will realize a “revolution in distribution” and thus become a “society of equal opportunities.” Thus, “socialism and capitalism are two forms of the same thing.”

The adversaries of Marxism also seek to undermine scientific communism from within, namely by opposing Marx’s ideas to Lenin’s activities. They claim that Lenin, on discovering that Marx’s “economic determinism,” was refuted by the 20th century switched over to voluntarism. But is that the case?

First of all “Marx’s economic determinism” is an invention of the critics of Marxism. Marx proved that the development of society is determined by the development of its economy, its production. But this development does not happen by itself, automatically. Far from it, the advance made by the economy, by society as a whole, is the result of the activity of the people, the nation, the classes; this in its turn is closely connected with such aspects as the people’s consciousness, their willpower and social activities.

Lenin’s “voluntarism” is likewise an invention. Lenin gave much thought to the study of conditions that would promote the creative poli-

tical activities of the masses, their revolutionary creative abilities, and this was quite natural, for the age of imperialism had actually brought to the fore the question of socialist revolution. And Lenin proved this by investigating the **economic** laws of imperialism. Where are the grounds for opposing Lenin to Marx?

Lenin developed Marx’s teaching, taking into consideration the historical experience of the age of imperialism and the construction of socialism; he enriched Marxism with new ideas.

Capitalism and communism have never and will never develop along converging lines, they will never converge in a single “integrated industrial society.”

Bourgeois ideologists seek to prove this “convergence” by alluding to the economic reforms that are under way in the USSR and other socialist countries. These reforms are based on the consistent application of the laws of commodity production to such economic levers as profit, price, credit, etc. The consideration given to these economic stimuli is used by the ideologists of a “single industrial society” to allege that socialist society is turning to production principles based on private ownership.

Nevertheless, the economic changes in the Soviet Union and a number of other socialist countries are nothing more than a **means** of creating the most favourable conditions for a successful solution of the economic problems of communist construction, for the most rapid achievement of the key **goal**—the building of communism, the fullest satisfaction of the entire people’s requirements.

Only with the full victory of communism

will commodity production and commodity-money relations be done away with. They are still retained under socialism. By distributing consumer goods according to labour (under socialism the distribution of goods corresponds to the amount and quality of labour performed) a commodity embodying a certain amount of labour is exchanged for another commodity embodying the same amount of labour.

The character of commodity-money relations in socialist society radically differs from relations of this kind under capitalism where **the aim** of production is profit. First of all, socialism entails distribution only **according to labour** (there is no distribution of profits according to the capital invested, for there are no capitalists; profits under socialism go only to the working people). Secondly, only articles of personal consumption are distributed, which excludes all possibilities of reviving private ownership of the means of production (the latter are excluded from the personal consumption fund). Thirdly, both production and distribution are not spontaneous but are the result of a planned economy the goal of which is to advance the welfare of **the entire people**.

Hence under socialism the possibility of commodity-money relations being used in the interests of capitalist exploitation is ruled out. They serve to promote the well-being of the entire people, thereby encouraging the growing initiative and creative activity of the masses and, making every worker, every enterprise interested in raising labour productivity and improving the quality of output, in achieving the most rapid development of the national economy.

The economic reforms being implemented in the USSR and some other socialist states are a new significant step in their economic development.

The whole picture of "social changes" under capitalism is painted by bourgeois ideologists in hues that are far from reality.

The apologists of modern capitalism claim that the latter has become a "welfare state" based on production development that fully conforms to the interests of the consumer. And their main argument is that in developed capitalist countries the living standard of certain strata of working people is rather high.

They disregard the existing unemployment and poverty which is the lot of millions in capitalist society while those that still have jobs are faced with the daily threat of unemployment. In 1965, US monopolies took in 45,000 million dollars of net profit which is four times the yearly average taken in during the years of the Second World War. And this while 32 million Americans, which is more than 15 per cent of the population, are living in poverty. This is acknowledged by the US Government.

What is left of the "production that fully conforms to the interests of the consumer?" Consideration for the consumer, and that only as long as he is able to purchase. Where anything else is concerned man is of no interest for the capitalist businessmen. Just as it was one hundred or two hundred years ago **distribution is based on capital** and profit remains the sole aim of production.

What about the "civilizing mission" of capi-

talism!—cry the bourgeois apologists; capitalism brings civilization to backward peoples!

But what are the “boons” of imperialism, what are the “fruits” of this “mission?” Poverty, illiteracy, the branding of colonial and semi-colonial peoples as “second-rate;” the Papuans of New Guinea still living in the Stone Age, the extermination of the Tasmanians, reservations for the remaining aborigenes of North America and Australia. Imperialism is fighting stubbornly to suppress the liberation struggle of the oppressed peoples; the peoples of Mozambique, Angola and other colonies—more than 40 million people—have not yet been able to secure even formal independence. While those peoples that have won political independence (and hard-won victories they were!) have come up against the most incredible economic difficulties that are the work of the colonialists. The national income of Asian, African and Latin-American countries is incredibly lower than that of the United States, Great Britain, West Germany and other industrially developed imperialist countries, which have amassed most of their riches by plundering the peoples of colonial, semi-colonial and dependent countries.

“Stratification?” Of course one can divide people according to their incomes, education and other features. All these distinctions have a definite meaning. But they cannot replace the class division of society which is determined by different relations to the ownership of the means of production and by the differing role of social groups in the process of production. No matter how hard one may try to disregard these fac-

tors, the actual state of affairs brings them to the forefront: the “nonexistent” class struggle manifests itself daily. The yearly number of strikers is 55-57 million—an increase of 100 per cent in the last decade.

“People’s capitalism?” To begin with, there are no more than five or six per cent of “people’s capitalists” out of the entire number of workers even in the economically developed countries. But that is not the main point. What really counts is that if, for example, Mr. Ford is deprived of his wages, he will be no worse off living only on his dividends. If the same thing happened to a worker, the latter’s dividends wouldn’t even cover his funeral expenses. Such are the “equal opportunities.”

It is characteristic of many languages that a word is not always pronounced the way it is spelled. Those studying English often joke: you spell “Manchester” and pronounce “Liverpool.”

Modern capitalist apologists were not joking when they decided to “change” the idea of capitalism and its social order by alterations in spelling. But the people will not be fooled: “people’s capitalism” reads “imperialism,” “stratification” reads “class struggle,” “civilizing mission” reads “neo-colonialism,” “welfare state” reads “unemployment, segregation, poverty.”

No, the new titles cannot change the essence of capitalism. So long as imperialism remains, its laws continue to act.

History could not and did not annihilate the objective necessity of social development from a lower stage—capitalism—to the higher stage—communism. Moreover, the last few decades have

aggravated the contradictions inherent in imperialism, and have accelerated this irreversible process. Mankind is emerging from the abyss of suffering and poverty to build a new society—a communist society—guaranteeing genuine freedom, peace, social equality and prosperity.

The Highroad of Today

The post-war years have witnessed the appearance of about 70 new sovereign states. Fresh victories are being scored by the peoples that are freeing themselves from colonial and semi-colonial rule.

As the first months and years of independence roll by, it becomes more and more evident that the economic and cultural heritage left by the imperialists is a hindrance to national prosperity. In order to prevent freedom from melting away into a mere spectre, in order to check every possibility of colonialism being implanted in a new form, political independence must be reinforced with economic independence.

In building up their national economy the newly-free peoples are inevitably confronted with the question of what road they should take—that of capitalist or non-capitalist development, the latter leading to socialism. Some, however, believe there is a third road which is the quickest way to freedom, wealth, cultural development. But they are quickly disillusioned, for both the opportunities offered and the road itself are sham.

Nobody has yet succeeded in violating the

laws of history. It is not the individual features of each people's development that are meant—the latter depend on the historical and other peculiarities of the nation concerned. The point is that the distinctive pattern of each people's development is a characteristic national form of effecting the laws of objective development. It is impossible to reverse the course of history, the past can never become the future.

This is borne out by palaeontology: the Earth was once inhabited by dinosaurs which were one of the stages in man's biological evolution. But they have become extinct, and nothing can bring them back again.

Thus mankind is faced with the task of moving forward. The much-vaunted "Golden Age" which allegedly existed at the very beginning of man's history is nothing more than a myth. It should properly be called the Stone Age, and it could not even provide man with sufficient food. Then there was slavery, and feudalism: there was and still remains capitalism, there is and will be communism.

What can the newly-free states expect by taking the capitalist road of development? Wealth for the few, abject poverty and ruthless exploitation for the masses. The national bourgeoisie oppresses the working people no less than the foreign bourgeoisie. Seeking to safeguard its personal predatory interests it even goes as far as committing national treason. The recent developments in the Congo (Leopoldville) are a typical example of this kind. And there are many others.

By consolidating social slavery, the capitalist

road of development actually restores colonialism under a new label.

The newly-free countries are developing under conditions that are essentially different from those that existed when capitalism was developing in the 18th and 19th centuries and this makes them easy prey to neo-colonialism. They are unable to compete with the capitalist monopolies, they cannot develop capitalism by enslaving other peoples, in the end "national capitalism" must look to imperialism for support.

What lies in store for the peoples that have chosen the non-capitalist road of development, the road to socialism?

Social freedom.

Economic upsurge.

National prosperity.

By ending the exploitation of man by man, socialism does away with all the forms of national or racial oppression which has always been practised by the exploiting classes. It guarantees the peoples genuine freedom and sees that independence and equality *de jure* actually become independence and equality *de facto*; it ensures their political, economic and cultural development. The growing level of economic and cultural development and the training of national specialists able to manage the state facilitate the achievement of genuine freedom and independence.

With the flourishing of the economy and culture, conditions are created for preserving the national heritage, bringing the people to prosperity, consolidating friendly relations among nations on the basis of mutual assistance.

All this has already been achieved in the So-

viet Union. One has but to look back to the history of the peoples of Russia to see that. In pre-revolutionary times many of them, such as the peoples of Central Asia, the Far North, Siberia and the Far East, were still at a primitive stage of development.

Let us take the Uzbek, Kirghiz, Tajik and Turkmen peoples in Central Asia. What had they before the October Revolution? The complete absence of industry and of a national working class, feudal rule and total illiteracy. Many peoples had no written language.

Today the Republics of Central Asia are known for their highly developed industry, universal literacy, huge contingents of schoolpupils and students, national Academies of Science, flourishing national literature and art.

The life of peoples building communism wholly destroys the imperialist "thesis" that backward peoples are incapable of independent existence and development.

Communism gives practical proof that there are no nations historically destined to dominate others.

But is the non-capitalist road of development open for peoples that have not yet passed the capitalist stage?

The experience of the Mongolian People's Republic, the peoples of Soviet Central Asia show that this is possible.

The world socialist system renders substantial aid to peoples that have taken the new path of development, thus enabling them to bypass the capitalist stage on their way to communism if they have a clear-cut goal and spare no efforts

to build a better future.

The mighty socialist community stands on guard over the interests of all peoples fighting for freedom and is a true guarantee that that goal will be reached.

CHAPTER V (AND THE LAST)

COMMUNISM AND THE HAPPINESS OF ALL THE PEOPLES

What is the prerequisite for man's dignity? What brings him happiness?

No person can be happy if he is prevented from developing his creative abilities. The opportunity to develop one's personality depends on the character of the social system. If the question concerns every member of society then the problem of man's development, the problem of man's dignity and happiness becomes the problem of destroying those social factors that are a brake on human personality.

The bourgeoisie marched to power with slogans of freedom, equality and happiness for all. Only a few benefited from those promises. Today bourgeois ideologists are the first to speak of the destruction of the personality.

They do not tie this process up with the nature of capitalism, although it was the development of capitalism that brought in its wake ruthless suppression of the personality. According to West German sociologist G. Friedman, man is identified with the dog in Pavlov's experiments—the dog is stimulated by an irritant to excrete

saliva, to attain a state of excitation or calmness. Italian philosopher M. Shakka draws a parallel between bourgeois freedom and the chains that shackled Prometheus.

Things have enthralled man. A car-driver, says West German sociologist G. Freyer, becomes a "function of the steering wheel", a man eating turkey becomes a "function of the turkey." A frank confession, indeed! The only point is that this was established long ago by the scientific theory of social development. The only difference is that the materialist understanding of history explained the enslavement of the personality as the inevitable consequence of capitalist social relations and not social relations as such.

But it is not the fact that "things rule man" under capitalism that counts. What matters is that capitalism turns labour, talent and beauty into a commodity, turns man himself into a thing that has or does not have value.

Capitalist society does not provide conditions for the happiness of hundreds of millions of people, i.e. the majority of the world population. Hence there is nothing left for bourgeois ideologists but to assert that the individual is hostile to society in general; man's dignity, his happiness is allegedly based on self-respect on which man's social activities have no bearing (report of French sociologist G. Marcel at the Congress of Philosophers in Mexico). To be happy, they say, man has to forget that he is a member of society. But inasmuch as man cannot abstract himself from society his dignity, freedom and happiness are nothing more than a myth.

It is true that for a man to be happy he

should be free to develop his abilities. But in real life man's abilities develop only in the process of his activities which in their turn have definite social consequences. The flourishing of man's personality and his happiness are directly tied up with his social activity. Man is happy when his activities are necessary to the people, are needed by society.

Certainly, complete happiness includes having a family, good living conditions, enjoying friendship. Care for personal welfare is quite natural and should not be disregarded, said Romaine Rolland. But if one concentrates only on this and neglects social welfare and the safeguarding of all human society, life becomes shameful, trivial, worthless.

Communism is inconceivable without the development of the creative abilities of every member of society, without the harmony of spiritual wealth, moral purity and physical perfection. Communism proclaims: from each according to his abilities. On the other hand, by guaranteeing the right to work, destroying want and putting an end to wars, by ensuring the equality of all people (equal relations to property, followed by equal opportunities of fully satisfying one's requirements) communism creates all the necessary conditions for the development of man's personality, for the complete happiness of all people. Inasmuch as communism requires the development of every man's abilities (which are different in different people), and creates the conditions for an all-round development of these abilities, communism excludes the levelling of the personality. Communism humanizes man.

Of course all this does not come of itself. But

even at the initial stage of communism, in the age of socialism, when labour is still a means of subsistence, when equality cannot as yet be fully effected in the sphere of consumption, when there are still essential distinctions between town and country, intellectual and physical labour, communism gives **all** the people the essential basis of happiness: the happiness to feel that one's labour, one's life are needed by society. It gives one the greatest pleasure, the fullest enjoyment to feel oneself a needed person.

Who's Who handbooks are popular in many capitalist countries. They are good publicity for the monopoly bosses, bank directors, statesmen and high-born aristocrats.

In socialist countries a person's social standing is not determined by his wealth, descent, or occupation. Be he a worker, or farmer, doctor or writer, spaceman or scientist, agronomist, artist or statesman, he is merited by the social results of his activities.

Communism makes every man a MAN spelled in capital letters.

CONTENTS

Chapter I (introductory). THE FUTURE WHICH CONCERNS EVERYONE TODAY	3
The Present and the Future	3
The Time We Live In	5
Chapter II (historical). COMMUNISM AND MYTHS	11
Dreams	11
Utopias	13
Experiments	25
Why Utopian Socialism Was Doomed	29
Chapter III (theoretical). COMMUNISM AND SCIENCE	32
How Do Rivers Know that They Should Flow into the Ocean?	32
From Utopia to Science	34
Why Nobody Sets Up a Party to Promote the Onset of a Lunar Eclipse	44
Communism: as It Is and Will Be in Future	47
Chapter IV (on the present). COMMUNISM AND HISTORY	53
Along the Road to Communism	54
Spelled Manchester—Pronounced Liverpool	59
The Highroad of Today	68
Chapter V (and the last). COMMUNISM AND THE HAPPINESS OF ALL THE PEOPLE	72

Ш. Герман

Размышления о социальном будущем человечества
на английском языке

Цена 20 коп.



